# Search

## Terminology

- **search tree (graph)** the path the search algorithm follows in exploring the state space via an initial state and a successor function
  - **search node** a state from the state space which has a successor function. A node is comprised of the following:
    - 1.  $\underline{\text{state}}$  the state the node represents
    - 2. <u>parent</u> the predecessor of the node.
    - 3.  $\frac{1}{action}$  the action applied to the parent to reach the node.
    - 4. path-cost g(n) the cost of the path from the initial state.
    - 5.  $\underline{depth}$  the number of search steps along the path.
  - *expanding a node* generating a new set of states via the node's successor function. <u>A node is not checked to be terminal until it is expanded.</u>
  - Note that several nodes in the search tree may contain the same states, generated by different paths. Hence, *the search becomes a graph in state space*.
- **search strategy** the methodology for choosing the next node to expand.
- **fringe** the collection of nodes generated but not yet expanded.
  - this collection typically imposes an ordering on which nodes in the collection will be expanded next based on a preference  $\rightarrow$  queue.

## Assessing Algorithms

- Performance Measures for our algorithms:
  - **completeness** Is algorithm guaranteed to find an existing solution?
  - **optimality** Does the algorithm find the optimal solution first?
  - **time complexity** How long does it take to find a solution
  - **space complexity** How much memory is needed to find a solution?
- Relevant quantities:
  - **branching factor** b maximum number of successors of a node.
  - $\circ$  *d* depth of the shallowest goal node.
  - $\circ$  *m* maximum length of any path in the state space.
- **path cost** a function used to define a numeric cost to each path.
- **search cost** the cost required to find a particular solution... typically time complexity.
- **total cost** a combination of search cost and path cost according to some tradeoff between the two.

**Uninformed (Blind) search** – search solely on the basis of being to expand the successors of a state and being able to distinguish a goal-state.

Criterion	BFS	Uniform	DFS	DLS	Iterative	<b>Bidirect.</b>
Complete?	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1,2</sup>	No	No	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1,4</sup>
Optimal?	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes	No	No	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes <sup>3,4</sup>
Time	$O\!\left(b^{^{d+1}} ight)$	$O\Big(b^{\left\lceil C^{^{*}}/arepsilon ight ceil}\Big)$	$O(b^m)$	$O\!\left(b^l ight)$	$O\!\left(b^{d} ight)$	$O\!\left(b^{d/2} ight)$
Space	$O\!\left(b^{d+1} ight)$	$O\!\left(b^{\left\lceil C^{^{*}}/arepsilon ight ceil} ight)$	O(bm)	O(bl)	O(bd)	$O\!\left(b^{d/2} ight)$

- 1. complete if b is finite.
- 2. complete if step cost is at least  $\varepsilon > 0$ .
- 3. optimal if step costs are all identical.
- 4. if both directions use BFS.
- **Breadth-first Search** all nodes at a given depth in the search tree are expanded before any of the nodes at larger depths → implemented with FIFO queue
  - *complete*: if the shallowest goal node is at depth *d*, it will be found after searching over all shallower nodes and other nodes at depth *d*.
  - o *optimal* if the path cost is a nondecreasing function of depth of a node.
  - Memory requirements of breadth-first search are crippling.
    - Every node must remain in memory  $\rightarrow O(b^{d+1})$
  - Uniformed exponential-complexity searches only can be solved for small (trivial) instances.
- Uniform-cost Search expands the next unexpanded node with the *lowest path*  $cost \rightarrow$  implemented by a priority queue. When costs are equal, becomes BFS.
  - *complete* and *optimal* provided the cost of every step is at least  $\varepsilon > 0$ .
  - Let  $C^*$  be the cost of the optimal solution. Then the space and time-

complexity is  $O(b^{\lceil C^*/\varepsilon \rceil})$ .

- **Depth-first Search** always expands the *deepest* node in the current fringe of the search tree (search backs-up when path unsuccessful) → implemented by Stack.
  - *Incomplete* for non-finite search trees. Always *non-optimal*.
    - In worst case, DFS will end up exploring O(b<sup>m</sup>) nodes where m is the maximum depth of any node.
  - Memory requirement only O(bm) where m is the maximum depth.
  - **backtracking search** uses only O(m) memory by only remembering a single successor at each level by having each node "remember" which node to generate as next unexplored successor for backtracking.
    - utilizes idea of generating a successor by modifying current state.

