

COMP3308/COMP3608, Lecture 2

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Problem Solving and Search.

Uninformed Search: BFS, DFS, UCS and IDS

Informed Search: Greedy Best-First

Reference: Russell and Norvig, ch. 3

Reminders

- **Tutorials start this week**
 - **All tutorials are on Tuesday or Wednesday in the SCS labs; check your timetable**
- **All students must submit their homework in Canvas by 4pm on Tuesday (no matter when your tutorial class is)**
- **Tutorial solutions will be available on Canvas on Wednesday after the last tutorial (at 6pm)**
- **Lecture slides are posted on Saturday morning and will not contain the answers to all questions and exercises that we do during the lecture. The complete lecture slides with the answers will be available on Monday after the lecture (at 1pm)**

Outline

- **Problem-solving and search**
- **Search strategies**
 - **Uninformed (blind)**
 - **Informed (heuristic)**
- **Uninformed search strategies**
 - **Breadth-first**
 - **Uniform cost**
 - **Depth-first**
 - **Depth-limited**
 - **Iterative-deepening**
- **Informed search strategies**
 - **Greedy best-first**
 - **A* - next week**

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Copyright Regulations 1969

WARNING

This material has been reproduced and communicated to you by or on behalf of the **University of Sydney** pursuant to Part VB of the Copyright Act 1968 (the Act).


The material in this communication may be subject to copyright under the Act. Any further reproduction or communication of this material by you may be the subject of copyright protection under the Act.

Do not remove this notice

Problem Solving and Search

Solving Problems by Searching


- Many tasks can be formulated as search problems
- Task: to get from an *initial problem state* to a *goal state*
 - Driving: starting address -> destination address
 - Chess: initial board position -> checkmate position
 - Reasoning: set of facts and rules + query -> answer
- Solution: a path from the initial state to the goal state
- Operators
 - possible actions, possible moves in a game
- Cost (quality) of operators
 - distance, time, money
 - strength of board position in games



Example: Romania

- **On holiday in Romania**
 - **currently in Arad**
 - **flight leaves tomorrow from Bucharest**
- **Step 1. Formulate *goal*: be in Bucharest**
- **Step 2. Formulate search problem:**
 - *states*: various cities
 - *operators*: drive between cities, e.g. from Arad to Sibiu, from Arad to Zerind
- **Step 3. Find solution (path):**
 - **a sequence of cities from Arad to Bucharest, e.g. Arad, Sibiu, Fagaras, Bucharest**

Romania Example - Map



Romania



http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Location_Romania_EU_Europe.PNG

Search Problem Formulation

- A search problem is defined by 4 items
 - 1) **Initial state**, e.g. Arad
 - 2) **Goal state** (1 or more)
 - Stated **explicitly**, e.g. Bucharest
 - Stated **implicitly** with a goal test, e.g. checkmate state
 - 3) **Operators** = actions
 - A set of possible actions transforming 1 state to another , e.g. Arad->Zerind, Arad->Sibiu, etc.
 - 4) **Path cost function** – assigns a numeric value to each path
 - Reflects the performance measure
 - E.g. time, path length in km, number of operators executed
- **Solution** – a path from the initial to a goal state
 - Its quality is measured by the path cost
 - Optimal solution is the one with the lowest path cost
- **State space** - all states reachable from the initial state by operators

Choosing States and Actions - Abstraction

- Real problems are too complex, to solve them we need to *abstract* them, i.e. to simplify them by removing the unnecessary details
 - E.g. we ignore the weather, travel companion, scenery; they are irrelevant for the task of finding a path to Bucharest
 - The actions need to be suitably specified, e.g. “turn the steering wheel to the left by 5 degrees” is not appropriate
 - => the *level of abstraction* must be appropriate (valid and useful)
- (Abstract) state = set of real states
- (Abstract) action = complex combination of real actions
- (Abstract) solution = a real path that is solution in the real world

Example Problem 1: The 8-puzzle

7	2	4
5		6
8	3	1

Start State


	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8

Goal State

a sliding block puzzle

- *States?* 1 state = 1 board configuration of the tiles
- *Operators?* Move blank left, right, up, down
- *Goal state?* Given
- *Path cost?* 1 per move, i.e. path cost=length of path=number of steps


Example Problem 2: The 8-queens



- Place 8 queens on a chessboard (8x8) so that no queen attacks each other
- Is this a solution?

