Uninformed Search

- Problem-solving agents
  - Single-State Problems
- Tree search algorithms
  - Breadth-First Search
  - Depth-First Search
  - Limited-Depth Search
  - Iterative Deepening
- Search with Partial Information



Many slides based on Russell & Norvig's slides Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach

Problem-Solving Agents

- Simple reflex agents
  - have a direct mapping from states to actions
  - typically too large to store
  - would take too long to learn
- Goal-Based agents
  - can consider future actions and the desirability of their outcomes (→ Planning)
- Problem-Solving Agents
  - special case of Goal-Based Agents
  - find sequences of actions that lead to desirable states
- Uninformed Problem-Solving Agents
  - do not have any information except the problem definition
- Informed Problem-Solving Agents
  - have knowledge where to look for solutions

Goal-Based Agent

- the agent knows what states are desirable
  - it will try to choose an action that leads to a desirable state



Formulate-Search-Execute Design

- **Formulate:**
  - Goal formulation:
    - A *goal* is a set of world states that the agents wants to be in (where the goal is achieved)
    - Goals help to organize behavior by limiting the objectives that the agent is trying to achieve
  - Problem formulation:
    - Process of which actions and states to consider, given a goal
- **Search:**
  - the process of finding the solution for a problem in the form of an **action sequence**
  - *an agent with several immediate options of unknown value can decide what to do by **examining different possible sequences** of actions that lead to states of known value, and then **choosing the best***
- **Execute:**
  - perform the first action of the solution sequence

Simple Problem-Solving Agent

```
function SIMPLE-PROBLEM-SOLVING-AGENT(percept) returns an action
    static: seq, an action sequence, initially empty
            state, some description of the current world state
            goal, a goal, initially null
            problem, a problem formulation

    state ← UPDATE-STATE(state, percept)
    if seq is empty then
        goal ← FORMULATE-GOAL(state)
        problem ← FORMULATE-PROBLEM(state, goal)
        seq ← SEARCH(problem)
    action ← RECOMMENDATION(seq, state)
    seq ← REMAINDER(seq, state)
    return action
```

Example: Navigate in Romania

- On holiday in Romania; currently in Arad.
- Flight leaves tomorrow from Bucharest

- Formulate goal:
  - be in Bucharest
- Formulate problem:
  - states: various cities
  - actions: drive between cities
- Find solution:
  - sequence of cities, e.g., Arad, Sibiu, Rimnicu Vilcea, Pitesti

- Assumption:
  - agent has a map of Romania, i.e., it can use this information to find out which of the three ways out of Arad is more likely to go to Bucharest

Example: Romania



Single-state Problem Formulation

A **problem** is defined by four items:

1. **initial state**
   - e.g., "at Arad"
2. **description of actions and their effects**
   - typically as a successor function that maps a state s to a set $S(s)$ of action-state pairs
   - e.g., $S(\text{„at Arad“}) = \{\text{<„goto Zerind“, „at Zerind“>}, \ldots\}$
3. **goal test**, can be
   - explicit, e.g., $s =$ "at Bucharest"
   - implicit, e.g., Checkmate(s), NoDirt(s)
4. **path cost** (additive)
   - e.g., sum of distances, number of actions executed, etc.
   - $c(s_1, a, s_2)$ are the costs for one step (one action),
   - assumed to be ≥ 0

Single-State Problems

Yes

- 8-queens puzzle
- 8-puzzle
- Towers of Hanoi
- Cross-Word puzzles
- Sudoku
- Chess, Bridge, Scrabble puzzles
- Rubik's cube
- Sobokan
- Traveling Salesman Problem

No

- Tetris
  - dynamic not static
- Solitaire
  - only partially observable

State Space of a Problem

State Space

- the set of all states reachable from the initial state
- implicitly defined by the initial state and the successor function, so we have a graph, the **state-space graph**



State Space of a Problem

State Space

- the set of all states reachable from the initial state
- implicitly defined by the initial state and the successor function

Path

- a sequence of states connected by a sequence of actions

Solution

- a path that leads from the initial state to a goal state

Optimal Solution

- solution with the minimum path cost

Example: Romania



Selecting a State Space

Real world is absurdly complex

→ **state space** must be **abstracted** for problem solving

- **(Abstract) state**
  - corresponds to a set of real states
- **(Abstract) action**
  - corresponds to a complex combination of real actions
  - e.g., "go from Arad to Zerind" represents a complex set of possible routes, detours, rest stops, etc.
  - for guaranteed realizability, any real state "in Arad“ must get to some real state "in Zerind"
  - each abstract action should be "easier" than the original problem
- **(Abstract) solution**
  - corresponds to a set of real paths that are solutions in the real world

