Uninformed search methods III.
Informed search methods.
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Announcements

Homework assignment 1 is out
- in the electronic form on the course web page
- Due on Wednesday, September 20, 2006 before the class
- Two parts:
  - Pen and pencil part
  - Programming part (Puzzle 8)

Course web page:
http://www.cs.pitt.edu/~milos/courses/cs1571/
Uninformed methods

- Uninformed search methods use only information available in the problem definition
  - Breadth-first search (BFS)
  - Depth-first search (DFS)
  - Iterative deepening (IDA)
  - Bi-directional search

- For the minimum cost path problem:
  - Uniform cost search

Breadth first search (BFS)

- The shallowest node is expanded first
Properties of breadth-first search

- **Completeness:** Yes. The solution is reached if it exists.

- **Optimality:** Yes, for the shortest path.

- **Time complexity:**
  \[ 1 + b + b^2 + \ldots + b^d = O(b^d) \]
  exponential in the depth of the solution \( d \)

- **Memory (space) complexity:**
  \[ O(b^d) \]
  same as time - every node is kept in the memory

---

Depth-first search (DFS)

- The deepest node is expanded first
- Backtrack when the path cannot be further expanded
Properties of depth-first search

- **Completeness**: No. Infinite loops can occur.

- **Optimality**: No. Solution found first may not be the shortest possible.

- **Time complexity**: 
  \[ O(b^m) \]
  exponential in the maximum depth of the search tree \( m \)

- **Memory (space) complexity**: 
  \[ O(bm) \]
  linear in the maximum depth of the search tree \( m \)

Elimination of state repeats

While searching the state space for the solution we can encounter the same state many times.

**Question**: Is it necessary to keep and expand all copies of states in the search tree?

**Two possible cases**:

(A) Cyclic state repeats
(B) Non-cyclic state repeats
Elimination of all state redundancies

- **General strategy:** A node is redundant if there is another node with exactly the same state and a shorter path from the initial state
  - Works for any search method
  - Uses additional path length information

**Implementation: marking with the minimum path value:**

- The new node is redundant and can be eliminated if
  - it is in the hash table (it is marked), and
  - its path is longer or equal to the value stored.
- Otherwise the new node cannot be eliminated and it is entered together with its value into the hash table. (if the state was in the hash table the new path value is better and needs to be overwritten.)

Iterative deepening algorithm (IDA)

- Based on the idea of the limited-depth search, but
- It resolves the difficulty of knowing the depth limit ahead of time.

**Idea:** try all depth limits in an increasing order.

That is, search first with the depth limit $l=0$, then $l=1$, $l=2$, and so on until the solution is reached

**Iterative deepening** combines advantages of the depth-first and breadth-first search with only moderate computational overhead.
Iterative deepening algorithm (IDA)

- Progressively increases the limit of the limited-depth depth-first search

Limit 0

Limit 1

Limit 2

Properties of IDA

- Completeness: ?
- Optimality: ?
- Time complexity: ?
- Memory (space) complexity: ?
Properties of IDA

- **Completeness:** Yes. The solution is reached if it exists. (the same as BFS)
- **Optimality:** Yes, for the shortest path. (the same as BFS)
- **Time complexity:**
  \[ O(1) + O(b^1) + O(b^2) + \ldots + O(b^d) = O(b^d) \]
  exponential in the depth of the solution \( d \)
  worse than BFS, but asymptotically the same
- **Memory (space) complexity:**
  \[ O(db) \]
  much better than BFS

Bi-directional search

- In some search problems we want to find the path from the initial state to the **unique goal state** (e.g. traveler problem)
- **Bi-directional search idea:**
  - Search both from the initial state and the goal state;
  - Use inverse operators for the goal-initiated search.
Bi-directional search

Why bidirectional search? What is the benefit? Assume BFS.
• Cut the depth of the search space by half

Initial state

Goal state

\[ d/2 \quad d/2 \]

\[ O(b^{d/2}) \quad \text{Time and memory complexity} \]
Bi-directional search

Why bidirectional search? What is the benefit? Assume BFS.
- It cuts the depth of the search tree by half.

What is necessary?
- Merge the solutions.
- How?
Bi-directional search

Why bidirectional search? Assume BFS.
- It cuts the depth of the search tree by half.

What is necessary?
- Merge the solutions.

- How? The hash structure remembers the side of the tree the state was expanded first time. If the same state is reached from other side we have a solution.

Minimum cost path search

Traveler example with distances [km]

**Optimal path:** the shortest distance path from Arad to Bucharest
Searching for the minimum cost path

- **General minimum cost path-search problem:**
  - adds weights or costs to operators (links)

  “Intelligent” expansion of the search tree should be driven by the cost of the current (partially) built path

  **Path cost function** $g(n)$; path cost from the initial state to $n$

**Search strategy:**

- Expand the leaf node with the minimum $g(n)$ first.
  - When operator costs are all equal to 1 it is equivalent to BFS
- The basic algorithm for finding the minimum cost path:
  - Dijkstra’s shortest path
- In AI, the strategy goes under the name
  - Uniform cost search

---

**Uniform cost search**

- Expand the node with the minimum path cost first
- **Implementation:** priority queue

```
g(n) 0
```

```
queue Arad 0
```
Uniform cost search

queue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zerind 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timisoara 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibiu 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arad

Zerind 75
Sibiu 140
Timisoara 118

Arad

Zerind 75
Sibiu 140
Timisoara 118

queue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timisoara 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibiu 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oradea 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arad 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arad

Zerind 75
Sibiu 140
Timisoara 118

Arad

Zerind 75
Sibiu 140
Timisoara 118
Uniform cost search

Properties of the uniform cost search

- Completeness: ?