- *Goal state?* 8 queens on board, none attacked
- *Path cost?* 0 (= only the goal state matters and not the number of steps). Other options are also possible, e.g. 1 per move.
- *States =?* 1 state = 1 board configuration of the tiles
- *Operators =?* Put 1 queen on the board or move 1 queen

8-queens - Different Types of Problem Formulation



1. **Incremental** – start with an empty board, add 1 queen at a time
2. **Complete-state** – start with all 8 queens and move them around

Let's take a closer look at 2 possible incremental formulations!

8-queens – Incremental Formulation 1

- *States?* Any arrangement of 0 to 8 queens
- *Initial state?* No queens on the board
- *Operators?* Add a queen to any square
- State space = 1.8×10^{14} states (= $64 \times 63 \times \dots \times 57$)
- Can you suggest a better formulation?
- Prohibit placing a queen in any square that is already attacked!

8-queens – Incremental Formulation 2

- ***States?*** Any arrangement of 0 to 8 queens, 1 in each column, with no queen attacking another
- ***Initial state?*** No queens on the board
- ***Operators?*** Place a queen in the left-most empty column such that it is not attacked by any other queen
- **State space: 2057 states**
- **For 100-queens:**
 - **formulation 1: 10^{400} states**
 - **formulation 2: 10^{52} states (huge improvement but problem still not tractable)**
- **The problem formulation is very important!**

Searching for Solutions

- How can we solve the 8-queens puzzle or the Romania example?
- By *searching the state space*
- We can generate a *search tree* starting from the initial state and applying the operators
- Or we can generate a *search graph* – in a graph the same state can be reached from multiple paths

Tree-Search algorithm – Pseudo Code

- **Basic idea:** offline exploration of the state space by generating successors of the explored states (i.e. by *expanding* states)


```
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
```

start with the initial node

the initial node at the beginning

1. Choose a node for expansion based on the search strategy
2. Check if it is a goal node
Yes-> return solution
No -> expand it by generating its children


Expanded and Fringe Lists



- We will keep two lists:
 - **Expanded** – for nodes that have been expanded
 - **Fringe** – for nodes that have been generated but not expanded yet.
 - We will keep the fringe ordered (implemented as a priority queue) and always select for expansion the first node of the fringe
- For the figure:
 - **Expanded:** Arad
 - **Fringe:** Sibiu, Timisoara, Zerind
 - All the other nodes have not been generated yet
 - Note the notation in the figure for the different types of nodes

Tree Search Example

- Let's put the children of the expanded node at the end of the fringe




Fringe: Arad

Is Arad a goal node? No => expand it

Expanded: none

Tree Search Example (2)




Fringe: Sibiu, Timisoara, Zerind

Expanded: Arad

Is Sibiu a goal node?

No => expand it

Tree Search Example (3)



Fringe: Timisoara, Zerind, Arad, Fagaras, Oradea, Rimnicu Vilcea

Expanded: Arad, Sibiu

Tree Search – More Detailed Pseudo Code

```
function TREE-SEARCH(problem, fringe) returns a solution, or failure
  fringe ← INSERT(MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem]), fringe)
  loop do // nodes in fringe ordered based on their priority according to the search strategy
    if fringe is empty then return failure
    node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe) //select node for expansion, then check if it is a goal
    if GOAL-TEST[problem](STATE[node]) then return SOLUTION(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
```

Is the first node in the fringe a goal node?

Yes => stop and return solution

No => expand it:


- Move it to the expanded list

- Generate its children and put them in the fringe in a order defined by the search strategy (top of the fringe = most desirable child)

- We will keep the fringe ordered

Nodes vs States

- A *node* is different than a *state*
- A node:
 - represents a state
 - is a data structure used in the search tree
 - includes *parent*, *children*, and other relevant information e.g. *depth* and *path cost g*



Search Strategies

- A *search strategy* defines which node from the fringe is most promising and should be expanded next
- We will keep the nodes in the fringe ordered based on the search strategy and always expand the first one (i.e. the best one)
- Evaluation criteria
 - *Completeness* – is it guaranteed to find a solution if one exists?
 - *Optimality* – is it guaranteed to find an *optimal (least cost path)* solution?
 - *Time complexity* – how long does it take to find the solution? (measured as number of generated nodes)
 - *Space complexity* – What is the maximum number of nodes in memory?
- Time and space complexity are measured in terms of:
 - b – max branching factor of the search tree (we can assume that it is finite)
 - d – depth of the optimal (least cost) solution
 - m – maximum depth of the state space (can be finite or not finite, i.e. ∞)
- Two types of search methods: *uniformed (blind)* and *informed (heuristic)*