Example: Romania – State Space



Example: The 8-puzzle



Start State



Goal State

- states?
  - location of tiles
    - ignore intermediate positions during sliding
- goal test?
  - situation corresponds to goal state
- path cost?
  - number of steps in path (each step costs 1)

- actions?
  - move blank tile (left, right, up, down)
    - easier than having separate moves for each tile
    - ignore actions like unjamming slides if they get stuck

Example: The 8-Queens Problem

conflict





no conflict

- states?
  - any configuration of 8 queens on the board
- goal test?
  - no pair of queens can capture each other
- actions?
  - move one of the queens to another square
- path cost?
  - not of interest here

inefficient complete-state formulation

$\rightarrow 64 \cdot 63 \cdot ... \cdot 57 \approx 3 \cdot 10^{14}$ states

Example: The 8-Queens Problem

conflict





no conflict

- states?
  - n non-attacking queens in the left n columns
- goal test?
  - no pair of queens can capture each other
- actions?
  - add queen in column $n + 1$
  - without attacking the others
- path cost?
  - not of interest here

more efficient incremental formulation
→ only 2057 states

Tree Search Algorithms

Treat the state-space graph as a tree

- Expanding a node
  - offline, simulated exploration of state space by generating successors of already-explored states (successor function)
- Search strategy
  - determines which node is expanded next

```
function TREE-SEARCH( problem, strategy) returns a solution, or failure
    initialize the search tree using the initial state of problem
    loop do
        if there are no candidates for expansion then return failure
        choose a leaf node for expansion according to strategy
        if the node contains a goal state then return the corresponding solution
        else expand the node and add the resulting nodes to the search tree
    end
```

Tree Search Example

- Initial state: start with node Arad



Tree Search Example

- Initial state: start with node Arad
- expand node Arad



Tree Search Example

- Initial state: start with node Arad
- expand node Arad
- expand node Sibiu



Tree Search Example

- Initial state: start with node Arad
- expand node Arad
- expand node Sibiu



States vs. Nodes

- State
  - (representation of) a physical configuration
- Node
  - data structure constituting part of a search tree
  - includes
    - state
    - parent node
    - action
    - path cost *g(x)*
    - depth
- Expand
  - creates new nodes
  - fills in the various fields
  - uses the successor function to create the corresponding states



Implementation: General Tree Search

```
function TREE-SEARCH( problem, fringe) returns a solution, or failure
    fringe ← INSERT(MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem]), fringe)
    loop do
        if fringe is empty then return failure
        node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)
        if GOAL-TEST(problem, STATE(node)) then return node
        fringe ← INSERTALL(EXPAND(node, problem), fringe)
```

```
function EXPAND( node, problem) returns a set of nodes
    successors ← the empty set
    for each action, result in SUCCESSOR-FN(problem, STATE[node]) do
        s ← a new NODE
        PARENT-NODE[s] ← node;  ACTION[s] ← action;  STATE[s] ← result
        PATH-COST[s] ← PATH-COST[node] + STEP-COST(node, action, s)
        DEPTH[s] ← DEPTH[node] + 1
        add s to successors
    return successors
```

Search Strategies

- A search strategy is defined by picking the **order of node expansion**
  - implementation in a queue
- Strategies are evaluated along the following dimensions:
  - **completeness**: does it always find a solution if one exists?
  - **time complexity**: number of nodes generated
  - **space complexity**: maximum number of nodes in memory
  - **optimality**: does it always find a least-cost solution?
- **Time and space com**plexity are measured in terms of
  - b: maximum branching factor of the search tree
  - d: depth of the least-cost solution
  - m: maximum depth of the state space (may be ∞)

Search Strategies

- **Uninformed** (blind) search strategies use only the information available in the problem definition
  - Breadth-first search
  - Uniform-cost search
  - Depth-first search
  - Depth-limited search
  - Iterative deepening search
- **Informed** (heuristic) search strategies have knowledge that allows to guide the search to promising regions
  - Greedy Search
  - A* Best-First Search

Breadth-First Strategy

- Expand all neighbors of a node (breadth) before any of its successors is expanded (depth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the shallowest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a FIFO queue (first-in-first-out, new nodes go to end of queue)



Breadth-First Strategy

- Expand all neighbors of a node (breadth) before any of its successors is expanded (depth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the shallowest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a FIFO queue (first-in-first-out, new nodes go to end of queue)



