Problem solving and search
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Problem-solving agents

Restricted form of general agent:

```
function SIMPLE-PROBLEM-SOLVING-AGENT( percept) returns an action
    static: seq, an action sequence, initially empty
            state, some description of the current world state
            goal, a goal, initially null
            problem, a problem formulation

    state ← UPDATE-STATE(state, percept)
    if seq is empty then
        goal ← FORMULATE-GOAL(state)
        problem ← FORMULATE-PROBLEM(state, goal)
        seq ← SEARCH(problem)
        action ← RECOMMENDATION(seq, state)
        seq ← REMAINDER(seq, state)
    return action
```

Note: this is offline problem solving; solution executed “eyes closed.”

Online problem solving involves acting without complete knowledge.
Example: Romania

On holiday in Romania; currently in Arad.
Flight leaves tomorrow from Bucharest

Formulate goal:
be in Bucharest

Formulate problem:
states: various cities
actions: drive between cities

Find solution:
sequence of cities, e.g., Arad, Sibiu, Fagaras, Bucharest
Example: Romania

[Diagram of Romania's road network with distances between cities labeled.]
Problem types

Deterministic, fully observable \( \implies \textit{single-state problem} \)
Agent knows exactly which state it will be in; solution is a sequence

Non-observable \( \implies \textit{conformant problem} \)
Agent may have no idea where it is; solution (if any) is a sequence

Nondeterministic and/or partially observable \( \implies \textit{contingency problem} \)
percepts provide \textit{new} information about current state
solution is a \textit{tree} or \textit{policy}
often \textit{interleave} search, execution

Unknown state space \( \implies \textit{exploration problem} \) (“online”)
Example: vacuum world

Single-state, start in #5. Solution??
[Right, Suck]

Conformant, start in {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8}
e.g., Right goes to {2, 4, 6, 8}. Solution??
[Right, Suck, Left, Suck]

Contingency, start in #5
Murphy’s Law: Suck can dirty a clean carpet
Local sensing: dirt, location only.
Solution??
[Right, if dirt then Suck]
Single-state problem formulation

A problem is defined by four items:

initial state  e.g., “at Arad”

successor function $S(x) = \text{set of action–state pairs}$
  e.g., $S(\text{Arad}) = \{\langle \text{Arad} \rightarrow \text{Zerind}, \text{Zerind} \rangle, \ldots \}$

goal test, can be
  explicit, e.g., $x = \text{“at Bucharest”}$
  implicit, e.g., $\text{NoDirt}(x)$

path cost (additive)
  e.g., sum of distances, number of actions executed, etc.
  $c(x, a, y)$ is the step cost, assumed to be $\geq 0$

A solution is a sequence of actions
leading from the initial state to a goal state
Selecting a state space

Real world is absurdly complex
⇒ state space must be *abstracted* for problem solving

(Abstract) state = set of real states

(Abstract) action = complex combination of real actions
  e.g., “Arad → Zerind” represents a complex set
  of possible routes, detours, rest stops, etc.
For guaranteed realizability, *any* real state “in Arad”
  must get to *some* real state “in Zerind”

(Abstract) solution =
  set of real paths that are solutions in the real world

Each abstract action should be “easier” than the original problem!
Example: vacuum world state space graph

states??
actions??
goal test??
path cost??
Example: vacuum world state space graph

**states??:** integer dirt and robot locations (ignore dirt *amounts*)

**actions??:** *Left, Right, Suck, NoOp*

**goal test??:** no dirt

**path cost??:** 1 per action (0 for *NoOp*)
Example: The 8-puzzle

Start State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example: The 8-puzzle**

![Diagram of the 8-puzzle with start and goal states]

- **states**: integer locations of tiles (ignore intermediate positions)
- **actions**: move blank left, right, up, down (ignore unjamming etc.)
- **goal test**: = goal state (given)
- **path cost**: 1 per move

[Note: optimal solution of \(n\)-Puzzle family is NP-hard]
Example: robotic assembly

