

Planning and Optimization


E10. Merge-and-Shrink: Algorithm

Malte Helmert and Gabriele Röger

Universität Basel

November 17, 2025

Content of the Course



Generic Algorithm

Generic Merge-and-shrink Abstractions: Outline

Using the results of the previous chapter, we can develop a **generic abstraction computation procedure** that **takes all state variables into account**.

- **Initialization:** Compute the FTS consisting of all atomic projections.
- **Loop:** Repeatedly apply a transformation to the FTS.
 - **Merging:** Combine two factors by replacing them with their synchronized product.
 - **Shrinking:** If the factors are too large, make one of them smaller by abstracting it further (applying an arbitrary abstraction to it).
- **Termination:** Stop when only one factor is left.

The final factor is then used for an abstraction heuristic.

Generic Algorithm Template

Generic Merge & Shrink Algorithm for planning task Π

```
 $F := F(\Pi)$ 
while  $|F| > 1$ :
  select  $type \in \{\text{merge}, \text{shrink}\}$ 
  if  $type = \text{merge}$ :
    select  $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in F$ 
     $F := (F \setminus \{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2\}) \cup \{\mathcal{T}_1 \otimes \mathcal{T}_2\}$ 
  if  $type = \text{shrink}$ :
    select  $\mathcal{T} \in F$ 
    choose an abstraction mapping  $\beta$  on  $\mathcal{T}$ 
     $F := (F \setminus \{\mathcal{T}\}) \cup \{\mathcal{T}^\beta\}$ 
return the remaining factor  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha$  in  $F$ 
```

Merge-and-Shrink Strategies

Choices to resolve to instantiate the template:

- When to merge, when to shrink?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **general strategy**
- Which abstractions to merge?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **merge strategy**
- Which abstraction to shrink, and how to shrink it (which β)?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **shrink strategy**

Merge-and-Shrink Strategies

Choices to resolve to instantiate the template:

- When to merge, when to shrink?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **general strategy**
- Which abstractions to merge?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **merge strategy**
- Which abstraction to shrink, and how to shrink it (which β)?
 $\rightsquigarrow$ **shrink strategy**

merge and shrink strategies $\rightsquigarrow$ Ch. E11/E12


General Strategy

A typical **general strategy**:

- define a **limit N** on the number of states allowed in each factor
- in each iteration, select two factors we would like to merge
- merge them if this does not exhaust the state number limit
- otherwise shrink one or both factors just enough to make a subsequent merge possible

Example

Back to the Running Example




Logistics problem with one package, two trucks, two locations:

- state variable **package**: $\{L, R, A, B\}$
- state variable **truck A**: $\{L, R\}$
- state variable **truck B**: $\{L, R\}$


Initialization Step: Atomic Projection for Package

$\mathcal{T}^{\pi}_{\{\text{package}\}}:$




Initialization Step: Atomic Projection for Truck A

$\mathcal{T}^{\pi\{\text{truck A}\}}:$



Initialization Step: Atomic Projection for Truck B


$\mathcal{T}^\pi\{\text{truck B}\}$:



current FTS: $\{\mathcal{T}^\pi\{\text{package}\}, \mathcal{T}^\pi\{\text{truck A}\}, \mathcal{T}^\pi\{\text{truck B}\}\}$

First Merge Step


$$\mathcal{T}_1 := \mathcal{T}^{\pi\{\text{package}\}} \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\pi\{\text{truck A}\}}:$$



current FTS: $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}^{\pi\{\text{truck B}\}}\}$


Need to Shrink?

- With sufficient memory, we could now compute $\mathcal{T}_1 \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\pi_{\{\text{truck B}\}}}$ and recover the full transition system of the task.
- However, to illustrate the general idea, we assume that memory is too restricted: we may never create a factor with more than **8 states**.
- To make the product fit the bound, we shrink $\mathcal{T}_1$ to 4 states. We can decide freely **how exactly** to abstract $\mathcal{T}_1$.
- In this example, we manually choose an abstraction that leads to a good result in the end. Making good shrinking decisions algorithmically is the job of the **shrink strategy**.

$$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$$



First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$




First Shrink Step

$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$



First Shrink Step


$\mathcal{T}_2 := \text{some abstraction of } \mathcal{T}_1$



current FTS: $\{\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}^{\pi_{\{\text{truck B}\}}}\}$

Second Merge Step


$$\mathcal{T}_3 := \mathcal{T}_2 \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\pi\{\text{truck B}\}}:$$



current FTS: $\{\mathcal{T}_3\}$

Another Shrink Step?

- At this point, merge-and-shrink construction stops. The distances in the final factor define the heuristic function.
- If there were further state variables to integrate, we would shrink again, e.g., leading to the following abstraction (again with four states):



- We get a heuristic value of 3 for the initial state, **better than any PDB heuristic** that is a proper abstraction.
- The example generalizes to arbitrarily many trucks, even if we stick to the fixed size limit of 8.

