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Review: DFS and BFS

• Breadth-first search
  • Frontier is a queue: expand the shallowest node
  • **Complete**: always finds a solution, if one exists
  • **Optimal** (finds the best solution) *if all actions have the same cost.*
  • **Time complexity**: $O\{b^d\}$
  • **Space complexity**: $O\{b^d\}$.

• Depth-first search – utility depends on relationship between $m$ and $d$
  • Frontier is a stack: expand the deepest node
  • **Not complete** (might never find a solution, if $m$ is infinite)
  • **Not optimal** (returned solution is rarely the best one)
  • **Time complexity**: $O\{b^m\}$
  • **Space complexity**: $O\{bm\}$.
Outline of today’s lecture

1. Uniform Cost Search (UCS): like BFS, but for actions that have different costs
   - **Complete**: always finds a solution, if one exists
   - **Optimal**: finds the best solution
   - **Time complexity** = # nodes that have cost < goal
   - **Space complexity** = # nodes that have cost < goal

2. Heuristics, e.g., Manhattan distance

3. Greedy Best-first search

4. A*: Like UCS but adds an estimate of the remaining path length
   - **Complete**: always finds a solution, if one exists
   - **Optimal**: finds the best solution
   - **Time complexity** = # nodes that have cost+heuristic < goal
   - **Space complexity** = # nodes that have cost+heuristic < goal
An example for which BFS is not optimal: Romania

BFS returns this path, because it requires only 3 actions.
Cost = 450 km
An example for which BFS is not optimal: Romania

It would have been better to find this path!
Cost = 418 km
The solution: Uniform Cost Search

• Breadth-first search (BFS): Next node expanded is the one with the fewest required actions
  • Frontier is a queue
  • First node into the queue is the first one expanded (FIFO)

• Uniform cost search (UCS): Next node expanded is the one with the lowest accumulated path cost
  • Frontier is a priority queue
  • Lowest-cost node is the first one expanded
Example of UCS: Romania

Arad: 0
Example of UCS: Romania

Zerind: 75, Timisoara: 118, Sibiu: 140
Example of UCS: Romania

Timisoara: 118, Sibiu: 140, Oradea: 146
Example of UCS: Romania

Sibiu: 140, Oradea: 146, **Lugoj: 239**
Example of UCS: Romania

Oradea: 146, **Ramnicu Valcea: 220**, Lugoj: 239, **Fagaras: 239**
Example of UCS: Romania

Ramnicu Valcea:220, Lugoj:239, Fagaras:239
Example of UCS: Romania

Example of UCS: Romania

Fagaras:239, **Mehadia:309**, Pitesti:317, Craiova:366
Example of UCS: Romania

Mehadia: 309, Pitesti: 317, Craiova: 366, **Bucharest: 450**
Example of UCS: Romania

Example of UCS: Romania

Craiova: 366, Dobreta: 384, Bucharest: 418
Example of UCS: Romania

Dobreta: 384, Bucharest: 418
Example of UCS: Romania

Bucharest:418
GOAL!!!! GOL!!!!!
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Heuristics main idea

Instead of choosing the node with the smallest total cost so far (UCS),

why not choose the node that’s CLOSEST TO GOAL,
and expand that one first?
Why not choose the node CLOSEST TO GOAL?

• Answer: because we don’t know which node that is!!

• Example: which of these two is closest to goal?
We don’t know which state is closest to goal

• Finding the shortest path is the whole point of the search
• If we already knew which state was closest to goal, there would be no reason to do the search
• Figuring out which one is closest, in general, is a complexity $O(b^d)$ problem.
Search heuristics: estimates of distance-to-goal

- Often, even if we don’t know the distance to the goal, we can estimate it.
- This estimate is called a heuristic.
- A heuristic is useful if:
  1. **Accurate**: \( h(n) \approx d(n) \), where \( h(n) \) is the heuristic estimate, and \( d(n) \) is the true distance to the goal
  2. **Cheap**: It can be computed in complexity less than \( O(b^d) \)
Example heuristic: Manhattan distance

If there were no walls in the maze, then the number of steps from position \((x_n, y_n)\) to the goal position \((x_G, y_G)\) would be

\[
h(n) = |x_n - x_G| + |y_n - y_G|
\]

If there were no walls, this would be the path to goal: straight down, then straight right.
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Greedy Best-First Search

Instead of choosing the node with the smallest total cost so far (UCS),

why not choose the node whose

HEURISTIC ESTIMATE

indicates that it might be

CLOSEST TO GOAL?
Greedy Search Example

According to the Manhattan distance heuristic, these two nodes are equally far from the goal, so we have to choose one at random.
Greedy Search Example

If our random choice goes badly, we might end up very far from the goal.

★ = states in the explored set

○ = states on the frontier
The problem with Greedy Search

Having gone down a bad path, it’s very hard to recover, because now, the frontier node closest to goal (according to the Manhattan distance heuristic) is this one:
The problem with Greedy Search

That’s not a useful path...
The problem with Greedy Search

Neither is that one...
What went wrong?
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The problem with Greedy Search

Among nodes on the frontier, this one seems closest to goal (smallest \( h(n) \), where \( h(n) \leq d(n) \)).

