


# Local Search




# Iterative Improvement




# Iterative Algorithms for CSPs

- Local search methods typically work with “complete” states, i.e., all variables assigned
- To apply to CSPs:
  - Take an assignment with unsatisfied constraints
  - Operators *reassign* variable values
  - No fringe! Live on the edge.
- Algorithm: While not solved,
  - Variable selection: randomly select any conflicted variable
  - Value selection: min-conflicts heuristic:
    - Choose a value that violates the fewest constraints
    - I.e., hill climb with  $h(n)$  = total number of violated constraints



# Example: 4-Queens





- States: 4 queens in 4 columns ( $4^4 = 256$  states)
- Operators: move queen in column
- Goal test: no attacks
- Evaluation:  $c(n) =$  number of attacks

# Performance of Min-Conflicts


- Given random initial state, can solve n-queens in almost constant time for arbitrary n with high probability (e.g., n = 10,000,000)!
- The same appears to be true for any randomly-generated CSP *except* in a narrow range of the ratio

$$R = \frac{\text{number of constraints}}{\text{number of variables}}$$



# Local Search

- Tree search keeps unexplored alternatives on the fringe (ensures completeness)
- Local search: improve a single option until you can't make it better (no fringe!)
- New successor function: local changes




- Generally much faster and more memory efficient (but incomplete and suboptimal)

# Hill Climbing

- Simple, general idea:
  - Start wherever
  - Repeat: move to the best neighboring state
  - If no neighbors better than current, quit
- What's bad about this approach?
  - Complete?
  - Optimal?
- What's good about it?




# Hill Climbing Diagram





# Hill Climbing Quiz



Starting from X, where do you end up ?

Starting from Y, where do you end up ?


Starting from Z, where do you end up ?

# Simulated Annealing

- Idea: Escape local maxima by allowing downhill moves
  - But make them rarer as time goes on


```
function SIMULATED-ANNEALING(problem, schedule) returns a solution state
  inputs: problem, a problem
           schedule, a mapping from time to "temperature"
  local variables: current, a node
                   next, a node
                   T, a "temperature" controlling prob. of downward steps

  current ← MAKE-NODE(INITIAL-STATE[problem])
  for t ← 1 to ∞ do
    T ← schedule[t]
    if T = 0 then return current
    next ← a randomly selected successor of current
     $\Delta E$  ← VALUE[next] - VALUE[current]
    if  $\Delta E > 0$  then current ← next
    else current ← next only with probability  $e^{-\Delta E/T}$ 
```





# Simulated Annealing

- Theoretical guarantee:
  - Stationary distribution:  $p(x) \propto e^{-\frac{E(x)}{kT}}$
  - If T decreased slowly enough, will converge to optimal state!
- Is this an interesting guarantee?
- Sounds like magic, but reality is reality:
  - The more downhill steps you need to escape a local optimum, the less likely you are to ever make them all in a row
  - People think hard about *ridge operators* which let you jump around the space in better ways




# Genetic Algorithms



- Genetic algorithms use a natural selection metaphor
  - Keep best N hypotheses at each step (selection) based on a fitness function
  - Also have pairwise crossover operators, with optional mutation to give variety
- Possibly the most misunderstood, misapplied (and even maligned) technique around

# Example: N-Queens



- Why does crossover make sense here?
- When wouldn't it make sense?
- What would mutation be?
- What would a good fitness function be?