

Cost function g

- actual cost from s to v along the cheapest path found so far
 - exact cost if G is a tree
 - can never underestimate the cost if G is a general graph
- $f(v) = g(s \rightsquigarrow v)$ and unit cost
→ breadth-first search
- $f(v) = -g(s \rightsquigarrow v)$ and unit cost
→ depth-first search

Heuristic function h

- carries information from outside the graph
- defined for the problem domain
- the closer to the actual cost, the less superfluous vertices are expanded
- $f(v) = g(s \rightsquigarrow v)$ → cheapest-first search
- $f(v) = b(v \rightsquigarrow r)$ → best-first search

Admissibility

- let Algorithm A be a best-first search using the evaluation function f
- search algorithm is *admissible* if it finds the minimal path (if it exists)
 - if $f = f^*$, Algorithm A is admissible
- Algorithm A* = Algorithm A using an estimate function h
 - A* is admissible, if h does not overestimate the actual cost



Monotonicity

- h is locally admissible → h is monotonic
- monotonic heuristic is also admissible
- actual cost is never less than the heuristic cost
→ f will never decrease
- monotonicity → A* finds the shortest path to any vertex the first time it is expanded
 - if a vertex is rediscovered, path will not be shorter
 - simplifies implementation



Optimality

- Optimality theorem: The first path from s to r found by A* is optimal.
- Proof: textbook p. 105



Informedness

- the more closely h approximates h^* , the better A* performs
- if A_1 using h_1 will never expand a vertex that is not also expanded by A_2 using h_2 , A_1 is more informed than A_2
- informedness → no other search strategy with *the same amount of outside knowledge* can do less work than A* and be sure of finding the optimal solution



Algorithm A*

- because of monotonicity
 - all weights must be positive
 - closed list can be omitted
- the path is constructed from the mapping π starting from the goal vertex
 - $s \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \pi(\pi(\pi(r))) \rightarrow \pi(\pi(r)) \rightarrow \pi(r) \rightarrow r$

Practical considerations

- computing h
 - despite the extra vertices expanded, less informed h may yield computationally less intensive implementation
- suboptimal solutions
 - by allowing overestimation A* becomes inadmissible, but the results may be good enough for practical purposes

Realizing the movement

- movement through the waypoints
 - unrealistic: does not follow the game world geometry
 - aesthetically displeasing: straight lines and sharp turns
- improvements
 - line-of-sight testing
 - obstacle avoidance
- combining path finding to user-interface
 - real-time response

Recapitulation

1. discretization of the game world
 - grid, navigation mesh
 - waypoints, connections, costs
2. path finding in a graph
 - Algorithm A*
3. realizing the movement
 - geometric corrections
 - aesthetic improvements

Alternatives?

- Although this is the *de facto* approach in (commercial) computer games, are there alternatives?

- possible answers

- AI processors (unrealistic?)
- robotics: reactive agents (unintelligent?)
- analytical approaches (inaccessible?)



$$\begin{aligned}
 &f^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} g(s') + \gamma \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} V^*(s') \\
 &f^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} g(s') + \gamma \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} V^*(s') \\
 &f^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} g(s') + \gamma \sum_{s'} p_{s, a, s'} V^*(s') \\
 &f^*(s, a) = 0
 \end{aligned}$$