Tutorial on LP-Based Heuristics

Daniel Fišer

Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, danfis@danfis.cz

April 8, 2020

April 8, 2020

Before you proceed with this tutorial, listed to the corresponding lecture and read Section 5 of the tutorial notes on classical planning https://cw.fel.cvut.cz/wiki/_media/courses/be4m36pui/notes-cp.pdf

Example Planning Task

In this tutorial, we use the following example FDR planning task $P = \langle \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, s_{\text{init}}, s_{\text{goal}}, c \rangle$: $\mathcal{V} = \{A, B, C\}.$ $D_A = \{D, E\}, D_B = \{F, G\}, D_C = \{H, J, K\},\$ $s_{\text{init}} = \{A = D, B = F, C = H\}, s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$ $\mathcal{O} = \{o_1, o_2, o_3, o_4, o_5\},\$

First we construct the LP constraints for the flow heuristic.

- Each LP variable x_o correspond to the operator $o \in \mathcal{O}$.
- And each variable x_o counts how many times the operator o appear in the optimal plan.
- Recall from the tutorial notes, that for a given variable V and its value v, $\operatorname{prod}(\langle V, v \rangle)$ denotes a set of operators "producing" $\langle V, v \rangle$, i.e., a set of operators that set $\langle V, v \rangle$ when applied.
- Furthermore recall, that for a given variable V and its value v, $cons(\langle V, v \rangle)$ denotes a set of operators "consuming" $\langle V, v \rangle$, i.e., a set of operators that un-set $\langle V, v \rangle$ when applied.

So to get back to our example planning task. We want to minimize $2x_{o_1} + x_{o_2} + x_{o_3} + 2x_{o_4} + 5x_{o_5}$ subject to $LB_{A,D} \leq x_{o_4} - x_{o_1}$ $LB_{A,E} \leq x_{o_1} - x_{o_4}$ $LB_{B,F} \leq 0$ $LB_{B,G} \leq x_{o2}$ $LB_{C,H} \leq -x_{o_1} - x_{o_5}$ $LB_{C,J} \leq x_{o_1} + x_{o_5} - x_{o_2}$ $LB_{C,K} \leq x_{o_2}$

where $LB_{V,v}$ is a constant for each state for which we want to compute the heuristic estimate.

Here is how we find out which constant to use if we compute the heuristic for the state s:

$$LB_{V,v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 1 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \\ -1 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 0 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \end{cases}$$

If V = v is set in goal states and also in s, then $\langle V, v \rangle$ cannot be consumed more times than it is produced to reach a goal state.

$$LB_{V,v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 1 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \\ -1 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 0 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \end{cases}$$

If V = v is set in goal states, but not in s, then $\langle V, v \rangle$ must be produced at least once to reach a goal state.

$$LB_{V,v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 1 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \\ -1 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 0 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \end{cases}$$

If V = v is not necessarily set in goal states, but it is set in s, then we don't know how many times should be $\langle V, v \rangle$ consumed or produced. So, we set the lower bound to -1.

$$LB_{V,v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 1 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \\ -1 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 0 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \end{cases}$$

If V = v is not necessarily set in goal states, and it is not set in s, then we can tighten the lower bound a little bit. In contrast to the previous case, $\langle V, v \rangle$ cannot be consumed before it is produced. So if we produce $\langle V, v \rangle$ (+1), then we can also consume $\langle V, v \rangle$ (-1), which gives us the lower bound 0.

$$LB_{V,v} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 1 & \text{if } V \in \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ and } s_{\text{goal}}[V] = v \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \\ -1 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] = v, \\ 0 & \text{if } (V \notin \text{vars}(s_{\text{goal}}) \text{ or } s_{\text{goal}}[V] \neq v) \text{ and } s[V] \neq v, \end{cases}$$

So, suppose we want to compute the heuristic estimate for the initial state $s_{\text{init}} = \{A = D, B = F, C = H\}$ (and recall the goal $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$).

So, suppose we want to compute the heuristic estimate for the initial state $s_{\text{init}} = \{A = D, B = F, C = H\}$ (and recall the goal $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$). We get the following lower bounds:

 $LB_{A,D} = 0$ $LB_{A,E} = 0$ $LB_{B,F} = -1$ $LB_{B,G} = 0$ $LB_{C,H} = -1$ $LB_{C,J} = 0$ $LB_{C,K} = 1$

So, suppose we want to compute the heuristic estimate for the initial state $s_{\text{init}} = \{A = D, B = F, C = H\}$ (and recall the goal $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$). Which leads to the following linear program: minimize 2x + x + x + 5x

minimize $2x_{o_1} + x_{o_2} + x_{o_3} + 2x_{o_4} + 5x_{o_5}$ subject to

$$LB_{A,D} = 0 \le x_{o_4} - x_{o_1}$$

$$LB_{A,E} = 0 \le x_{o_1} - x_{o_4}$$

$$LB_{B,F} = -1 \le 0$$

$$LB_{B,G} = 0 \le x_{o_2}$$

$$LB_{C,H} = -1 \le -x_{o_1} - x_{o_5}$$

$$LB_{C,J} = 0 \le x_{o_1} + x_{o_5} - x_{o_3}$$

$$LB_{C,K} = 1 \le x_{o_3}$$

Now we construct the linear program for the potential heuristic optimized for the initial state.

