Implementing a Planning Search

1. Optimal Plan

There are a few different versions of optimal plans for each problem. This is because each action is "instanatenous". There is no concept of time taken to perform each task and each task is performed sequentially. In theory if you have two planes at the same starting point needing to load cargo and fly to the same place you could load them at the same time (or one at a time) and fly them at the same time to the same destination. Since our simple algorithm doesn't work this way, plans like Load, Fly, Unload, Load, Fly, Unload, could be equivalent to Load, Load, Fly, Fly, Unload, Unload, or Load, Fly, Load, Fly, Unload, Unload, etc. While some searches had different results, they might have had "optimal results" meaning the smaller number of steps to accomplish the goal.

I will show the results of the top 4 searches. These all produced the smallest plan lengths in acceptable amount of time. Even though they might be different, they can all be considered optimal in terms of plan length.

```
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 1
Solving Air Cargo Problem 1 using breadth_first_search...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
  43
          56
                  180
Plan length: 6 Time elapsed in seconds: 0.027739397992263548
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 5
Plan length: 6
Solving Air Cargo Problem 1 using uniform_cost_search...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
  55
          57
                  224
Plan length: 6 Time elapsed in seconds: 0.03437601499899756
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
```

```
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 8
Solving Air Cargo Problem 1 using astar_search with h_1...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
  55
          57
                  224
Plan length: 6 Time elapsed in seconds: 0.03279911399295088
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
python run_search.py -p 1 -s 9
Solving Air Cargo Problem 1 using astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
  41
          43
                  170
Plan length: 6 Time elapsed in seconds: 0.03736400400521234
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
python run search.py -p 2 -s 1
Solving Air Cargo Problem 2 using breadth_first_search...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
 3343
           4609
                    30509
Plan length: 9 Time elapsed in seconds: 13.636947063001571
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
Unload(C3, P3, SFO)
```

```
python run_search.py -p 2 -s 5
Solving Air Cargo Problem 2 using uniform_cost_search...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
 4853
           4855
                    44041
Plan length: 9 Time elapsed in seconds: 11.210942698002327
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
Unload(C3, P3, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
python run_search.py -p 2 -s 8
Solving Air Cargo Problem 2 using astar_search with h_1...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
 4853
           4855
                    44041
Plan length: 9 Time elapsed in seconds: 11.454999515990494
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
Unload(C3, P3, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
python run_search.py -p 2 -s 9
Solving Air Cargo Problem 2 using astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
 1428
           1430
                   13085
Plan length: 9 Time elapsed in seconds: 3.876375399995595
Load(C3, P3, ATL)
Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
Unload(C3, P3, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
```

```
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
```

python run_search.py -p 3 -s 1 Solving Air Cargo Problem 3 using breadth_first_search... Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes 14663 18098 129631 Plan length: 12 Time elapsed in seconds: 94.99353891800274 Load(C2, P2, JFK) Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P2, JFK, ORD) Load(C4, P2, ORD) Fly(P1, SFO, ATL) Load(C3, P1, ATL) Fly(P1, ATL, JFK) Unload(C1, P1, JFK) Unload(C3, P1, JFK) Fly(P2, ORD, SFO) Unload(C2, P2, SFO) Unload(C4, P2, SFO) python run_search.py -p 3 -s 5 Solving Air Cargo Problem 3 using uniform_cost_search... Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes 18233 18235 159697 Plan length: 12 Time elapsed in seconds: 48.442402720000246 Load(C1, P1, SFO) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P1, SFO, ATL) Load(C3, P1, ATL) Fly(P2, JFK, ORD) Load(C4, P2, ORD) Fly(P2, ORD, SFO) Unload(C4, P2, SFO) Fly(P1, ATL, JFK) Unload(C3, P1, JFK) Unload(C2, P2, SFO) Unload(C1, P1, JFK) python run_search.py -p 3 -s 8 Solving Air Cargo Problem 3 using astar_search with h_1... Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes 18235 18233 159697 Plan length: 12 Time elapsed in seconds: 49.29397620300006

```
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
Load(C3, P1, ATL)
Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
Load(C4, P2, ORD)
Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
Unload(C4, P2, SFO)
Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
Unload(C3, P1, JFK)
Unload(C2, P2, SFO)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
python run search.py -p 3 -s 9
Solving Air Cargo Problem 3 using astar_search with h_ignore_preconditions...
Expansions Goal Tests New Nodes
 4859
           4861
                    43129
Plan length: 12 Time elapsed in seconds: 15.309105210006237
```

Load(C2, P2, JFK)
Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
Load(C4, P2, ORD)
Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
Unload(C4, P2, SFO)
Load(C1, P1, SFO)
Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
Load(C3, P1, ATL)
Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
Unload(C3, P1, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)
Unload(C1, P1, JFK)

2. Compare and contrast non-heuristic search result metrics
Uniform Cost Search - This was the best performing non-heuristic search
algorithm in terms of plan length and time. It was slightly worse than Breadth First
Search in terms of expansions and goal tests.

Breadth First Search - This was the best performing non-heuristic search algorithm in terms of plan length and expansions, goal tests, and new nodes. It is worse than Uniform Cost Search in terms of time taken. The time is pretty comparable with the simpler problems, but as you add literals, the time increases a lot. Problem 3 takes almost twice as long as Uniform Cost Search. If memory is an issue, this algorithm might be a good alternative to Uniform Cost Search, but with he current problems and my computer setup, this is definitely second.

