Compliant Conditions for Polynomial Time Approximation of Operator Counts
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Abstract

We develop a computationally simpler version of the operator count heuristic for a particular class of domains. The contribution of this abstract is thus threefold, we (1) propose an efficient closed form approximation to the operator count heuristic; (2) leverage compressed sensing techniques to obtain an integer approximation in polynomial time; and (3) discuss the relationship of the proposed formulation to existing heuristics and investigate properties of domains where such approaches are useful.

The OP–COUNT Heuristic

Domain Model. The domain is described by a set of variables $f \in F$ which can assume values from a (finite) domain $D(f) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. A state is given by the particular assignment of values to these variables: $S = \{ f = v \mid v \in D(f) \forall f \in F \}$. The value of variable $f$ in state $S$ is referred to as $S(f)$. The action model $A$ consists of operators $a = (C_a, E_a)$ where $C_a$ is the cost of the action, and $E_a = \{(f, v_o, v_n) \mid f \in F; v_o, v_n \in \{-1\} \cup D(f)\}$ is the set of effects. The transition function $\delta(\cdot)$ determines the next state after the application of action $a$ to state $S$ as -

$$\delta(a, S) = \perp \text{ if } \exists (f, v_o, v_n) \in E_a \text{ s.t. } v_o \neq -1 \wedge v_n \neq S(f);$$

$$\{ f = v_o, \forall (f, v_o, v_n) \in E_a; \text{ else } f = S(f) \} \text{ otherwise.}$$

Plans and Operator Counts. A planning problem is a tuple $P = (F, A, I, G)$, where $I, G$ are the initial and (partial) goal states respectively. The solution to the planning problem is a plan $\pi = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, \pi(n) = a \in A$ such that $\delta(\pi, I) \models G$, where the cumulative transition function is given by $\delta(\pi, S) = \delta(\langle a_2, a_3, \ldots, \delta(a_1, S)\rangle)$. The cost of the plan is given by $C(\pi) = \sum_{a \in \pi} C_a$ and an optimal plan $\pi^*$ is such that $C(\pi^*) \leq C(\pi) \forall \pi$. The operator count for an action $a$ given a plan $\pi$ is given by $\lambda(a, \pi) = |\{i \mid a = \pi(i)\}|$ and the total operator count of the plan $\lambda(\pi) = |\pi|$. Compliant Variables. We define compliant variables as those that whenever they occur as a precondition of an action, they must also be an effect, and vice versa. Thus, $f \in F$ is compliant iff $\forall a \in A, (f, v_o, v_n) \in E_a \implies v_o \neq -1 \wedge v_n \neq -1$; $f$ is referred to as rogue otherwise. Let $\Phi \subseteq \Phi$ be the set of all compliant variables, and the set of compliant variables whose values are specified in the goal be $\Phi \subseteq \Phi$, henceforth referred to as goal compliant conditions.

The State Transformation Equation. Let $|\phi| = m$ and $|A| = n$. Consider an $m \times n$ matrix $M$ whose $i,j$th element $M_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the numerical change in $f_i \in \phi$ produced by action $a_j \in A$, i.e. $M_{ij} = v_n - v_o; (f_i, v_o, v_n) \in E_{a_j}$. Also, let $D$ be a vector of size $m$ whose $i$th entry $d_i$ is the change in a goal compliant $f_i \in \phi$ from the current state to the final state, i.e. $d_i = v_g - v_c; v_g = f_i \in G, v_c = f_i \in S$; and let $x$ be a vector of size $n$, whose $i$th element is $x_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following equality holds:

$$Mx = D$$

The integer solution $x^*$ to this system of linear equations with the least $|x^*|$ gives a lower bound on the operator counts required to solve the planning problem, i.e. $|x^*| \leq |\pi^*|$. We can compute a real-valued approximation to this in closed form, by minimizing the $l_{2}$-norm $||x||_{2}^{2}$ using the Lagrangian multiplier method as follows -

$$L(x) = \frac{1}{2} ||Qx||^{2} + \lambda^{T}(D - Mx)$$

$$\implies x^* = Q^{-1}M^{T}(MQ^{-1}M^{T})^{-1}D$$

Here $Q$ is a $n \times n$ matrix of action costs whose $i,j$th entry $Q_{ij} = C_i$ if $i = j$; 0 otherwise (for unit cost domains) $Q$ is an identity matrix and $x^*$ is the solution to this system of equations. The most costly operation here is the calculation of the pseudo inverse, which can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.3})$ time. Further, $M$ is problem independent, and hence the factor $Z = Q^{-1}M^{T}(MQ^{-1}M^{T})^{-1}$ can be precomputed given an action model. Thus it follows that we can readily use $||QZD||$ as a heuristic for state-space search. Note that this formulation can also determine infeasibility of goal reachability immediately (in domains where actions are not reversible this is extremely useful in the course of search) when the system is unsolvable, as shown in Algorithm 1.