- **Depth-limited Search** depth-first search with a predetermined depth limit *l*. Becomes DFS when  $l = \infty$ .
  - $\circ$  incomplete if l < d. non-optimal if l > d.
  - time complexity:  $O(b^l)$ . space complexity: O(bl)
  - the **diameter** of the space provides a good clue about the value to choose for *l*, but it is hard to discover the diameter without solving the problem.
- **Iterative Deepening Depth-first Search** iteratively repeated depth-limited search where *l* is increased by 1 on each iteration from an initial value of 0. This combines the benefits of BFS and DFS.
  - o *complete* when branching factor is finite.
  - o *optimal* when the cost is a non-decreasing function of depth.
  - o space complexity: O(bd)
  - *Insight*: most of the nodes are in the bottom-most level so repeating upper levels is not that bad of an idea.
    - time complexity:  $O(b^d)$  ... a factor of *b* better than BFS.
  - In general, iterative deepening is the preferred method of uninformed search when there is a large search space with unknown solution depth.
  - **iterative lengthening search** iterative search on increasing *path-costs* analogous to uniform cost search.
    - incurs substantial overhead compared to uniform-cost search.
- **Bidirectional Search** simultaneous searches from the initial state forward and from the goal state backwards that stop when the 2 searches meet. Encouraged by the fact that  $b^{d/2} + b^{d/2} \ll b^d$ 
  - o *complete & optimal* (with uniform step costs) if both algorithms are BFS.
  - Checking a node for membership in the other search tree can be done in constant time via a hash table, but requires that 1 search tree be in memory.
    - Time-complexity:  $O(b^{d/2})$  Space-complexity:  $O(b^{d/2})$
  - Bidirectional search requires that the **predecessors** of a node be efficiently computable:
    - Easy when actions are *reversible*. Otherwise...
  - To deal with several (explicitly listed) goal states, we make them all have a successor of a single *dummy goal state*.

- Avoiding Repeated States avoiding repeated visits to states that have already been visited could result in substantial savings in space and time. *Algorithms that forget their history are doomed to repeat it.* 
  - o repeated states are unavoidable is some problems. e.g. reversible actions.
  - Repetition Detection usually requires comparing new node to those that have already been expanded.
    - Once found, one of the paths to a repeated state can be discarded.
  - DFS can only avoid the exponential proliferation of non-looping paths by keeping more nodes in memory.
  - Algorithms can simply remember every state that has been visited.
    - **closed list** stores all expanded nodes.
    - **open list** stores all nodes on the fringe.
    - In worst-case, time/space is proportional to the size of the state space.
  - Optimality
    - Uniform-cost search and BFS (constant step size) are both optimal graph-search algorithms
    - Iterative-deepening needs to check if new path is better and if so, it must revise costs of all paths going through the altered state.

#### Searching with Partial Information

- Sensorless (Conformant) Problems agent has no sensors.
  - o agent must be able to reason about a set of possible states.
  - **belief state** a set of states representing the agent's belief of what states it might be in. In general, environment of S states has  $2^{S}$  belief states.
  - **coercion** executing actions that cause the agent's belief state to collapse to a certain set of states.
    - *solution* coercing the belief state to a set of all goal states.
- *Contingency Problems* environment is partially observable or the outcome of an agent's actions is uncertain.
  - o **adversarial** uncertainty is caused by actions of other agents.
  - **contingency plan** trees of decisions made based on the current set of percepts made after the last action.
  - Agent can act before finding a guaranteed plan
    - idea of acting and seeing what contingences actually arise.
    - *interleaving* of search and execution also useful in exploration.
- *Exploration Problems* when states and actions are unknown, agent must explore.

## 4: Informed Search and Exploration

- **Informed Search** uses problem-specific knowledge beyond the problem's definition.
- **Best-First Search** general Tree (Graph) Search where node's are selected based on an evaluation function f(n) cost of cheapest path to goal through node n.
- **Greedy Best-First Search** Assumes f(n) = h(n); a heuristic function.
  - o susceptible to false starts
  - o not optimal; incomplete.
  - Worst case time and space:  $O(b^m)$ .