**states??**: real-valued coordinates of robot joint angles
parts of the object to be assembled

**actions??**: continuous motions of robot joints

**goal_test??**: complete assembly *with no robot included!*

**path_cost??**: time to execute
**Tree search algorithms**

Basic idea:
- offline, simulated exploration of state space
  - by generating successors of already-explored states
    (a.k.a. *expanding* states)

```plaintext
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
    end
```
Tree search example
Tree search example

Diagram:
- Arad
- Sibiu (connected to Arad, Fagaras, Oradea, Rimnicu Vilcea)
- Timisoara (connected to Arad, Lugo)
- Zerind (connected to Arad, Oradea)
Tree search example
Implementation: states vs. nodes

A state is a (representation of) a physical configuration
A node is a data structure constituting part of a search tree includes parent, children, depth, path cost \( g(x) \)
States do not have parents, children, depth, or path cost!

The Expand function creates new nodes, filling in the various fields and using the SuccessorFn of the problem to create the corresponding states.
Implementation: general tree search

**function** Tree-Search(problem, fringe) **returns** a solution, or failure

fringe ← INSERT(Make-Node(Initial-State[problem]), fringe)

loop do
    if fringe is empty then return failure

    node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)

    if Goal-Test[problem] applied to State(node) succeeds return 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
A strategy is defined by picking the *order of node expansion*

Strategies are evaluated along the following dimensions:
- **completeness**—does it always find a solution if one exists?
- **time complexity**—number of nodes generated/expanded
- **space complexity**—maximum number of nodes in memory
- **optimality**—does it always find a least-cost solution?

Time and space complexity are measured in terms of:
- $b$—maximum branching factor of the search tree
- $d$—depth of the least-cost solution
- $m$—maximum depth of the state space (may be $\infty$)
Uninformed search strategies

*Uninformed* strategies use only the information available in the problem definition

Breadth-first search

Uniform-cost search

Depth-first search

Depth-limited search

Iterative deepening search
Breadth-first search

Expand shallowest unexpanded node

Implementation:

fringe is a FIFO queue, i.e., new successors go at end
Breadth-first search

Expand shallowest unexpanded node

Implementation:

*fringe* is a FIFO queue, i.e., new successors go at end
Breadth-first search

Expand shallowest unexpanded node

**Implementation:**

*fringe* is a FIFO queue, i.e., new successors go at end
Breadth-first search

Expand shallowest unexpanded node

Implementation:

*fringe* is a FIFO queue, i.e., new successors go at end
Properties of breadth-first search

**Complete**? Yes (if \( b \) is finite)

**Time**? \( 1 + b + b^2 + b^3 + \ldots + b^d + b(b^d - 1) = O(b^{d+1}) \), i.e., exp. in \( d \)

**Space**? \( O(b^{d+1}) \) (keeps every node in memory)

**Optimal**? Yes (if cost = 1 per step); not optimal in general

*Space* is the big problem; can easily generate nodes at 10MB/sec so 24hrs = 860GB.
Uniform-cost search

Expand least-cost unexpanded node

Implementation:
\[ fringe = \text{queue ordered by path cost} \]

Equivalent to breadth-first if step costs all equal

Complete?? Yes, if step cost \( \geq \epsilon \)

Time?? \# of nodes with \( g \leq \) cost of optimal solution, \( O(b^{C^*/\epsilon}) \)
where \( C^* \) is the cost of the optimal solution

Space?? \# of nodes with \( g \leq \) cost of optimal solution, \( O(b^{C^*/\epsilon}) \)

Optimal?? Yes—nodes expanded in increasing order of \( g(n) \)
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

\[ \text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

-fringe = LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

$fringe = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front}$
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

\[ \text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

\[ \text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

$fringe = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front}$
**Depth-first search**

Expand deepest unexpanded node

**Implementation:**

\(fringe = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front}\)

![Diagram of a tree search]

