#### 1. An optimal plan for Problem 1, 2, 3

### An optimal plan for Problem 1:

Load(C1, P1, SFO)

Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)

Load(C2, P2, JFK)

Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)

UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)

UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)

#### An optimal plan for Problem 2:

Load(C2, P2, JFK)

Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)

Load(C1, P1, SFO)

Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)

Load(C3, P3, ATL)

Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)

UnLoad(C3, P3, SFO)

UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)

UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)

#### An optimal plan for Problem 3:

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)

Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)

UnLoad(C4, P2, SFO)

UnLoad(C3, P1, JFK)

UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)

UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)

# 2. 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

Problem	Search Algorithm	Expansions	<b>Goal Tests</b>	New Nodes	Time consuming	Plan	Result
						length	
Problem 1	breadth_first_search	43	56	180	0.036	6	Load(C2, P2, JFK)
							Load(C1, P1, SFO)
							Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
							Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
							UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)

Duckla 2	broadth East	2242	4609	30509	7.2766	9	Lood(C2 D2 HEV)
Problem 2	breadth_first_search	3343	4609	30509	7.2766	9	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)
Problem 3	breadth_first_search	14663	18098	129631	37.8	12	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)
Problem 1	uniform_cost_searc	55	57	224	0.04	6	Load(C1, P1, SFO)
	 h						Load(C2, P2, JFK)
							Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
							Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
							UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)
							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 2	uniform_cost_searc	4852	4854	44030	11.38	9	Load(C1, P1, SFO)
	h						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(C1, P1, JFK)
							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 3	uniform_cost_searc	18223	18225	159618	46.16	12	Load(C1, P1, SFO)
	h						Load(C2, P2, JFK)
							Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
							Load(C3, P1, ATL)
							Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
							Load(C4, P2, ORD)
							Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
		I	<u> </u>	1			, (, 010, 510)

							Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
							UnLoad(C4, P2, SFO)
							UnLoad(C3, P1, JFK)
							UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)
							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 1	depth_first_graph_s	12	13	48	0.013566	12	Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
	earch						Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
							Load(C1, P2, SFO)
							Fly(P2, SFO, JFK)
							Fly(P1, JFK, SFO)
							UnLoad(C1, P2, JFK)
							Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)
							Fly(P1, SFO, JFK)
							Load(C2, P1, JFK)
							Fly(P2, SFO, JFK)
							Fly(P1, JFK, SFO)
							UnLoad(C2, P1, SFO)
Problem 2	depth_first_graph_s	582	583	5211	3.31	575	Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
	earch						Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
							Fly(P3, SFO, JFK)
							Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
							Fly(P2, JFK, ATL)
							Fly(P3, JFK, ATL)
							Fly(P2, ATL, SFO)
							Fly(P3, ATL, SFO)
							Load(C1, P3, SFO)
							Fly(P3, SFO, ATL)
							Fly(P2, SFO, ATL)
							Fly(P3, ATL, JFK)
Problem 3	depth_first_graph_s	627	628	5176	3.58	596	Fly(P1, SFO, ORD)
	earch						Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
							Fly(P1, ORD, ATL)
							Fly(P2, ORD, ATL)
							Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
							Fly(P2, ATL, SFO)
							Load(C1, P2, SFO)
							Fly(P2, SFO, ORD)
							Fly(P1, JFK, ORD)
							Fly(P2, ORD, ATL)
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>			

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

Problem	Search Algorithm	Expansions	<b>Goal Tests</b>	New Nodes	Time consuming	Plan length	Result
Problem 1	astar_search h_ignore_preconditi ons	33	35	136	0.1656	6	Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO) UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK) UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 2	astar_search h_ignore_preconditi ons	1045	1047	9646	75.494	9	Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO) Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) Load(C3, P3, ATL) Fly(P3, ATL, SFO) UnLoad(C3, P3, SFO) UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK) UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 3	astar_search h_ignore_preconditi ons	6017	6019	53851	721.39	12	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) Fly(P1, ATL, JFK) UnLoad(C4, P2, SFO) UnLoad(C3, P1, JFK) UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK) UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 1	astar_search h_pg_levelsum	32	34	138	0.688	6	Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO) UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 2	astar_search h_pg_levelsum	168	170	1618	56.304	9	Load(C1, P1, SFO) Fly(P1, SFO, JFK) Load(C3, P3, ATL) Fly(P3, ATL, SFO) UnLoad(C3, P3, SFO) UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK) Load(C2, P2, JFK) Fly(P2, JFK, SFO)

							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)
Problem 3	astar_search	940	942	8732	410.82	12	Load(C1, P1, SFO)
	h_pg_levelsum						Fly(P1, SFO, ATL)
							Load(C2, P2, JFK)
							Fly(P2, JFK, ORD)
							Load(C3, P1, ATL)
							Fly(P1, ATL, JFK)
							Load(C4, P2, ORD)
							UnLoad(C3, P1, JFK)
							Fly(P2, ORD, SFO)
							UnLoad(C1, P1, JFK)
							UnLoad(C4, P2, SFO)
							UnLoad(C2, P2, SFO)

## 4. 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?

Levelsum is the best heuristic for these problems.

Heuristic search planning methods are not always better than non-heuristic search planning methods. According to the tables above breadth first search and uniform cost search are all consuming less time than heuristic search planning methods. Although heuristic search planning methods has less expansions, goal tests and new nodes exploring than non-heuristic methods, but the time consuming may be more than the non-heuristic methods since computing the heuristic function h(n) may consume much more time.