Maintaining the Abstraction

Generic Algorithm Template

Generic Merge & Shrink Algorithm for planning task Π

```
 $F := F(\Pi)$ 
while  $|F| > 1$ :
  select  $type \in \{\text{merge}, \text{shrink}\}$ 
  if  $type = \text{merge}$ :
    select  $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \in F$ 
     $F := (F \setminus \{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2\}) \cup \{\mathcal{T}_1 \otimes \mathcal{T}_2\}$ 
  if  $type = \text{shrink}$ :
    select  $\mathcal{T} \in F$ 
    choose an abstraction mapping  $\beta$  on  $\mathcal{T}$ 
     $F := (F \setminus \{\mathcal{T}\}) \cup \{\mathcal{T}^\beta\}$ 
return the remaining factor  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha$  in  $F$ 
```

- The algorithm computes an abstract transition system.
- For the heuristic evaluation, we need an abstraction.
- How to maintain and represent the corresponding abstraction?

The Need for Succinct Abstractions

- One major difficulty for non-PDB abstraction heuristics is to **succinctly represent the abstraction**.
- For pattern databases, this is easy because the abstractions – projections – are very **structured**.
- For less rigidly structured abstractions, we need another idea.

How to Represent the Abstraction? (1)

Idea: the computation of the abstraction follows the sequence of product computations

- For the **atomic abstractions** $\pi_{\{v\}}$, we generate a **one-dimensional table** that denotes which value in $\text{dom}(v)$ corresponds to which abstract state in $\mathcal{T}^{\pi_{\{v\}}}$.
- During the **merge** (product) step $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$, we generate a **two-dimensional table** that denotes which pair of states of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ corresponds to which state of $\mathcal{A}$.
- During the **shrink** (abstraction) steps, we make sure to keep the table in sync with the abstraction choices.

How to Represent the Abstraction? (2)


Idea: the computation of the abstraction mapping follows the sequence of product computations

- Once we have computed the final abstract transition system, we compute all **abstract goal distances** and store them in a **one-dimensional table**.
- At this point, we can **throw away** all the abstract transition systems – we just need to keep the tables.
- During **search**, we do a sequence of table lookups to navigate from the atomic abstraction states to the final abstract state and heuristic value
 $\rightsquigarrow 2|V|$ lookups, $O(|V|)$ time

Again, we illustrate the process with our running example.


Abstraction Example: Atomic Abstractions

Computing abstractions for the transition systems of atomic abstractions is simple. Just number the states (domain values) consecutively and generate a table of references to the states:



Abstraction Example: Atomic Abstractions


Computing abstractions for the transition systems of atomic abstractions is simple. Just number the states (domain values) consecutively and generate a table of references to the states:



<i>L</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
0	1	2	3


Abstraction Example: Merge Step

For product transition systems $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$, we again number the product states consecutively and generate a table that links state pairs of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ to states of $\mathcal{A}$:




Abstraction Example: Merge Step

For product transition systems $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$, we again number the product states consecutively and generate a table that links state pairs of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ to states of $\mathcal{A}$:



Abstraction Example: Merge Step

For product transition systems $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$, we again number the product states consecutively and generate a table that links state pairs of $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ to states of $\mathcal{A}$:



	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$
$s_1 = 0$	0	1
$s_1 = 1$	2	3
$s_1 = 2$	4	5
$s_1 = 3$	6	7

Maintaining the Abstraction when Shrinking


- The hard part in representing the abstraction is to keep it consistent when shrinking.
- In theory, this is easy to do:
 - When combining states i and j , arbitrarily use one of them (say i) as the number of the new state.
 - Find all table entries in the table for this abstraction which map to the other state j and change them to i .
- However, doing a table scan each time two states are combined is very inefficient.
- Fortunately, there also is an efficient implementation which takes constant time per combination.

Maintaining the Abstraction Efficiently

- Associate each abstract state with a linked list, representing all table entries that map to this state.
- Before starting the shrink operation, initialize the lists by scanning through the table, then discard the table.
- While shrinking, when combining i and j , splice the list elements of j into the list elements of i .
 - For linked lists, this is a constant-time operation.
- Once shrinking is completed, renumber all abstract states so that there are no gaps in the numbering.
- Finally, regenerate the mapping table from the linked list information.

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step


Representation before shrinking:



	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$
$s_1 = 0$	0	1
$s_1 = 1$	2	3
$s_1 = 2$	4	5
$s_1 = 3$	6	7

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step


1. Convert table to linked lists and discard it.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0)\}$ $list_3 = \{(1, 1)\}$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0)\}$ $list_5 = \{(2, 1)\}$ $list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$ $list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$

	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$
$s_1 = 0$	0	1
$s_1 = 1$	2	3
$s_1 = 2$	4	5
$s_1 = 3$	6	7


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0)\}$ $list_3 = \{(1, 1)\}$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0)\}$ $list_5 = \{(2, 1)\}$ $list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$ $list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.