Breadth-First Strategy

- Expand all neighbors of a node (breadth) before any of its successors is expanded (depth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the shallowest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a FIFO queue (first-in-first-out, new nodes go to end of queue)



Breadth-First Strategy

- Expand all neighbors of a node (breadth) before any of its successors is expanded (depth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the shallowest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a FIFO queue (first-in-first-out, new nodes go to end of queue)



Properties of Breadth-First Search

- Completeness
  - Yes (if b is finite)
- Time Complexity
  - each depth has b times as many nodes as the previous
  - each node is expanded
  - except the goal node in level d
    - worst case: goal is last node in this level

$\Rightarrow 1 + b + b^2 + b^3 + \ldots + b^d + \left(b^{(d+1)} - b\right) = O\left(b^{d+1}\right)$

If goal-property is checked right after generation instead before expansion, it reduces to $O\left(b^d\right)$

- Space Complexity
  - every node must remain in memory
    - it is either a fringe node or an ancestor of a fringe node
    - in the end, the goal will be in the fringe, and its ancestors will be needed for the solution path

$\Rightarrow O(b^d)$ many nodes in the fringe, hence $O(b^d)$

- Optimality: Yes, if the costs are non-decresing function of depth, e.g., for uniform costs (e.g., if cost = 1 per step)

Combinatorial Explosion

- Breadth-first search
  - branching factor $b = 10$, 1,000,000 nodes/sec, 1000 bytes/node

Depth	Nodes	Time	Memory
2	110	.11 msecs	107 kB
4	11 110	11 msecs	10.6 MB
6	10^6	1.1 secs	1 GB
8	10^8	2 minutes	103 GB
10	10^{10}	3 hours	10 TB
12	10^{12}	13 days	1 PetaBytes
14	10^{14}	3.5 years	99 PetaBytes
16	10^{16}	350 years	10 ExaBytes

  - Space is the bigger problem
    - Storing 10 TB every 3 hours is a challenge...
  - But Time is also quite challenging.

Uniform-Cost Search

- Breadth-first search can be generalized to cost functions
  - each node now has associated costs
  - costs accumulate over path
  - instead of expanding the shallowest path, expand the least-cost unexpanded node
  - breadth-first is special case where all costs are equal
- Implementation
  - fringe = queue ordered by path cost
- Completeness
  - yes, if each step has a positive cost (cost ≥ ε)
  - otherwise infinite loops are possible
- Space and Time complexity $b^{1+o(\lfloor C^*/\varepsilon \rfloor)}$
  - number of nodes with costs < costs of optimal solution C^*
- Optimality
  - Yes – nodes expanded in increasing order of path costs

Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Depth-First Strategy

- Expand all successors of a node (depth) before any of its neighbors is expanded (breadth)
- Implemetation:
  - expand the deepest unexpanded node
  - fringe is a LIFO queue (last-in-first-out, new nodes at begin of queue)



Properties of Depth-First Search

Completeness

- No, fails in infinite-depth search spaces and spaces with loops
- complete in finite spaces if modified so that repeated states are avoided

Time Complexity

- has to explore each branch until maximum depth $m \Rightarrow O(b^m)$
- terrible if $m > d$ (depth of goal node)
- but may be faster than breadth-first if solutions are dense

Space Complexity

- only nodes in current path and their unexpanded siblings need to be stored

$\Rightarrow$ only linear complexity $O(m \cdot b)$

Optimality

- No, longer (more expensive) solutions may be found before shorter (cheaper) ones

Backtracking Search

Even more space-efficient variant

- does not store all expanded nodes, but only the current path
  $\Rightarrow O(m)$
  - if no further expansion is possible, go back to the predecessor
  - each node is able to generate the *next* successor
- only needs to store and modify one state
  - actions can do and undo changes on this one state

Depth-limited Search

- depth-first search is provided with a depth limit l
  - nodes with depths $d > l$ are not considered → incomplete
  - if $d < l$ it is not optimal (like depth-first search)
  - time complexity $O(b^l)$, space complexity $O(bl)$

```
function DEPTH-LIMITED-SEARCH( problem, limit) returns soln/fail/cutoff
    RECURSIVE-DLS(MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem]), problem, limit)

function RECURSIVE-DLS(node, problem, limit) returns soln/fail/cutoff
    cutoff-occurred? ← false
    if GOAL-TEST(problem, STATE[node]) then return node
    else if DEPTH[node] = limit then return cutoff
    else for each successor in EXPAND(node, problem) do
        result ← RECURSIVE-DLS(successor, problem, limit)
        if result = cutoff then cutoff-occurred? ← true
        else if result ≠ failure then return result
    if cutoff-occurred? then return cutoff else return failure
```