- Optimality: ?

- Time complexity: 

- Memory (space) complexity: ?
Properties of the uniform cost search

- **Completeness**: Yes, assuming that operator costs are non-negative (the cost of path never decreases)
  \[ g(n) \leq g(\text{successor}(n)) \]
- **Optimality**: Yes. Returns the least-cost path.

- **Time complexity**: number of nodes with the cost \( g(n) \) smaller than the optimal cost
- **Memory (space) complexity**: number of nodes with the cost \( g(n) \) smaller than the optimal cost

Elimination of state repeats

**Idea:**
- A node is redundant and can be eliminated if there is another node with exactly the same state and a shorter path from the initial state

**Assuming positive costs:**
- If the state has already been expanded, is there a shorter path to that node?
Elimination of state repeats

Idea:
• A node is redundant and can be eliminated if there is another node with exactly the same state and a shorter path from the initial state

Assuming positive costs:
– If the state was already expanded, is there a shorter path to that node?
– No!

Implementation:
• Marking with the hash table

Informed (heuristic) search methods
Additional information to guide the search

• **Uninformed search methods**
  – use only the information from the problem definition; and
  – past explorations, e.g. cost of the path generated so far.

• **Informed search methods**
  – incorporate additional measure of a potential of a specific state to reach the goal
  – a potential of a state (node) to reach a goal is measured through a **heuristic function**

• Heuristic function is denoted \( h(n) \)

---

**Evaluation-function driven search**

• A search strategy can be defined in terms of **a node evaluation function**

• **Evaluation function**
  – Denoted \( f(n) \)
  – Defines the desirability of a node to be expanded next

• **Evaluation-function driven search**: *expand the node (state) with the best evaluation-function value*

• **Implementation**: **priority queue** with nodes in the decreasing order of their evaluation function value
Uniform cost search

- **Uniform cost search (Dijkstra’s shortest path):**
  - A special case of the evaluation-function driven search
    \[ f(n) = g(n) \]
- **Path cost function** \( g(n) \);
  - path cost from the initial state to \( n \)
- **Uniform-cost search:**
  - Can handle general minimum cost path-search problem:
  - **weights or costs** associated with operators (links).
- **Note:** Uniform cost search relies on the problem definition only
  - It is an uninformed search method

Best-first search

**Best-first search**

- incorporates a **heuristic function**, \( h(n) \), into the evaluation function \( f(n) \) to guide the search.

**Heuristic function:**

- Measures a potential of a state (node) to reach a goal
- Typically in terms of some distance to a goal estimate

**Example of a heuristic function:**

- Assume a shortest path problem with city distances on connections
- Straight-line distances between cities give additional information we can use to guide the search
Example: traveler problem with straight-line distance information

- **Straight-line distances** give an estimate of the cost of the path between the two cities.

---

**Best-first search**

- **Best-first search** incorporates a **heuristic function**, $h(n)$, into the evaluation function $f(n)$ to guide the search.
- **Heuristic function**: measures a potential of a state (node) to reach a goal.

**Special cases** (differ in the design of evaluation function):

- **Greedy search**
  
  $$f(n) = h(n)$$

- **A* algorithm**
  
  $$f(n) = g(n) + h(n)$$

  + **iterative deepening** version of A*: **IDA***

---
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Greedy search method

- Evaluation function is equal to the heuristic function
  \[ f(n) = h(n) \]
- Idea: the node that seems to be the closest to the goal is expanded first

Greedy search

\[ f(n) = h(n) \]

Queue: Arad 366
Greedy search

\[ f(n) = h(n) \]

```
Greedy search

\[ f(n) = h(n) \]

queue

Arad

Zerind

Sibiu

Timisoara

366

75

140

118

374

253

329

queue

Fagaras

Rimnicu V.

Timisoara

Arad

Sibiu

Oradea

Fagaras

Rimnicu Vilcea

366

380

178

193

366

140

151

99

80

118

253

140

75

374

queue

Sibiu

Timisoara

Zerind

253

329

374

```
Greedy search

\[ f(n) = h(n) \]

Properties of greedy search

- **Completeness:** ?

- **Optimality:** ?

- **Time complexity:** ?

- **Memory (space) complexity:** ?
Properties of greedy search

- **Completeness:** No.
  
  We can loop forever. Nodes that seem to be the best choices can lead to cycles. Elimination of state repeats can solve the problem.

- **Optimality:** No.
  
  Even if we reach the goal, we may be biased by a bad heuristic estimate. Evaluation function disregards the cost of the path built so far.

- **Time complexity:** $O(b^m)$
  
  Worst case !!! But often better!

- **Memory (space) complexity:** $O(b^m)$
  
  Often better!

---

**Example: traveler problem with straight-line distance information**

- **Greedy search result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Straight-line distance from Bucharest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arad</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craiova</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobroiu</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eforie</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagaras</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giurgiu</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiersa</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasi</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupului</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehadia</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenast</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oradea</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitesti</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rmnicil Vitea</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slatin</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirisoara</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urziceni</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaslui</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerind</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Total: 450
Example: traveler problem with straight-line distance information

- Greedy search and optimality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arad</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craiova</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrogea</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eforie</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagaras</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giurgiu</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlinseni</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iasi</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugoj</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldovia</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neamt</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oradea</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploesti</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimnic Vilea</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sila</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighina</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursulele</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaslui</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalau</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 450

Total: 418