Uninformed (Blind) Search Strategies

Uninformed (Blind) Search Strategies

- **Uninformed strategies:**
 - Do not use problem-specific heuristic knowledge
 - Generate children in a systematic way, e.g. level by level, from left to right
 - Know if a child node is a goal or non-goal node
 - Do not know if one non-goal child is better (more promising) than another one. Exception: UCS, but this is not based on heuristic knowledge.
 - In contrast, informed (heuristic) use heuristic knowledge to determine the most promising non-goal child
- **5 uninformed search strategies**
 - Breadth first
 - Depth-limited
 - Uniform-cost
 - Iterative deepening
 - Depth-first

Breadth-First Search (BFS)

- Expands the shallowest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the end of the fringe

Fringe: A


Expanded: none

Is the first node in the fringe a goal node?

Yes => stop and return solution

No => expand it:

- Move it to the expanded list
- Generate its children and put them in the fringe in a order defined by the search strategy




Breadth-First Search (BFS)

- Expands the shallowest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the end of the fringe

Fringe: B, C

Expanded: A




Breadth-First Search (BFS)

- Expands the shallowest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the end of the fringe

Fringe: C, D, E

Expanded: A, B




Breadth-First Search (BFS)

- Expands the shallowest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the end of the fringe

Fringe: D, E, F, G

Expanded: A, B, C



Breadth-First Search (BFS)

- Expands shallowest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the end of the fringe

Fringe: E, F, G

Expanded: A, B, C, D


Fringe: F, G

Expanded: A, B, C, D, E

Fringe: G

Expanded: A, B, C, D, E, F

G is a goal node => stop



Order of expansion: ABCDEFG (the goal node is also included)

Goal node found: G

Solution path found: ACG (requires tracing back)


BFS for Romania Example

- **There will be loops (repeated states)**
- **Needs a repeated state checking mechanism**

Properties of BFS

- **Complete?** Yes (if branching factor b is finite but we assume this)
- **Optimal?**
 - **Optimal solution = least cost path**
 - **It doesn't consider the step cost + we need to know the step costs**
 - **If all step costs are the same, e.g. =1, is BFS optimal? Yes**
 - **If the step costs are different, is BFS optimal? No**

The shallowest goal node is not necessarily the optimal one!



Suppose C and J were goal nodes and J is a better solution than C; BFS will find C – not optimal

Properties of BFS (2)

- **Complete?** Yes
- **Optimal?** Not optimal in general; Yes, if step cost is the same, e.g. =1
- **Time?** generated nodes = $1+b+b^2+b^3+b^4 + \dots + b^d = O(b^d)$, exponential
- **Space?** $O(b^d)$ (keeps every node in memory)
- Both time and space are problems as they grow exponentially with depth but space is the bigger problem!


Depth	Nodes	Time	Memory
2	110	.11 milliseconds	107 kilobytes
4	11,110	11 milliseconds	10.6 megabytes
6	10^6	1.1 seconds	1 gigabyte
8	10^8	2 minutes	103 gigabytes
10	10^{10}	3 hours	10 terabytes
12	10^{12}	13 days	1 petabyte
14	10^{14}	3.5 years	99 petabytes
16	10^{16}	350 years	10 exabytes

Figure 3.13 Time and memory requirements for breadth-first search. The numbers shown assume branching factor $b = 10$; 1 million nodes/second; 1000 bytes/node.

Search problems with exponential complexity can NOT be solved by uninformed search except for small depth & small branching factor.

We may wait 13 days for the solution to an important problem but there is still no personal computer with 1 petabyte of memory!

Romania with Step Coast in km



Uniform Cost Search (UCS)

- We saw that:
 - BFS does not consider the step cost at all; it simply systematically expands the nodes level by level, from left to right
 - BFS finds the shallowest goal node but this may not be always the optimal solution (least cost solution = shortest path)
- UCS considers the step cost. It expands the least-cost unexpanded node - the node n with the *lowest path cost $g(n)$ from the initial state*
- Implementation: insert nodes in the fringe in order of increasing path cost from the root

UCS for the Romania Example (1)


Fringe: Arad

Expanded: none

Is Arad a goal state? No

-Move it to Expanded

**-Generate its children and
put them in Fringe in
order**




fringe

UCS for the Romania Example

Fringe: (Zerind,75), (Timisoara, 118), (Sibiu, 140)

Expanded: Arad




The fringe is ordered based on the path cost from the root

UCS for the Romania Example

Fringe: (Timisoara, 118), (Sibiu, 140), (Oradea,146), (Arad, 150)

