AIND-Planning Project

Optimal Plans

Problem 1.	
Init(At(C1, SFO) ∧ At(C2, JFK) ∧ At(P1, SFO) ∧ At(P2, JFK) ∧ Cargo(C1) ∧ Cargo(C2) ∧ Plane(P1) ∧ Plane(P2) ∧ Airport(JFK) ∧ Airport(SFO)) Goal(At(C1, JFK) ∧ At(C2, SFO))	Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO) Unload(C2, P2, SFO) Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Problem 2.	
Init(At(C1, SFO) ∧ At(C2, JFK) ∧ At(C3, ATL) ∧ At(P1, SFO) ∧ At(P2, JFK) ∧ At(P3, ATL) ∧ Cargo(C1) ∧ Cargo(C2) ∧ Cargo(C3) ∧ Plane(P1) ∧ Plane(P2) ∧ Plane(P3) ∧ Airport(JFK) ∧ Airport(SFO) ∧ Airport(ATL)) Goal(At(C1, JFK) ∧ At(C2, SFO) ∧ At(C3, SFO))	Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO) Load(C3, P3, ATL) Fly(P3, ATL, SFO) Unload(C3, P3, SFO) Unload(C2, P2, SFO) Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Problem 3.	
Init(At(C1, SFO) ∧ At(C2, JFK) ∧ At(C3, ATL) ∧ At(C4, ORD) ∧ At(P1, SFO) ∧ At(P2, JFK) ∧ Cargo(C1) ∧ Cargo(C2) ∧ Cargo(C3) ∧ Cargo(C4) ∧ Plane(P1) ∧ Plane(P2) ∧ Airport(JFK) ∧ Airport(SFO) ∧ Airport(ATL) ∧ Airport(ORD)) Goal(At(C1, JFK) ∧ At(C3, JFK) ∧ At(C2, SFO) ∧ At(C4, SFO))	Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, ORD) Load(C4, P2, ORD) Fly(P2, ORD, SFO) Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, ATL) Load(C3, P1, ATL) Fly(P1, ATL, JFK) Unload(C4, P2, SFO) Unload(C3, P1, JFK) Unload(C2, P2, SFO) Unload(C1, P1, JFK)

Priya: Awesome: Good work! You have identified the optimal no. of steps for each of the 3 problems.

- Compare and contrast non-heuristic search result metrics (optimality, time elapsed, number of node expansions) for Problems 1,2, and 3. Include breadth-first, depth-first, and at least one other uninformed non-heuristic search in your comparison; Your third choice of non-heuristic search may be skipped for Problem 3 if it takes longer than 10 minutes to run, but a note in this case should be included.

Search	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
breadth_first_search	43	56	180	6	0.2525
breadth_first_tree_search	1458	1459	5960	6	10.6024
depth_first_graph_search	21	22	84	20	0.1643
depth_limited_search	101	271	414	50	0.5415
uniform_cost_search	55	57	224	6	0.2941

In problem 1, depth_first variants failed to deliver optimal plans, even though they perform well in term expansions, goal tests and new nodes. Overall, breadth_first_search is the winning search (optimal, fast).

Search	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
breadth_first_search	3343	4609	30509	9	79.2501
depth_first_graph_search	624	625	5602	619	17.2183
uniform_cost_search	4852	4854	44030	9	119.1123

Priya: Very neat comparison of all the different search results on problems 1, 2 and 3.

Search	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
breadth_first_search	14663	19098	129631	12	538.4931
depth_first_graph_search	408	409	3364	392	12.5751
uniform_cost_search	18223	18225	159618	12	661.3171

We see similar results for problems 2 and 3. Depth_first explored the fewest numbers of nodes, which in turn had the shortest execution time, however, failed to deliver optimal plans. In problem 2, the returned plan's length was 619, comprised of many repeated steps. Breadth_first_search overall outperforms and delivers optimal plans. However, we could see that there's a need for 'smarter' (heuristic-based) searches since execution time is getting too long.

Priya: Suggestion: The link below has an interesting comparison of the BFS and DFS methods on when to chose
one vs the other : http://stackoverflow.com/questions/3332947/when-is-it-practical-to-use-dfs-vs-bfs

- Compare and contrast heuristic search result metrics using A* with the "ignore preconditions" and "level-sum" heuristics for Problems 1, 2, and 3.

Problem 1	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
recursive_best_first_search h_1	4229	4230	17023	6	21.8154
greedy_best_first_graph_search h_1	7	9	28	6	0.0371
astar_search h_1	55	57	224	6	0.2855
astar_search h_ignore_preconditions	41	43	170	6	0.4099
astar_search h_pg_levelsum	11	13	50	6	0.6041
Problem 2	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
greedy_best_first_graph_search h_1	990	992	8910	21	30.644
astar_search h_1	4852	4854	44030	9	153.2734
astar_search h_ignore_preconditions	1450	1452	13303	9	43.2556
astar_search h_pg_levelsum	86	88	841	9	10.21
Problem 3	expansions	goal tests	new nodes	plan length	time
greedy_best_first_graph_search h_1	5578	5580	49150	22	193.103
astar_search h_1	18223	18225	159618	12	665.9928
astar_search h_ignore_preconditions	5040	5042	44944	12	175.4908
astar_search h_pg_levelsum	325	327	3002	12	44.5952

Priya: Well done! All algorithms have been implemented properly

Most of the search strategies deliver optimal plans (except for greedy_best_first_graph in Problems 2 and 3). The recursive_best_first strategy reached optimal plan, but had prohibitive running time and node expansions (relatively).

Priya: Required: You have summarized well the performance of the algorithms. However please explain the reason for the observed results using at least one appropriate justification
from the video lessons or from outside resources (e.g., Norvig and Russells textbook). Example why does ignore preconditions run faster than pg_levelsum? why can DFS not find the optimal plan length?
Please don't forget to site your references like you did in your research report

Among the A*, we can see a clear pattern of improvement from h_1 to h_ignore_preconditions to h_pg_levelsum. This reflects the degrees of admissibility among the heuristics. However, there is a reverse trend in execution time in problem 1. This is possibly due to the increase in heuristic complexity outweighing the numbers of nodes explored as these are small.

Priya: This is an important point. Better heuristics like level sum
may be more efficient in reducing the no. of expansions but costly in terms of taking more time.

- What was the best heuristic used in these problems? Was it better than non-heuristic search planning methods for all problems? Why or why not?

A* with pg_levelsum heuristics outperform everything else, shortest execution time in general, fewest nodes explored, and deliver optimal plans.

Priya: I agree with your conclusiobn

Note: Some searches were not performed due to prohibitive execution time (hours+)