The reduction in time complexity makes bidirectional search attractive, but how do we search backward? This is not as easy as it sounds. Let the predecessors of a state \( x \) be all those states that have \( x \) as a successor. Bidirectional search requires a method for computing predecessors. When all the actions in the state space are reversible, the predecessors of \( x \) are just its successors. Other cases may require substantial ingenuity.

Consider the question of what we mean by "the goal" in searching "backward from the goal." For the 8-puzzle and for finding a route in Romania, there is just one goal state, so the backward search is very much like the forward search. If there are several explicitly listed goal states—for example, the two dirt-free goal states in Figure 3.3—then we can construct a new dummy goal state whose immediate predecessors are all the actual goal states. But if the goal is an abstract description, such as the goal that "no queen attacks another queen" in the \( n \)-queens problem, then bidirectional search is difficult to use.

### 3.4.7 Comparing uninformed search strategies

Figure 3.21 compares search strategies in terms of the four evaluation criteria set forth in Section 3.3.2. This comparison is for tree-search versions. For graph searches, the main differences are that depth-first search is complete for finite state spaces and that the space and time complexities are bounded by the size of the state space.

![Figure 3.20](image)  
A schematic view of a bidirectional search that is about to succeed when a branch from the start node meets a branch from the goal node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Breadth-First</th>
<th>Uniform-Cost</th>
<th>Depth-First</th>
<th>Depth-Limited</th>
<th>Iterative Deepening</th>
<th>Bidirectional (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>(O(b^d))</td>
<td>(O(b^{d+1/2}))</td>
<td>(O(b^m))</td>
<td>(O(b^t))</td>
<td>(O(b^d))</td>
<td>(O(b^{d+1/2}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>(O(b^d))</td>
<td>(O(b^{d+1/2}))</td>
<td>(O(b^{m+1/2}))</td>
<td>(O(b^d))</td>
<td>(O(b^d))</td>
<td>(O(b^{d+1/2}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal?</td>
<td>Yes(^c)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes(^c)</td>
<td>Yes(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.21  
Evaluation of tree-search strategies. \( b \) is the branching factor; \( d \) is the depth of the shallowest solution; \( m \) is the maximum depth of the search tree; \( t \) is the depth limit. Superscript caveats are as follows: \(^a\) complete if \( b \) is finite; \(^b\) complete if step costs \( \geq c \) for positive \( c \); \(^c\) optimal if step costs are all identical; \(^d\) if both directions use breadth-first search.