## CompSci 171: Intro AI

## Homework 3

## Informed search

### 4.1 A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



Straight-line distance
to Bucharest

| H-men | 364 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Eincthar | 0 |
| Crameram | 160 |
| Choinreta | $2+2$ |
| Efomme | 161 |
| Wragerams | 176 |
|  | 7 |
| HFirsanim | 151 |
| Imsin | 그노의 |
| T |  |
| MTeharactir | $2+1$ |
| Prorroset | 1 |
| Chranters | 389 |
| Pilustil | 10 |
| Reimminichn witheers | 193 |
| ctate. | --2 |
| TTinmiscorater | 328 |
| TIEAEmose | 80 |
| Wrastini | 195 |
| Yerrimen | 374 |

## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



Straight-line distance

| Ahrad Einchararest | 360 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crinticeta | 150 |
| Dhobrreter | 242 |
| ETMOMTE | 161 |
| Fragaras | 176 |
| Cinnryin | 77 |
| Hirsanm | 151 |
| Insi | 226 |
| Lingraj | 214 |
| NTeharactira | 241 |
| Nemant | 234 |
| Orandera | 380 |
| Phtesti | 10 |
| Refrnmicin Wilcea | 193 |
| Sibinis | 253 |
| Timmisomatra | 329 |
| Uraicemi | 80 |
| Whaslui | 159 |
| Zerinad | 374 |

## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest



## A* search: From Lugoj to Bucharest


$f=70+75+120+138+101=504$

### 4.2 Heuristic path algorithm

$f(n)=(2-w) g(n)+w h(n)$
For what value of $w$ is this algorithm guaranteed to be optimal?
$\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{n})$ : a path cost to n from a start state
$h(n)$ : a heuristic estimate of cost from $n$ to a goal state

### 4.2 Heuristic path algorithm

If $h(n)$ is admissible, the algorithm is guaranteed to be optimal

$$
f(n)=(2-w)\left[g(n)+\frac{w}{2-w} h(n)\right]
$$

which behaves exactly like $A^{*}$ search with a heuristic

$$
f(n)=g(n)+\frac{w}{2-w} h(n)
$$

To be optimal, we require $\quad \frac{w}{2-w} \leqslant 1$

$$
w \leqslant 1
$$

### 4.2 Heuristic path algorithm

For $w=0: f(n)=2 g(n)->$ Uniform-cost search

For $w=1: f(n)=g(n)+h(n)->A^{*}$ search

For $w=2: f(n)=2 h(n)->$ Greedy best search

## 4.3

(a) Breadth-first search is a special case of uniform-cost search

When all step costs are equal (and let's assume equal to 1$), g(n)$ is just a multiple of depth $n$. Thus, breadth-first search and uniform-cost search would behave the same in this case

$$
\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{n})=\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{n})=1^{*}(\text { depth of } n)
$$

## 4.3

(b) BFS, DFS and uniform-cost search are special cases of best-first search

- BFS: $\quad f(n)=\operatorname{depth}(n)$
- DFS: $\quad f(n)=-\operatorname{depth}(n)$
- UCS: $\quad f(n)=g(n)$


## 4.3

(c) Uniform-cost search is special case of $\mathrm{A}^{*}$ search

A* search: $f(n)=g(n)+h(n)$
Uniform-cost search: $f(n)=g(n)$

Thus, for $h(n)=0$, uniform cost search will produce the same result as A* search

## 4. Prove that the Manhattan Distance heuristic for 8-puzzle is admissible



Start State


Goal State

Manhattan Distance for points

$$
P_{1}\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right), P_{2}\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right) \text { is defined by: }
$$

$$
d\left(p_{1}, p_{2}\right)=\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|+\left|y_{1}-y_{2}\right|
$$

Heuristic: $\quad h=\sum_{n=1}^{8} d(n)$

- Tiles cannot move along diagonals, so each tile has to move at least $d(n)$ steps to its goal
-Any move can only move one tile at a time


## 5. Eight Queens problem


$h$ - number of pairs of queens that are attacking each other

## 5. Eight Queens problem

$h=2$
However, number of conflicts for Queen at "b3" are:


## 5. Eight Queens problem




Therefore, the true cost to reach the goal state $h^{*}$ is 1
Thus, h>h*
heuristic is not admissible

## 5. Eight Queens problem




One solution.
We can propose another heuristic.
For example, we can propose heuristic derived form a relaxed (and trivial) version of 8 -Queens problem, that the eight queens must be placed in the board so that no two queens are on the same row.