- Root node A
- Child nodes B and C
- B has children E and J
- C has children F, G, M, N, O
- J has children L and K
- G has children L, M, N, O

---
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Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

\[ \text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

**Implementation:**

\[\text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front}\]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

\[ \text{fringe} = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

**Implementation:**

\[ fringe = \text{LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front} \]
Depth-first search

Expand deepest unexpanded node

Implementation:

fringe = LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front
Properties of depth-first search

**Complete??** No: fails in infinite-depth spaces, spaces with loops
   Modify to avoid repeated states along path
       ⇒ complete in finite spaces

**Time??** $O(b^m)$: terrible if $m$ is much larger than $d$
   but if solutions are dense, may be much faster than breadth-first

**Space??** $O(bm)$, i.e., linear space!

**Optimal??** No
Depth-limited search

= depth-first search with depth limit \( l \),
i.e., nodes at depth \( l \) have no successors

Recursive implementation:

```plaintext
function DEPTH-LIMITED-SEARCH(problem, limit) returns soln/fail/cutoff
    RECURSIVE-DLS(MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem]), problem, limit)

function RECURSIVE-DLS(node, problem, limit) returns soln/fail/cutoff
    cutoff-occurred? ← false
    if GOAL-TEST(problem)(STATE[node]) then return node
    else if DEPTH[node] = limit then return cutoff
    else for each successor in EXPAND(node, problem) do
        result ← RECURSIVE-DLS(successor, problem, limit)
        if result = cutoff then cutoff-occurred? ← true
        else if result ≠ failure then return result
    if cutoff-occurred? then return cutoff else return failure
```
Iterative deepening search

function ITERATIVE-DEEPENING-SEARCH(problem) returns a solution
  inputs: problem, a problem
  for depth ← 0 to ∞ do
    result ← DEPTH-LIMITED-SEARCH(problem, depth)
    if result ≠ cutoff then return result
  end
Iterative deepening search $l = 0$
Iterative deepening search $l = 1$
Iterative deepening search $l = 2$

Limit = 2
Iterative deepening search $l = 3$

Limit = 3
Properties of iterative deepening search

**Complete** Yes

**Time** \((d + 1)b^0 + db^1 + (d - 1)b^2 + \ldots + b^d = O(b^d)\)

**Space** \(O(bd)\)

**Optimal** Yes, if step cost = 1  
Can be modified to explore uniform-cost tree

Numerical comparison for \(b = 10\) and \(d = 5\), solution at far right:

\[
N(\text{IDS}) = 50 + 400 + 3,000 + 20,000 + 100,000 = 123,450
\]

\[
N(\text{BFS}) = 10 + 100 + 1,000 + 10,000 + 100,000 + 999,990 = 1,111,100
\]
### Summary of algorithms

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete?</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, if ( l \geq d )</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>( b^{d+1} )</td>
<td>( b^{[C^*/\epsilon]} )</td>
<td>( b^m )</td>
<td>( b^l )</td>
<td>( b^d )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>( b^{d+1} )</td>
<td>( b^{[C^*/\epsilon]} )</td>
<td>( b^m )</td>
<td>( b^l )</td>
<td>( bd )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal?</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repeated states

Failure to detect repeated states can turn a linear problem into an exponential one!
Graph search

function `GRAPH-SEARCH(problem, fringe)` returns a solution, or failure

```
closed ← an empty set
fringe ← INSERT(MAKE-NODE(Initial-State[problem]), fringe)
loop do
    if fringe is empty then return failure
    node ← REMOVE-FRONT(fringe)
    if GOAL-TEST[problem](STATE[node]) then return node
    if STATE[node] is not in closed then
        add STATE[node] to closed
        fringe ← INSERTALL(EXPAND(node, problem), fringe)
end
```
Summary

Problem formulation usually requires abstracting away real-world details to define a state space that can feasibly be explored.

Variety of uninformed search strategies

Iterative deepening search uses only linear space and not much more time than other uninformed algorithms.