Expanded: Arad, (Zerind, 75)




The fringe is ordered based on the path cost from the root

UCS for the Romania Example

Fringe: (Sibiu, 140), (Oradea,146), (Arad, 150), (Arad,228), (Lugoj, 229)

Expanded: Arad, (Zerind, 75), (Timisoara, 118)




The fringe is ordered based on the path cost from the root

UCS for the Romania Example

Fringe: (Oradea,146), (Arad, 150), (Rimnicu Vilcea, 220),
(Arad,228), (Lugoj, 229), (Fagaras, 239), (Oradea , 291)

Expanded: Arad, (Zerind, 75), (Timisoara, 118), (Sibiu, 140)



The fringe is ordered based on the path cost from the root


etc. – not finished

Properties of UCS

- Complete? Yes (if step cost > 0)
 - Optimal? Yes
 - Time?
 - Space?
- Depend on path costs not depths => difficult to characterize them in terms of b and d**
-
- Time? $O(b^{1+\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil})$, typically $> O(b^d)$ -> because UCS may explore long paths of small steps before exploring paths with large steps which might be more useful
 - Space? $O(b^{1+\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil})$
 - C^* - cost of optimal solution
 - ϵ - the smallest step cost

UCS and BFS

- When is UCS equivalent to BFS? What should be the step cost and the $g(n)$ cost? Assume that among the nodes with the same priority the left most is expanded first. Reminder:
 - $g(n)$ is the cost from the root node to a given node
 - step cost is the cost between 2 nodes



Answer – in all of these cases:


1. step cost is 1
 2. step cost is the same (a constant) - generalization of case 1
 3. $g(n)$ is the same (follows from case 2 - if the step cost is a constant, then $g(n)$ is also a constant)
 4. $g(n) = \text{depth}(n)$
 5. $g(n)$ is the same at each level and increasing as the level increases, e.g. 5 for level 1, 7 for level 2, etc.
- Draw a tree for each of these cases and run UCS and BFS!

Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the front of the fringe

Fringe: A

Expanded: none




Goal node: M

Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: B, C

Expanded: A




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: D, E, C

Expanded: A, B




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: H, I, E, C

Expanded: A, B, D




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: I, E, C

Expanded: A, B, D, H




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: E, C

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: J, K, C

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: K, C

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: C

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: F, G

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: L, M, G

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C, F




Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert successors at the front of the fringe

Fringe: M, G

Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C, F, L



Depth-First Search (DFS)

- Expands the deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation: insert children at the front of the fringe

Fringe: M, G


Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C, F, L

M is a goal node => stop

order of expansion: ABDHIEJKCF LM

solution node found: M

solution path found: ACFM



DFS for Romania Example


- **DFS can perform infinite cyclic explorations => needs a finite, non-cyclic search space or a repeated state checking mechanism**

Properties of DFS

- Complete?
 - No, fails in infinite-depth spaces (i.e. $m = \infty$)
 - Yes, in finite spaces (i.e. if m is finite)
- Optimal? No
 - May find a solution longer than the optimal (even if step cost=1)
- Time? $1+b+b^2+b^3+b^4 + \dots + b^m = O(b^m)$ similar to BFS
 - higher than BFS as $m \gg d$ (m =max depth, d =least cost solution depth)
- Space? $O(bm)$, linear; excellent; Why?


Can get stuck going down a very long (or even infinite) path e.g. suppose the left subtree was unbounded and did not contain a goal node – DFS would never terminate

Suppose J and C were goal nodes and C is a better solution than J; DFS will find J – not optimal



Space Complexity of DFS

- Space? $O(bm)$, linear; excellent – why?
- Once a node has been expanded, it can be removed from memory as soon as all its descendants have been fully explored



Depth-Limited Search

- Depth-limited search = DFS with depth limit l
 - i.e. it imposes a cutoff on the maximum depth
- Properties – similar to DFS:
 - Complete? Yes (as the search depth is always finite)
 - Optimal? No
 - Time? $1+b^2+b^3+b^4 + \dots + b^l = O(b^l)$
 - Space? $O(bl)$
- Problem - how to select a good limit l ? Based on domain knowledge.
 - There are 20 cities on the map of Romania \Rightarrow if there is a solution it must be of length 19 at most $\Rightarrow l=19$
 - We can even see that any city can be reached from any other city in at most 9 steps; this is called *diameter of a state space* $\Rightarrow l=9$
 - However, for most problems the diameter of the state space is not known in advance , i.e. before we have solved the problem