But it’s also farthest from the start. Let’s say \( g(n) \) = total path cost so far.

So the total distance from start to goal, going through node \( n \), is

\[
\text{c}(n) = g(n) + d(n) \geq g(n) + h(n)
\]
The problem with Greedy Search

Of these three nodes, this one has the smallest $g(n) + h(n)$

$$(g(n) + h(n) = 4 + 28 = 32)$$

So if we want to find the lowest-cost path, then it would be better to try that node, instead of this one, which has

$$g(n) + h(n) = 21 + 14 = 35$$
A* search

In an A* search, we keep track of TWO things about each path:
1. The cost from START to NODE n. Let’s call this $g(n)$.
2. The cost from NODE n to GOAL.
   • The true cost is $d(n)$. But it’s unknown.
   • The heuristic estimate is $h(n)$, and $d(n) \geq h(n)$.

The total cost of the best path that goes $\text{START} \rightarrow \text{NODE n} \rightarrow \text{GOAL}$ is:
• $c(n) = g(n) + d(n)$. But it’s unknown.
• Known to be greater than or equal to $f(n) = g(n) + h(n)$. 
A* search

The total cost of the best path that goes $\text{START} \rightarrow \text{NODE } n \rightarrow \text{GOAL}$ is:

- $c(n) = g(n) + d(n)$. But it’s unknown.
- Known to be greater than or equal to $f(n) = g(n) + h(n)$.

An A* search is a search in which the frontier is a priority queue, sorted in order of increasing $f(n)$:

$$\{(m, f(m)), (n, f(n)), (p, f(p)), (q, f(q)), \ldots \}$$

...where “priority queue” means that $f(m) \leq f(n) \leq f(p) \leq f(q) \leq \ldots$

Thus, the next node we expand, $n$, is always the one that seems to be part of the shortest path between START and GOAL.
Optimality of A*

• Suppose that the frontier is a priority queue of tuples: 
  \{ (m, f(m)), (n, f(n)), (p, f(p)), (q, f(q)), ... \} 
  ...where “priority queue” means that \( f(m) \leq f(n) \leq f(p) \leq f(q) \leq ... \)

• Suppose we expand the first node, and discover that it’s the goal: 
  \text{State}(m) = \text{GOAL}!

• Does that mean that the path from START to GOAL specified by 
  back-tracking Parent(m) is the SHORTEST path to the goal?
Optimality of A*

Suppose that the frontier is a priority queue of tuples:
\{(m, f(m)), (n, f(n)), (p, f(p)), (q, f(q)), \ldots\}

1. \(f(m) = g(m) + h(m) \leq g(m) + d(m) = g(m) + 0 = c(m)\)
So \(f(m)\) is the cost to reach GOAL along the path through Parent(m).

1. \(f(m) \leq f(n) = g(n) + h(n) \leq g(n) + d(n) = c(n)\)
So every other node has a higher cost than node m.

\[c(n) \geq f(n) \geq c(m)\]
Optimality of A* Search

- **Definition**: An admissible heuristic is a heuristic that satisfies the condition $d(n) \geq h(n)$.
- If $h(n)$ is admissible, and if the frontier is a priority queue sorted according to $g(n) + h(n)$, then
- the FIRST path to goal discovered by the tree search, path $m$, is guaranteed to be the SHORTEST path to goal.
Example of A*: Romania

Suppose we don’t know the distance from Sibiu to Bucharest on highways, but we DO know the distance “as the crow flies.”

\[ h(n) = \text{Euclidean distance (as the crow flies)} \]

- Sibiu: \( h(n) = 260\text{km} \)
- Timisoara: \( h(n) = 410\text{km} \)
- Zerind: \( h(n) = 422\text{km} \)
Romania using UCS

Zerind: 75, Timisoara: 118, Sibiu: 140
Romania using A*

Sibiu: 140 + 260 = 400, Zerind: 75 + 422 = 495, Timisoara: 118 + 410 = 528

No, pick this one first!!!
BFS vs. A* Search Example
The heuristic $h(n)=$Euclidean distance favors nodes on the main diagonal. Those nodes all have the same $g(n)+h(n)$, so A* evaluates them first.
Outline of today’s lecture

1. Uniform Cost Search (UCS): like BFS, but for actions that have different costs
   • **Complete**: always finds a solution, if one exists
   • **Optimal**: finds the best solution
   • **Time complexity** = # nodes that have cost < goal
   • **Space complexity** = # nodes that have cost < goal

2. Heuristics, e.g., Manhattan distance

3. Greedy Best-first search

4. A*: Like UCS but adds a **lower bound** of the remaining path length
   • **Complete**: always finds a solution, if one exists
   • **Optimal**: finds the best solution
   • **Time complexity** = # nodes that have cost+heuristic < goal
   • **Space complexity** = # nodes that have cost+heuristic < goal