Thus, $\mathrm{h}=\Sigma$ (\# queens that are on the same row -1 ) for all conflicting rows

### 4.11

(a) Local beam search with $\mathrm{k}=1$

- We would randomly generate 1 start state
- At each step we would generate all the successors, and retain the 1 best state
- Equivalent to HILL-CLIMBING


### 4.11

(b) Local beam search with $\mathrm{k}=\infty$

- $\quad 1$ initial state and no limit of the number of states retained
- We start at initial state and generate all successor states (no limit how many)
- If one of those is a goal, we stop
- Otherwise, we generate all successors of those states (2 steps from the initial state), and continue
- Equivalent to BREADTH-FIRST SEARCH


### 4.11

(c) Simulated annealing with $\mathrm{T}=0$ at all times

- If $T$ is very small, the probability of accepting an arbitrary neighbor with lower value is approximately 0
- This means that we choose a successor state randomly and move to that state if it is better than the current state
- Equivalent to FIRST-CHOICE HILL CLIMBING


### 4.11

(d) Genetic algorithm with population size $\mathrm{N}=1$

- If selection step necessarily chooses the single population member twice, so the crossover steo does nothing.
- Moreover, if we think of the mutation step as selecting a successor at random, there is no guarantee that the successor is an improvement over the parent
- Equivalent to RANDOM WALK


## 4-Queens problem

## Min-conflict algorithm:

1. Randomly choose a variable from set of problematic variables
2. Reassign its value to the one that results in the fewest conflicts overall
3. Continue until there are no conflicts

| Q1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Q2 |  |  |
|  |  | Q3 |  |
|  |  |  | Q4 |

## 4-Queens problem

|  | A | B | C | D |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Q1 ${ }^{3}$ | 1 | 2 | 1 | All queens are attacked. |
| 3 | 1 | $\text { Q2 }{ }^{3}$ | 1 | 2 | Pick Q2 randomly <br> We can move Q2 to B2 or B4 |
| 2 | $2$ | 1 | $\text { Q3 }{ }^{3}$ | 1 | Randomly, move Q2 to B4 |
| 1 |  |  |  | $\text { Q4 } \quad \begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |

## 4-Queens problem

|  | A | B | C | D |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $\text { Q1 }{ }^{3}$ | $\text { Q2 }{ }^{1}$ | 2 | 2 | All queens are attacked. |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | Pick Q1 randomly <br> We can move Q1 to A1 ~ A3 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | $\text { Q3 }{ }^{2}$ |  | Randomly, move Q1 to A2 |
| 1 |  | 2 | 1 | $\text { Q4 }{ }^{2}$ |  |

## 4-Queens problem



## 4-Queens problem



## 4-Queens problem



## 8. Compute the following gradients

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x, y, z, t)=(x-1)(2-y) z+\left(t^{3}-1\right) x y z \\
& g(x, y)=\frac{1}{1+\exp (-(a x+b y+c))} \\
& h(x, y, z)=(x-1)^{2} \exp (x)+(y-2)^{3} z^{3} \\
& c(x, y, z)=\left(x-z-2 y^{-2}\right)^{b} \\
& g(x, y)=2(x-1)^{2}+2(y-2)^{2}-2(x-1)(y-2)
\end{aligned}
$$

$a, b, c$ are some arbitrary constants

## 8. Compute the following gradients

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x, y, z, t)=(x-1)(2-y) z+\left(t^{3}-1\right) x y z \\
& g(x, y)=\frac{1}{1+\exp (-(a x+b y+c))} \\
& h(x, y, z)=(x-1)^{2} \exp (x)+(y-2)^{3} z^{3} \\
& c(x, y, z)=\left(x-z-2 y^{-2}\right)^{b} \\
& g(x, y)=2(x-1)^{2}+2(y-2)^{2}-2(x-1)(y-2) \\
& \quad \nabla f=\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{1}}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{2}}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{3}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 8. Compute the following gradients