Iterative Deepening Search (IDS)

- Sidesteps the issue of choosing the best depth limit by trying all possible depth limits in turn (0, 1, 2, etc.) and applying DFS
- for depth=0 to ∞ do *depth-limited search(depth)*:

```
function ITERATIVE-DEEPENING-SEARCH(problem) returns a solution, or fail-  
ure  
  inputs: problem, a problem  
  for depth  $\leftarrow$  0 to  $\infty$  do  
    result  $\leftarrow$  DEPTH-LIMITED-SEARCH(problem, depth)  
    if result  $\neq$  cutoff then return result
```

- Tries to combine the benefits of DFS (low memory) and BFS (completeness if b is finite and optimality if step costs are the same) by **repeated DFS searches with increased depth**
- The nodes close to the root will be expanded multiple times but the number of these nodes is small – the majority of the nodes are close to the leaves, not the root \Rightarrow the overhead is small

IDS, $l=0$

cutoff limit $l=0$

A tree till level $l=0$; do DFS

Goal found?

Yes \rightarrow stop


No \rightarrow increment l and repeat

Limit = 0



Expanded: A

The tree we are searching –
M is the goal node



IDS, $l=1$

cutoff limit $l=1$





A tree till level $l=1$; do DFS

Goal found?

Yes \rightarrow stop

No \rightarrow increment l and repeat


Limit = 1



Expanded: A, B, C

IDS, l=2


Limit = 2



Expanded: A, B, D, E, C, F, G

IDS, l=3

Limit = 3



Expanded: A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C, F, L, M (goal)

IDS – Overhead of Multiple Expansion

- May seem wasteful as many nodes are expanded multiple times
- But for most problems the overhead of this multiple expansion is small!
 - BFS: # expansions: $1+b+b^2+\dots+b^d$, i.e. 111 111 for $b=10$, $d=5$
 - IDS: #expansions: $(d+1)1+(d)b+(d-1)b^2+\dots+3b^{d-2}+2b^{d-1}+1b^d$, i.e. 123 456 for $b=10$, $d=5 \Rightarrow$ only 11% more
- IDS is the preferred method when there is a large search space and the depth of the solution is unknown


Expanded:

A

A, B, C

A, B, D, E, C, F, G

A, B, D, H, I, E, J, K, C, F, L, M (goal)



Properties of IDS

b – branching factor

d – depth of least cost solution

m – max depth

- Combines the benefits of DFS and BFS

- Complete? As BFS:

Yes

[DFS: yes, if m is finite; no otherwise]*

- Optimal? As BFS:

No in general; Yes if step cost=1

[DFS: not optimal, even if step cost=1] *

- Time? As BFS:

$$(d+1)b^0 + db^1 + (d-1)b^2 + \dots + b^d = O(b^d) \quad [\text{DFS: } O(b^m)] *$$

- Space? As DFS:

$O(bd)$, linear

- Where are the **improvements of IDS in comparison to DFS?**


- in completeness, optimality and time (shown with *)

- Can be modified to explore uniform-cost tree

Summary

Example

- **G is the goal.**
Give the list of expanded nodes and the solution path.



- **DFS?**
 - SADEG, solution found: SAG (non optimal)
- **BFS?**
 - SABCDEG, solution found: SAG (non-optimal solution; will find optimal solution only if step cost=1)
- **UCS?**
 - **Resolving ties: Among nodes with the same priority, expand the node that was added first to the fringe**
 - SADBCEG, solution found: SBG (optimal)
Among nodes with the same priority (E and C, g=8), the first added to the fringe (C) was chosen to be expanded first
- **IDS (l=2)**
 - S SABC SADEG, solution found: SAG (non-optimal solution; will find optimal solution only if step cost=1)

Real-World Path Finding Problems

- **Planning trips from A to B - Google maps, planning public transport trips**
 - **Example - web sites for planning air travel:**
 - **Initial and goal states:** specified by the user
 - **Actions:** take any flight from the initial location, leaving after the current time with enough time for within-airport transfer
 - **Path cost:** monetary cost, flight time, waiting time, time of the day (too early/too late), frequent-flyer millage awards, customs and immigration procedures
- **VLSI layout - position millions of components and connections on a very small chip (to minimize area and circuits delays)**
- **Assembling objects by a robot - find the correct order for the parts; wrong order will require undoing some of the work already done**
- **Protein design - find a sequence of amino acids that will fold into a 3-dimensional protein with useful properties (i.e. curing a disease)**