**A**<sup>\*</sup> **Search** - f(n) = g(n) + h(n) where g(n) is the cost to reach the node n and h(n) is a heuristic function estimating the cost to a goal through n  $\rightarrow$  estimated cheapest cost through n.

- A\* is *optimal* if h(n) is an *admissible* (and *consistent* for Graph-Search) heuristic.
- A\* is complete.
- If h(n) is *consistent*, the values of f(n) along any path are nondecreasing!
- A\* searches on contours of cost in the state space.
  - $\circ$  C\* is the cost of the optimal solution path
    - A\* expands all nodes such that  $f(n) < C^*$ .
    - A\* expands some nodes on the goal contour  $f(n) = C^*$ .
    - A\* never explores nodes with  $f(n) > C^* \rightarrow pruned -$

elimination of possibilities without considering them.

• A\* is **optimally efficient** for any given heuristic since any algorithm that doesn't expand a node n with  $f(n) < C^*$  might miss the optimal solution.

#### **Heuristic Functions**

- Heuristic Function h(n) estimated cost of cheapest path to goal through node n.
- Admissible Heuristic h(n) never overestimates the cost to reach a goal.
- **Consistent (Monotonic) Heuristic** h(n) is not more than the cost through n to n' plus h(n'). Thus, a general triangle inequality:

$$h(n) \le c(n, a, n') + h(n')$$

- Effective Branching Factor (b\*) the branching factor of a uniform tree of depth d with N+1 nodes would have to have given that A\* has generated N nodes with depth d.
- **Dominance** a heuristic  $h_1$  is said to **dominate** another heuristic  $h_2$  if, for any node n,  $h_1(n) \ge h_2(n)$ .
  - A heuristic will never expand more nodes in A\* than any other heuristic it dominates.
  - Every node surely expanded by search with A\* under the dominant heuristic will also surely be expanded by the dominated heuristic.
- **Relaxed Problem** a problem with fewer restrictions on the actions allowable in the problem domain.
  - The cost of an optimal solution to a relaxed problem is an admissible heuristic for the original problem!
  - The "relaxed problem" heuristic must obey the triangle inequality, hence it is consistent.
  - The relaxed problem must be easily solved to be used as heuristic.
- <u>MultiHeuristic</u>: if we have a set of heuristics {*h<sub>i</sub>*} we can combine them into a single heuristic:

$$\tilde{h}(n) = \max_{i} \{h_{i}(n)\}$$

- if  $\{h_i\}$  is admissible,  $\tilde{h}$  is admissible.
- $\circ$   $\tilde{h}$  is also consistent and dominates each of its components.
- **Pattern Databases** a database of solutions to every subproblem.
  - **Disjoint Pattern Databases** sum of costs of two subproblems is a lower bound on the cost of solving the entire problem.
  - The solution cost of a subproblem can thus be used to form an admissible heuristic.
- <u>Learning Heuristics</u> learn a heuristic from experience in solving problem repeatedly.
  - $\circ$  use *inductive learning algorithm* to construct a function h(n) that can predict cost of other states that arise in search.
  - typically use *features* of a state that are relevant to its evaluation. e.g. linear combination of features.