Iterative Deepening Search

- Main problem with depth-limited search is setting of l
- Simple solution:
  - try all possible $l = 0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots$

```
function ITERATIVE-DEEPENING-SEARCH( problem) returns a solution
    inputs: problem, a problem
    for depth ← 0 to ∞ do
        result ← DEPTH-LIMITED-SEARCH( problem, depth)
        if result ≠ cutoff then return result
    end
```

  - costs are dominated by the last iteration, thus the overhead is marginal

Iterative Deepening Search

Limit = 0

Limit = 1

Limit = 2



Iterative Deepening Search



Properties of Iterative Deepening Search

- Completeness
  - Yes (no infinite paths)
- Time Complexity
  - first level has to be searched d times
  - last level has to be searched once

$$\Rightarrow d \cdot b + (d-1)b^2 + \ldots + 1 \cdot b^d = \sum_{i=1}^{d} (d-i+1) \cdot b^i$$

- Space Complexity

  $\Rightarrow$ only linear complexity $O(bd)$
- Optimality
  - Yes, the solution is found at the minimum depth

$\Rightarrow$ combines advantages of depth-first and breadth-first search

Comparison of Time Complexities

Worst-case (goal is in right-most node at level d)

- Depth-Limited Search

$$N_{DLS} = b + b^2 + \ldots + b^d = \sum_{i=1}^{d} b^i$$

- Iterative Deepening

$$N_{IDS} = d \cdot b + (d-1)b^2 + \ldots + 1 \cdot b^d = \sum_{i=1}^{d} (d - i + 1) \cdot b^i$$

Example: $b = 10, d = 5$

$$N_{DLS} = 10 + 100 + 1000 + 10{,}000 + 100{,}000 = 111{,}110$$

$$N_{IDS} = 50 + 400 + 3000 + 20{,}000 + 100{,}000 = 123{,}450$$

} Overhead of IDS only ca. 10%

Bidirectional Search

- Perform two searches simultaneously
  - forward starting with initial state
  - backward starting with goal state

  check whether generated node is in fringe of the other search



- Properties
  - reduction in complexity $\left(b^{d/2} + b^{d/2} \ll b^{d}\right)$
  - only possible if actions can be reversed
  - search paths may not meet for depth-first bidirectional search

Summary of Algorithms

- Problem formulation usually requires abstracting away real-world details to define a state space that can feasibly be explored
- Variety of uninformed search strategies
- Iterative deepening search uses only linear space and not much more time than other uninformed algorithms

Criterion	Breadth-First	Uniform-Cost	Depth-First	Depth-Limited	Iterative Deepening
Complete?	Yes*	Yes*	No	Yes, if $l \geq d$	Yes
Time	b^{d+1}	$b^{\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil}$	b^m	b^l	b^d
Space	b^{d+1}	$b^{\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil}$	bm	bl	bd
Optimal?	Yes*	Yes	No	No	Yes*

Assumptions about the Environment

- static
  - we do not pay attention to possible changes in the environment
- observable
  - we can at least observe our initial state
- discrete
  - possible actions can be enumerated
- deterministic
  - the expected outcome of an action is always identical to the true outcome
  - once we have a plan, we can execute it „with eyes closed“

→ easiest possible scenario

Problems with Partial Information

Single-State Problem

deterministic, fully observable

- agent knows exactly which state it will be in
- solution is a sequence

Conformant Problem (sensorless problem)

non-observable

- agent may have no idea where it is
- solution (if any) is a sequence

Contingency Problem

nondeterministic and/or partially observable

- percepts provide new information about current state
- solution is a contingent plan (tree) or a policy
- search and execution often interleaved

Exploration Problem

state-space is not known → Reinforcement Learning

Example: Vacuum World

- Single-state Problem
  - start in #5
  - goal
    - no dirt
- Solution
  - [*Right, Suck*]



Example: Vacuum World

- Conformant Problem
  - start in any state (we can't sense)
    - $start \leftarrow \{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8\}$
  - actions
    - e.g., *Right* goes to $\{2,4,6,8\}$
  - goal
    - no dirt
- Solution
  - [*Right, Suck, Left, Suck*]



Example: Vacuum World

- Contingency Problem
  - start in #5
  - indeterministic actions
    - *Suck* can dirty a clean carpet
  - sensing
    - dirt at current location?
  - goal
    - no dirt
- Solution
  - [*Right,* **if** *dirt* **then** *Suck*]