$$
\begin{gathered}
f(x, y, z, t)=(x-1)(2-y) z+\left(t^{3}-1\right) x y z \\
\nabla f=\left((2-y) z+\left(t^{3}-1\right) y z,-(x-1) z+\left(t^{3}-1\right) x z,(x-1)(2-y)+\left(t^{3}-1\right) x y, 3 t^{2} x y z\right) \\
g(x, y)=\frac{1}{1+\exp (-(a x+b y+c))} \\
\nabla g=\left(\frac{a \exp (-(a x+b y+c))}{(1+\exp (-(a x+b y+c)))^{2}}, \frac{b \exp (-(a x+b y+c))}{(1+\exp (-(a x+b y+c)))^{2}}\right) \\
h(x, y, z)=(x-1)^{2} \exp (x)+(y-2)^{3} z^{3} \\
\nabla h=\left(\left(x^{2}-1\right) \exp (x), 3(y-2)^{2} z^{3,} 3(y-2)^{3} z^{2}\right) \\
c(x, y, z)=\left(x-z-2 \mathrm{y}^{-2}\right)^{b} \\
\nabla c=\left(b\left(x-z-2 \mathrm{y}^{-2}\right)^{b-1}, 4 \mathrm{~b}\left(x-z-2 \mathrm{y}^{-2}\right)^{b-1} y^{-3},-b\left(x-z-2 \mathrm{y}^{-2}\right)^{b-1}\right) \\
g(x, y)=2(x-1)^{2}+2(y-2)^{2}-2(x-1)(y-2) \\
\nabla g=(4 \mathrm{x}-2 \mathrm{y},-2 \mathrm{x}+4 \mathrm{y}-6)
\end{gathered}
$$

# Pseudo code for gradient descent algorithm that minimize $g(x, y)$ 

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p C u r=(0,0) \\
& p N x t=(5,5) \\
& e p s=10 e-2
\end{aligned}
$$

\# current point<br>\# next point<br>\# step size

precision $=10 e-5$;
while (|pCur - pNxt|) > precision):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p C u r=p N x t ; \\
& p N x t=p N x t-e p s * \quad \nabla g(p N x t) ;
\end{aligned}
$$

print "Local minimum occurs at ", pCur

## Uniform Cost Search



Goal: path AI
Queue: A (root)

## Uniform Cost Search



## Uniform Cost Search



Note: nodes in the queue are sorted by distance from the root

## Uniform Cost Search



At node G:
Queue: $\mathrm{I}=4, \mathrm{C}=4, \mathrm{E}=4, \mathrm{~B}=5, \mathrm{H}=5$
Note: nodes in the queue are sorted by distance from the root

## Uniform Cost Search



## A* Search

$$
f(n)=g(n)+h(n)
$$

Where:
$f(n)$ - estimated total cost of path
$\quad$ through $n$ to goal
$g(n)$ - cost so far to reach $n$
$h(n)$ - estimated cost from $n$ to goal

Heuristic Estimates:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h(B->G 2)=9 \\
& h(D->G 2)=10 \\
& h(A->G 1)=2 \\
& h(C->G 1)=1
\end{aligned}
$$

## A* Search

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(n)=g(n)+h(n) \\
& h(B->G 2)=9 \\
& h(D->G 2)=10 \\
& h(A->G 1)=2 \\
& h(C->G 1)=1
\end{aligned}
$$



## A* Search

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(n)=g(n)+h(n) \\
& h(B->G 2)=9 \\
& h(D->G 2)=10 \\
& h(A->G 1)=2 \\
& h(C->G 1)=1
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
f(A)=11<f(D)=13
$$

## A* Search

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(n)=g(n)+h(n) \\
& h(B->G 2)=9 \\
& h(D->G 2)=10 \\
& h(A->G 1)=2 \\
& h(C->G 1)=1
\end{aligned}
$$



## A* Search

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(n)=g(n)+h(n) \\
& h(B->G 2)=9 \\
& h(D->G 2)=10 \\
& h(A->G 1)=2 \\
& h(C->G 1)=1
\end{aligned}
$$



## A* Search

Order:
R-B - A - C - G1

There is no need to check the unfinished path (cost of G2), because it already costs more than the current path does.


