

Blind Search

Some material from: D Lin, J You, JC Latombe

Search Overview

- Introduction to Search
- Blind Search Techniques aka "Uninformed Search" (Goal vs NonGoal)
 - Breadth-First (Uniform Cost)
 - Depth-First
 - "Iterative Deepening"
 - Bi-Directional
- Heuristic Search Techniques
- Stochastic Algorithms
- Game Playing search
- Constraint Satisfaction Problems

Generic Search Algorithm

```
Search<sub>insert</sub>( start, operations, isGoal): path
  L = make-queue( start )
  loop
      n := pop(L)
      if [ isGoal( n )]
        return(n)
      S := successors( n, operators )
      L := (insert(S, L))
 until L is empty
 return( failure )
```

insert could be queue, stack, . . . defines strategy!

Blind Search

Blind Search

- Depth-first search
- Breadth-first search
- Iterative deepening

....

- Not "guided" by goal
- No matter where the goal is, these algorithms will do the same thing.



Performance Measures of Search Algorithms

- Completeness
 - Does algorithm always find **a sol'n** (if ∃)?
- Optimality
 - Does it always find **least cost** sol'n?
- Time complexity How long does it take to find sol'n?
- Space complexity How much memory is required to find a sol'n?



To measure Time and Space complexity:

- b: maximum branching factor of the search tree
 - Max number of operations at any state
- *d*: depth of the least-cost solution
 depth of shallowest goal node in search tree
- *m*: maximum depth of the state space (may be ∞)

Breadth-first search

- Expand shallowest unexpanded node
 Implementation:
 - *fringe* is a FIFO queue,
 ... new successors go at end



Breadth-First Search



Properties of Breadth-First search

- <u>Complete?</u> Yes (if *b* is finite)
 <u>Optimal?</u> Yes (if cost = 1 per step)
- Time? $O(b^d)$

• $1 + b + b^2 + ... + b^d/2 = O(b^d)$

- <u>Space?</u> *O(b^d)*
 - keeps every intermediate node in memory
- Space is the bigger problem (more than time)

Time and Memory Requirements

d	#Nodes	Time	Memory
2	111	.01 msec	11 Kbytes
4	11,111	1 msec	1 Mbyte
6	~10 ⁶	1 sec	100 Mb
8	~108	100 sec	10 Gbytes
10	~10 ¹⁰	2.8 hours	1 Tbyte
12	~10 ¹²	11.6 days	100 Tbytes
14	~10 ¹⁴	3.2 years	10,000 Tb

Assumptions: b = 10; 1,000,000 nodes/sec; 100bytes/node

Uniform Cost Search

- BreadthFirst returns SHALLOW-est Goal
 ... not necessarily best. . .
- Uniform Cost Search:

Expand LEAST Cost node

• If $COST \equiv Depth$, then UC = BF

To insure optimality...

To guarantee OPTIMAL path, need to maintain queue, sorted in increasing order:



Uniform-cost search

- Expand least-cost unexpanded node
- Implementation:
 - fringe = queue ordered by path cost
- Equivalent to breadth-first if step costs all equal
- <u>Complete?</u> Yes, if step $cost \ge \varepsilon$ (in trouble if cost = 0)
- Optimal? Yes

...as nodes expanded in increasing order of cost
 Time? O(b^[C*/ε])

where $C^* = cost$ of optimal solution

• Space? $O(b^{C^*/\epsilon^{-1}})$

Depth-first search

- Expand deepest unexpanded node
- Implementation:
 - fringe = LIFO queue, i.e., put successors at front



Depth-first Search



Properties of Depth-First Search

Complete? No: fails in infinite-depth spaces, or if loops Modify to avoid repeated states along path \rightarrow complete in finite spaces No **Optimal?** ... first found \neq ? best Time? O(b^m): ■terrible if *m* is much larger than *d* but if solutions are dense, may be much faster than BF

• Space? (b m) • $d=12 \Rightarrow 12$ kb, not 111 terabytes!

BFS/UC vs. DFS

	Complete?	Optimal?	Time	Space				
BFS/UC	YES	YES	b ^d	b ^d				
DFS	finite depth	NO	b ^m	b m				
 Time: m=d DFS typic="""" Challenge: Challenge: How to get BFS's guarantees, How to get BFS's memory?? using only DFS's memory? using only always beats BFS 								

Which Strategy to Use?