$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$

$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$

$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$

$list_3 = \emptyset$

$list_4 = \{(2, 0)\}$


$list_5 = \{(2, 1)\}$

$list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$

$list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \emptyset$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0)\}$ $list_5 = \{(2, 1)\}$ $list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$ $list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.



$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$

$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$

$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$

$list_3 = \emptyset$

$list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1)\}$


$list_5 = \emptyset$

$list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$

$list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.



$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$

$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$

$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$

$list_3 = \emptyset$

$list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1)\}$


$list_5 = \emptyset$

$list_6 = \{(3, 0)\}$

$list_7 = \{(3, 1)\}$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.



$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$

$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$

$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$

$list_3 = \emptyset$

$list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1)\}$


$list_5 = \emptyset$

$list_6 = \{(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$

$list_7 = \emptyset$


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \emptyset$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1)\}$ $list_5 = \emptyset$ $list_6 = \{(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ $list_7 = \emptyset$


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \emptyset$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1),$
 $(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ $list_5 = \emptyset$ $list_6 = \emptyset$ $list_7 = \emptyset$


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

2. When combining i and j , splice $list_j$ into $list_i$.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \emptyset$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1),$
 $(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ $list_5 = \emptyset$ $list_6 = \emptyset$ $list_7 = \emptyset$


Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

3. Renumber abstract states consecutively.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \emptyset$ $list_4 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1), (3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ $list_5 = \emptyset$ $list_6 = \emptyset$ $list_7 = \emptyset$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

3. Renumber abstract states consecutively.



$$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$$

$$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$$

$$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$$

$$list_3 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1), (3, 0), (3, 1)\}$$

$$list_4 = \emptyset$$


$$list_5 = \emptyset$$

$$list_6 = \emptyset$$

$$list_7 = \emptyset$$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

4. Regenerate the mapping table from the linked lists.



$$list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$$

$$list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$$

$$list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$$

$$list_3 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1), \\ (3, 0), (3, 1)\}$$

$$list_4 = \emptyset$$


$$list_5 = \emptyset$$

$$list_6 = \emptyset$$

$$list_7 = \emptyset$$

Abstraction Example: Shrink Step

4. Regenerate the mapping table from the linked lists.

 $list_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ $list_1 = \{(0, 1)\}$ $list_2 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ $list_3 = \{(2, 0), (2, 1),$
 $(3, 0), (3, 1)\}$ $list_4 = \emptyset$ $list_5 = \emptyset$ $list_6 = \emptyset$ $list_7 = \emptyset$

	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$
$s_1 = 0$	0	1
$s_1 = 1$	2	2
$s_1 = 2$	3	3
$s_1 = 3$	3	3

The Final Heuristic Representation

At the end, our heuristic is represented by six tables:

- three one-dimensional tables for the atomic abstractions:

T_{package}	L	R	A	B	$T_{\text{truck A}}$	L	R	$T_{\text{truck B}}$	L	R
	0	1	2	3		0	1		0	1

- two tables for the two merge and subsequent shrink steps:

$T_{\text{m\&s}}^1$	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$	$T_{\text{m\&s}}^2$	$s_2 = 0$	$s_2 = 1$
$s_1 = 0$	0	1	$s_1 = 0$	1	1
$s_1 = 1$	2	2	$s_1 = 1$	1	0
$s_1 = 2$	3	3	$s_1 = 2$	2	2
$s_1 = 3$	3	3	$s_1 = 3$	3	3

- one table with goal distances for the final transition system:

T_h	$s = 0$	$s = 1$	$s = 2$	$s = 3$
$h(s)$	3	2	0	1

Given a state $s = \{\text{package} \mapsto L, \text{truck A} \mapsto L, \text{truck B} \mapsto R\}$, its heuristic value is then looked up as:

- $h(s) = T_h[T_{\text{m\&s}}^2[T_{\text{m\&s}}^1[T_{\text{package}}[L], T_{\text{truck A}}[L]], T_{\text{truck B}}[R]]]$

Summary

Summary (1)

- Merge-and-shrink abstractions are constructed by iteratively **transforming** the factored transition system of a planning task.
- **Merge** transformations combine two factors into their synchronized product.
- **Shrink** transformations reduce the size of a factor by abstracting it.

Summary (1)

- Merge-and-shrink abstractions are constructed by iteratively **transforming** the factored transition system of a planning task.
- **Merge** transformations combine two factors into their synchronized product.
- **Shrink** transformations reduce the size of a factor by abstracting it.
- Merge-and-shrink abstractions are **represented by a set of reference tables**, one for each atomic abstraction and one for each merge-and-shrink step.
- The heuristic representation uses an additional table for the goal distances in the final abstract transition system.

Summary (2)

- Projections of SAS^+ tasks correspond to merges of atomic factors.
- By also including shrinking, merge-and-shrink abstractions **generalize** projections: they can reflect **all** state variables, but in a potentially **lossy** way.