#### **Local Search**

- Local Search Algorithms When the path to reach goal is irrelevant, local search are methods for only maintaining *current state* and (generally) only moving to its neighbors. Often used in optimizations where the goal is to minimize a objective function.
- Advantages:
  - 1. small memory requirement
  - 2. reasonable solutions in large spaces
- **state space landscape** the space of possible states defined by a "*location*" corresponding to state and a "*elevation*" corresponding to an evaluation, cost, or objective function.
- **complete local search** always finds a goal (if any exist)
- **optimal local search** always finds the global min/max.
- greedy local search moves to "good" neighbor without considering future.
- **Hill-Climbing Search** Always moves in "uphill" direction to maximize objective only searching amongst immediate neighbors of current state and terminating when no improvements can be made → *greedy*.
  - o Problems
    - Local Max/Min
    - Ridges
    - Plateaux
  - o <u>sideways moves</u> moves along "flat" objective to get off plateau.
  - **Stochastic Hill Climbing** random uphill moves where probability of choice depends on steepness of climb.
  - **First-Choice Hill Climbing** generate successors until one is better than "current" and take it.
  - Random Restart Hill Climbing succession of hill climbs with random initial state. If probability of success is p, expected number of restarts is 1/p.
  - NP-hard problems typically have exponential number of local min/max.
- **Simulated Annealing** Hill-Climbing with random walk thus giving efficiency and completeness.
  - Candidate move  $\beta$  is randomly selected. If candidate is uphill, it is always accepted. Otherwise, it is accepted with a probability exponentially decreasing with "badness"  $\Delta E$  and decreasing as temperature T is lowered  $\rightarrow Boltzmann Distrubution$ .

$$P(n_{t+1} = \beta) = \min(1, \exp\{\Delta E(\beta)/T\})$$

• If the *schedule* for T cools "slowly enough", simulated annealing finds global optimum with probability approaching 1.

- Local Beam Search maintains the k "best" successor states; an approach more powerful than k independent searches since information effectively passes between the "search threads."
  - **Stochastic Beam Search** chooses next k states at random with a probability of a state as an increasing function of the states value. This approach helps alleviate "lack of diversity."
- Genetic Algorithms A variant of stochastic beam search in which successors are generated through combinations of 2 current states.
  - **population** the k states maintained by the algorithm
  - **individual** an instance in the state space.
  - **fitness function** an evaluation function that returns higher values for better states.
  - Essence of Algorithm
    - Parents are randomly selected with probabilities related to their fitness.
    - **Crossover** points are selected randomly in accordance with the rules of the state.
    - **Random Mutation** occurs in each successor with some small probability.
  - Schema a substring (representing state) in which some positions of state have been left unspecified. *Instances* are strings that match a schema.
    - If the average fitness of the instances of a schema is above the mean, then the number of instances of that schema within the population will grow over time.
    - GA's work best when schema correspond to meaningful components of the solution.

- Continuous Spaces
  - **Gradient Descent (Ascent)** moves the current solution in the direction of the gradient in the state-space landscape.

**Gradient** - 
$$\nabla f = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right)$$

Update -  $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} + \alpha \nabla f(\mathbf{x})$ 

- Gradient is local, not global direction.
- empirical gradient estimation of gradient for non-differentiable objective function by calculating f in a close neighborhood around x.
- If step size α is too small, too many steps are needed. If it's too large, the steps overshoot the extrema. Line Search dynamically chooses α in some scheme.
- o Newton-Raphson Method
  - Newton's Method for iteratively finding roots:

$$x \leftarrow x - g(x) / g'(x)$$

• To find min/max, we need to find roots of gradient:

$$\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{H}_{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla f(\mathbf{x})$$
  
where  $H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^{2} f}{\partial x_{i} \partial x_{j}}$ ; the **Hessian**

- **Constrained Optimization** an optimization in which solutions must satisfy hard constraints for the values of each variable.
  - **linear programming** constraints must be linear inequalities forming a convex region and objective function is linear.

#### **Online Agents**

- **Online Search** agent interleaves action and computation by taking actions and observing environment to determine result of the action.
  - Online search necessary in *exploration* where states and actions are unknown.
  - o Essentials:
    - Action(s) returns actions for state s.
    - step-cost function c(s,a,s') determines cost of step s to s' by way
      of action a.
    - Goal-Test(s) determines if s is a goal.
  - **competitive ratio** comparison of cost of path that agent actually travels to the cost of the path of the agent would travel if it knew the search space a priori.
  - No algorithm can avoid dead ends in all possible search spaces → Adversarial Argument.
  - **safely explorable state space** space in which every state can reach some goal state eventually.
  - Hill-climbing is already a local search
    - local minimum can be dealt with via *random walks*.
    - estimated cost to reach cost through neighbor s' is the cost to get to s' plus the estimated cost to reach the goal from there (updated):

c(s,a,s')+H(s')

• **optimism under uncertainty** – encourages agent to explore new paths by giving new states least possible cost.