- Depends on problem.
- If there are infinite paths
 - \Rightarrow depth-first is bad
- If goal is at known depth
 ⇒ depth-first is good
- If ∃ large (possibly ∞) branching factor
 ⇒ breadth-first is bad

(Could try nondeterministic search: Expand an open node at random.)

Depth-Limited Strategy

 Depth-first with depth cut-off k (do NOT expand nodes below depth k)

Three possible outcomes:

- Solution
- Failure (no solution)
- Cutoff (no solution within cutoff)

Depth-Limited Depth-First-Search

• Depth cut-off: k=3



- Complete: No unless soln @ depth $\leq k$
- Optimal: No
- Time:
- Space:



Iterative Deepening Strategy

Use an artificial depth cutoff, k.

- For k = 1...
 - Use Depth-limited Depth-First Search(k)
 - If succeeds: DONE.
 - If not: increase k by 1 (Regenerate nodes, as necessary)

Iterative Deepening Search k=0

Limit = 0



Þ.



Iterative Deepening Search: *k=1*



Iterative Deepening Search: *k* = 2



Iterative Deepening Search *k=3*





Iterative Deepening: Analysis

- Time: \approx BFS !
 - ... even though it regenerates intermediate nodes !
- Why? Almost all work ON FINAL LEVEL anyway!
- Eg: b = 10, d = 5:
 - BFS expands 1 + 10 + 100 + ... + 100,000 = 111,111
- IDS expands
 - bottom level: 1 time
 - second to bottom: 2 times
 - **.**...
 - toplevel: d+1 times
 - total: $(d+1)b^{0} + db^{1} + (d-1)b^{2} + ... + 3b^{d-2} + 2b^{d-1} + 1b^{d}$
 - $\dots 100,000 + 20,000 + \dots + 50 + 6 = 123,456$
- Ratio of IDS to BFS: $\approx [b / (b-1)]^2$
- Cost of repeating work at shallow depths: MINOR!

Properties of Iterative Deepening Search

- Complete? Yes
- Optimal? Yes, if step cost = 1
- Time?
 - $(d+1)b^0 + d b^1 + (d-1)b^2 + ... + b^d = O(b^d)$
- <u>Space?</u> *O(b d)*
 - IDS does not get stuck on infinite path
 - Space: Same as DFS but with *d*, not *m* (as each search is DFS)

BiDirectional Search

Start Goal

- Simultaneously:
 - Search "forward" from start
 - Search "backward" from goal
 - Stop when two searches meet in middle
- If branching factor = b in each direction & solution at depth d
 - \Rightarrow need only O(2b^{d/2}) = O(b^{d/2}) steps
- Eg: b = 10, d = 6:

BFS expands 1,111,111 nodes BiDirectional: 2,222 !

- Issues:
 - How to "search backwards from goal"?
 - What if > 1 goals (chess)?
 - How to check if paths meet? constant time?
 - What type of search done in each half? (BFS)



Comparing "Blind" Search Strategies

Criterion	Breadth-	Uniform-	Depth-	Depth-	Iterative
	First	Cost	First	Limited	Deepening
Complete?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Time	$O(b^{d+1})$	$O(b^{\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil})$	$O(b^m)$	$O(b^l)$	$O(b^d)$
Space	$O(b^{d+1})$	$O(b^{\lceil C^*/\epsilon \rceil})$	O(bm)	O(bl)	O(bd)
Optimal?	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

Comparison of Strategies

 Breadth-first is complete and optimal, but has high space complexity

Bad when branching factor is high

Depth-first is space efficient, but not complete nor optimal

Bad when search depth is infinite

Iterative deepening is asymptotically optimal !

Avoiding Repeated States

- May reach same state thru multiple paths

 - ... if operations are REVERSIBLE (∞)
 - $\blacksquare \Rightarrow$ "Obvious" algorithms may
 - be inefficient (exponentially worse)
 - loop forever!



Approaches to Deal w/Repeated State

- Don't return to parent state
 - Don't generate successor = node's parent
- Don't allow cycles
 - Don't generate successor = node's ancestor
- Don't ever revisit state
 - Keep every visited state in memory! O(b^d)

Summary of Blind Search

- Search strategies:
 - breadth-first, depth-first, iterative deepening, ...
- Evaluation of strategies:
 - completeness, optimality, time and space complexity
- Iterative deepening search
 - uses only linear space
 - \approx same time as other blind-searchers
- Avoid repeated states