- In this case, each LP variable $P_{V,v}$ correspond to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$, and each LP variable M_V correspond to the variable V.
- The value of $P_{V,v}$ is the potential corresponding to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$.
- M_V is the upper bound on the potentials from the variable V.
- We use M_V in situations where we don't know which value is set (in the goal or in a precondition of operator) so we prepare for the worst case.
- For example, take our goal specification $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$: We don't know how the variable B is set in goal states.

So to ensure goal-awareness of the heuristic we could construct (in this case) two constraints: $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,K} \leq 0$ and $P_{A,D} + P_{B,G} + P_{C,K} \leq 0$, which will cover all cases.

Now we construct the linear program for the potential heuristic optimized for the initial state.

- In this case, each LP variable $P_{V,v}$ correspond to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$, and each LP variable M_V correspond to the variable V.
- The value of $P_{V,v}$ is the potential corresponding to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$.
- M_V is the upper bound on the potentials from the variable V.
- We use M_V in situations where we don't know which value is set (in the goal or in a precondition of operator) so we prepare for the worst case.
- For example, take our goal specification $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$: We don't know how the variable B is set in goal states.

Or we can construct the constraint $P_{A,D} + M_B + P_{C,K} \leq 0$ and make sure that M_B will be the maximum over $P_{B,F}$ and $P_{B,G}$ by adding auxiliary constraints $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ and $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$.

Now we construct the linear program for the potential heuristic optimized for the initial state.

- In this case, each LP variable $P_{V,v}$ correspond to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$, and each LP variable M_V correspond to the variable V.
- The value of $P_{V,v}$ is the potential corresponding to the fact $\langle V, v \rangle$.
- M_V is the upper bound on the potentials from the variable V.
- We use M_V in situations where we don't know which value is set (in the goal or in a precondition of operator) so we prepare for the worst case.
- For example, take our goal specification $s_{\text{goal}} = \{A = D, C = K\}$: We don't know how the variable B is set in goal states.

Or we can construct the constraint $P_{A,D} + M_B + P_{C,K} \leq 0$ and make sure that M_B will be the maximum over $P_{B,F}$ and $P_{B,G}$ by adding auxiliary constraints $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ and $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$. It should be clear that the first approach can (in the worst case) generate an exponential number of constraints, whereas the second approach will always generate only a linear number constraints.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{A,D} + M_B + P_{C,K} \le 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BC} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$

$$P_{C,H} - P_{C,J} \le 5$$

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_{B} - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{CH} - P_{CJ} < 5$ First, note that we constructed constraints only for M_B , but not for M_A or M_C . The reason is that M_A or M_C is not used anywhere so we can simplify the linear program a little bit.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{CH} - P_{CJ} < 5$ When we have computed the potentials $P_{V,v}$, we compute the heuristic estimate for a state s as $\sum_{V \in \mathcal{V}} P_{V,v}$.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BC} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{CH} - P_{CJ} < 5$ So, for example, for the initial state $s_{\text{init}} = \{A = D, B = F, C = H\}$, the heuristic value will be $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{CH} - P_{CJ} < 5$ We make sure that the sum of potentials is always admissible by making the sums goal-aware and consistent.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{A D} + M_B + P_{C K} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{C,H} - P_{C,J} \leq 5$ These constraints make sure that the sum will always be goal-aware.

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,I} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{CH} - P_{CJ} < 5$ This constraint make sure that the heuristic is consistent with respect to the operator o_1 . (Note that when o_1 is applied on a state s, we can express the heuristic estimate for $o_1[s]$ as $h(o_1[s]) = h(s) - P_{A,D} - P_{C,H} + P_{A,E} + P_{C,L}$

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{B,G} \le 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{C,H} - P_{C,J} \leq 5$

These constraints ensure consistency with respect to o_2 .

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,I} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{C,H} - P_{C,J} \leq 5$

And so on, for o_3 , o_4 , and o_5 .

So, for our planning example, the linear program for the potential heuristic will maximize $P_{A,D} + P_{B,F} + P_{C,H}$ subject to $P_{B,F} \leq M_B$ $P_{B,G} \leq M_B$ $P_{AD} + M_B + P_{CK} < 0$ $P_{A,D} + P_{C,H} - P_{A,E} - P_{C,J} \le 2$ $M_B - P_{BG} < 1$ $P_{C,J} - P_{C,K} \leq 1$ $P_{A,E} - P_{A,D} \leq 2$ $P_{C,H} - P_{C,J} \leq 5$ So the sum of potentials for every state will be an admissable estimate.