Depth First Graph Search - While this doesn't produce an optimal path, it is extremely fast and has the smallest number of expansions, goal tests, and new nodes. If speed or memory are an issue, this is a good algorithm, however the plan isn't great. In the first example, you start out with a plan at JFK and SFO. The first thing that this algorithm does is fly the planes to the opposite airports for no reason. While this is extremely wasteful with regard to airplanes, the speed, and small memory footprint could be useful in a situation where all actions are instantaneous, and an optimal solution isn't necessary. It's speed could even be used to test if a solution is possible before passing it to a slower but more optimal algorithm.

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

A Star Search Ignore Preconditions - This was the best performing heuristic algorithm in terms of plan length, time taken, and was great in terms of expansions, goal tests, and new nodes. It was actually the best overall of all searches. Only Depth First Graph search was significantly better in terms of memory and time, but that produced a widely un-optimised plan.

A Star Search - This was the best performing search in terms of plan length, but wasn't as good as Ignore Preconditions when it comes to memory or execution time. Ignore Preconditions is simply better.

A Star Search Level Sum - This performed decently well for problems 1 and 2. It was able to find optimal plans, but the time increased drastically when parameters were added. Problem 2 took 519 seconds where Ignore Preconditions took 3.88 and Problem 3 never finished.

4. The best heuristic

The best heuristic overall was the Ignore Preconditions heuristic. This simply computes the number of states that still need to change and assumes that each takes one action to change them. It worked surprisingly well in this example. It was the hands down winner of all the search algorithms that produce optimal solutions. It also works very quickly and doesn't take up much memory. I would think that it wouldn't work as well for problems were single actions effect more parameters or if the preconditions get more complicated.

Results Table

1 breadth_first_search

	Expansions	Goal	Test	S	New Nod	es	Time	Plan Lenç	gth
	Cargo Problem ´	1	43	56	180 0.02	27	6	Tied Best	Score andThird
Air (Cargo Problem 2	2	334	3	4609	3050	09	13.637	9
Air (Cargo Problem 3	3	1466	63	18098	1296	31	94.99	12

2 breadth_first_tree_search

Expans	sions Go	al Tests	New No	des	TimePlan Length
Air Cargo Pr	oblem 1	1458	1459	5960	0.89 6
Air Cargo Pr	oblem 2		Tin	neout 3	0+ min
Air Cargo Pr	oblem 3		Tin	neout 3	0+ min

3 depth_first_graph_search

	Expansions	Goal	Test	S	New	/ Nod	es	TimePlan	Length
	Cargo Problem Cargo Problem							12 12.32	1444
Air	Cargo Problem	3	592	593	492	7	2.70	571	

4 depth_limited_search

	Expansions	Goal	Test	S	New	Nodes	TimePlan Length
	Cargo Problem Cargo Problem		101	271	414	0.09 50 Timeout	10+ min
Air	Cargo Problem	3				Timeout	30+ min

5 uniform_cost_search

Expar	sions	Goal	Test	ts	New Nod	es Ti	mePlan Len	gth
Air Cargo I Second Be		1	55	57	224 0.03	36 Tie	ed Best Sco	ore and Tied
Air Cargo I	Problem 2	2	485	3	4855	44041	11.21	9
Air Cargo I	Problem (3	1823	33	18235	159697	48.44	12

6 recursive_best_first_search h_1

Expansions	Goa	l Tests	New N	lodes	Time	ePlan Length
Air Cargo Problem	1	4229	4230	1702	29	2.80 6
Air Cargo Problem	2		Т	imeout	10+ n	nin
Air Cargo Problem	3		Т	imeout	10+ n	nin

7 greedy_best_first_graph_search h_1

Goa	Test	S	New	Nod	es	Time	ePlan Le	ngth
1	7	9	28	0.00	5	6		
2	339	401	3617	70.96	3	25		
3	4188	3	4190	C	3700	80	11.59	27
	1	1 7 2 339	1 7 9 2 339 401	1 7 9 28 2 339 401 3617	1 7 9 28 0.00 2 339 401 36170.96	1 7 9 28 0.005 2 339 401 36170.963	1 7 9 28 0.005 6 2 339 401 36170.963 25	2 339 401 36170.963 25

8 astar_search h_1

Expansions	Expansions Goal			New Nodes Tir		Time	mePlan Length		
Air Cargo Problem Second Best Time	1	55	57	224 0.0	33	6	Tied Be	est Score	and Tied
Air Cargo Problem	2	485	3	4855	440	41	11.45	9	

Air Cargo Problem 3 18233 18235 159697 **49.29 12**

9 astar_search h_ignore_preconditions

Expansions	ansions Goal Te		Tests New Nodes			les	TimePlan Length			
Air Cargo Problem Time Overall Win		41	43	170	0.03	37	6	Tied Bes	t Score and Best	
Air Cargo Problem 2		1428		1430 13		1308	35	3.889		
Air Cargo Problem	3	485	9	486	1	4312	29	15.31	12	

10 astar_search h_pg_levelsum

	Expansions Goal		Test	S	New Noo	des	TimePlan Length		
	Cargo Problem Cargo Problem		55 485		224 0.09 4855		•	519.85	9
Air	Cargo Problem	3			Tim	eout 3	30+ r	nin	