Sparse Coding. We would have ideally wanted an integer solution to Eqn 1, but this makes the problem computationally intractable. The real-valued approximation of minimizing $l_{2}$-norm mentioned above can be improved further. For this, we note that in most cases $n \gg m$ and also $n \gg |x^*|$ due to the combinatorial explosion during grounding of domains. To exploit this knowledge about the sparsity of $|x^*|$, we draw upon compressed sensing techniques (Cand `es and Wakin 2008) to enforce sparsity. To this end, we suggest
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minimization of $l_1$-norm ($l_1$-LP) or weighted $l_1$-norm ($\omega$-$l_1$-LP) (Candés, Wakin, and Boyd 2008) (with the added constraint $x \succeq 0$ to enforce positive integer solutions). For $\omega$-$l_1$-LP, we empirically observe that rounding up the individual operator counts produce a more informed heuristic (even though it loses out on admissibility). Thus, we arrive at a more informed polynomial time proxy for integer solutions.

**Evaluations.** The table shows the evaluation of the proposed heuristics across a total of 83 problems from five well-known unit cost planning domains. Each entry in the table represents the percentage difference in the initial state heuristic value and the optimal plan length averaged across the problems in each domain. The %-compliance column shows the average number of goal compliant predicates in the problems. Rows 1-3 show the performance of our heuristics on the original domains (’-‘ indicates that the heuristics could not be computed due to absence of any goal complaint variables). Rows 3-6 show the performance in domains where the-%-compliance was increased (this was done by identifying instances in the action model where variables assume a don’t care condition, i.e. a value of -1, and replacing it with appropriate values as entailed by domain axioms). Finally, rows 6-9 show the performance of our heuristics in problems with more completely specified goals (which results in higher percentage compliance). As expected, our heuristic performs better as-%-compliance increases across a particular domain. The performance of $l_1$ LP and $\omega$-$l_1$ LP highlights the usefulness of compressed sensing techniques in obtaining better integer approximations to the MILP.

**Discussion and Related Work**

**Relation to Existing Heuristics.** The proposed heuristic has close associations with both heuristics on state change equations and operator counts (Pommerning et al. 2014; Bonet, Van Den Briel, and others 2014; Van Den Briel et al. 2007). Specifically, compliant conditions capture the net change very succinctly and are thus extremely useful where such properties are relevant. Another interesting connection to existing work is with respect to graph-plan based heuristics (Blum and Furst 1997), except here we are relaxing preconditions instead of delete effects.

**Compliance.** Our approach works better in domains that have many goal compliant conditions, e.g. in manufacturing domains (Nau, Gupta, and Regli 1995) or in puzzles like Sudoku (Babu et al. 2010). Thus goal completion strategies and semantic preserving actions have a direct effect on the quality of the heuristic. Intermediate representations such as transition normal form (TNF) (Pommerning and Helmert 2015) should be investigated in this context.

**Landmarks.** Our purpose here is not to compete with the most sophisticated heuristics of today but to motivate a special case that can be computed extremely efficiently. We discussed the simplest version of this formulation here, but it can be easily extended to incorporate more informative features like landmarks (Porteous, Sebastian, and Hoffmann 2001). A landmark constraint is added by simply subtracting the corresponding net change from $D$: $d_i \leftarrow d_i - k_a \times (x_n - x_o)$ if $(d_i, x_n, x_o) \in E_a$ and $a \in A$ is an action landmark with cardinality $k_a$; and the closed form solution remains valid. In fact in terms of plan recognition with operator counts, observations are landmarks and the same approach applies. This demonstrates the flexibility of our approach.

**Resource Constrained Interaction.** The approach is especially relevant in the context of multi-agent interactions constrained by usage $\pi^n - \eta$ of a shared resource $\eta$ by a plan $\pi^n$ of an agent $a$. For example, in an adversarial setting, if an agent $a_2$ wanted to stop $a_1$ from executing its plan, all it needs to do is to ensure that $\exists \eta$ s.t. $\pi^{n_1} - \eta + \pi^{n_2} - \eta > |\eta|$. Similarly, in a cooperative setting, if agent $a_2$ wanted to ensure that $a_1$’s plan succeeds, it would need to make sure that $\forall \eta$ $\pi^{n_1} - \eta + \pi^{n_2} - \eta \leq |\eta|$. In fact, as resource variables are compliant, our approach may provide quick estimates of an agent’s intent without computing the entire plan.
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