Informed (Heuristic) Search Strategies

Informed vs Uninformed Search

- A search strategy defines the order of node expansion
- *Uninformed search* strategies do not use problem specific knowledge beyond the definition of the problem, i.e. they **do not use heuristic knowledge**. They:
 - expand nodes systematically, e.g. BFS: level by level, from left to right
 - know if a given node is a goal or non-goal node
 - cannot compare 2 non-goal nodes – they do not know if one non-goal node is better than another one based on heuristic knowledge
 - UCS does this but it is not based on heuristic knowledge but path cost so far, so it is classified as uninformed
 - are typically inefficient in finding the solution (time and space)
- *Informed search* strategies use problem-specific **heuristic** knowledge to select the order of node expansion. They:
 - can compare non-goal nodes – they know if one non-goal node is better than another one
 - are typically more efficient


Best-first Search

- How can informed strategies compare non-goal nodes?
- By using domain specific knowledge to devise an *evaluation function* which estimates how good each node is
- The evaluation function assigns a *value* to each node
- At each step, the best node is expanded (the one with the best value)
- This is called *best-first search*
 - Note that we don't *really* know which is the best node as we use an estimate based on the evaluation function. So best-first search expands the node that *appears* to be the best.
- Fringe: insert children in decreasing order of desirability
- We will study 2 **best-first** search algorithms: *greedy* and A^*

Greedy Search

Romania with Step Coast and Straight-line Distance to Bucharest

Problem-specific knowledge



Straight-line distance to Bucharest	
Arad	366
Bucharest	0
Craiova	160
Dobreta	242
Eforie	161
Fagaras	176
Giurgiu	77
Hirsova	151
Iasi	226
Lugoj	244
Mehadia	241
Neamt	234
Oradea	380
Pitesti	10
Rimnicu Vilcea	193
Sibiu	253
Timisoara	329
Urziceni	80
Vaslui	199
Zerind	374


Greedy Search (GS)

- It uses the so called h value as an evaluation function (h from *heuristic*)
- The $h(n)$ for a node n is the estimated cost from n to a goal node
- E.g. for the Romania example we can use $h(n) = SLD(n, Bucharest)$ = straight-line distance from n to Bucharest
- Note that the h value of a goal node is 0, i.e. $h(goal) = 0$
- GS expands the node with the smallest h , i.e.
 - The node that appears to be closest to a goal
- Thus: GS minimizes h , the estimated cost to a goal


Greedy Search for Romania Example




Greedy Search for Romania Example



Greedy Search for Romania Example




Greedy Search for Romania Example



Solution path: Arad-Sibiu-Fagaras-Bucharest, cost=450

Optimal =?


Greedy Search for Romania Example



Solution path: Arad-Sibiu-Fagaras-Bucharest, cost=450
Optimal =?


Greedy Search – Another Example

- **Given:**
 - **Goal nodes: C, I, E and K**
 - **Step path cost: along the links**
 - **h value of each node: in ()**
- **Run GS**
 - **List of expanded nodes =?**
 - **Solution path =? Cost of the solution path=?**




Solution

- **Fringe:** S
- **Expanded:** nil




Solution

- **Fringe:** (A,3), (B,4)
- **Expanded:** S




Solution

- **Fringe:** (C,0), (B,4), (D, 5) //C and D are added and the fringe is ordered
- **Expanded:** S, (A,3)




Solution

- **C is selected for expanding; is it a goal node? Yes ->stop**
- **Expanded: S, A, C //note that the goal node is also considered to be
// expanded and is included in the list of expanded**
- **Solution path: SAC, path cost: $2+8=10$**



Solution

- Is SAC the optimal solution (i.e. shortest path to a goal)?



Properties of Greedy Search

- **Complete? As DFS**
 - Yes, in finite space (if m is finite)
 - No – fails in infinite spaces (and can get stuck in loops, e.g. Iasi->Neamt->Iasi->Neamt)
- **Optimal? No (e.g. Arad->Sibiu->R.Vincea->Pitesti->Buharest is shorter)**
- **Time? $O(b^m)$, but a good heuristic can give dramatic improvement**
- **Space? $O(b^m)$, keeps every node in memory**

Question

- $g(n)$ = cost so far
- $h(n)$ = estimated cost to the goal
- Greedy search uses $h(n)$

Suppose that we run a greedy search algorithm with $h(n) = g(n)$. This greedy search will be equivalent to what kind of uninformed search?

In other words, which algorithm uses $g(n)$?

UCS

