# Errata

# Admissible Heuristics for Automated Planning

## Patrik Haslum

**Page 45 (figure 3.5)** The line

    c2 = eval(pre(a) union q);

should read

    c2 = eval(pre(a) union {$r$});

**Page 66** The sum of the Manhattan distances of tiles 5 and 6 (and the value of $h^{\{\texttt{T5},\texttt{T6}\}}$) is 3, as tile 6 is only one step out of place, and the lower bound incorporating the linear conflict is thus 5. (The heuristic values for this problem given by the different pattern selections in the example on page 70 are correct.)

**Page 71** $CG^{-1}(V)$ is the set of $V$s immediate *successors* in the causal graph (thus, the function should have been called $CG(V)$). The preceeding definition is correct as intended.

**Page 89** Job J2 requires resource R1 and consumes resource F1 when executed in mode *M2*.

**Page 102** The assumption that the admissible heuristic $h$ is parameterized by $R$ is unnecessary. It is sufficient that each $h_{R_i}$ is an admissible heurstic for the search space defined by $R_i$ (*i.e.* a lower bound on $h^*_{R_i}$). These heuristics do not need to be defined in the same way.

**Page 114** The reference to figures "7.2 – 7.2" should be to figures *7.2 – 7.4*.

**Page 153** The acknowledgement of funding should include the National Graduate School in Computer Science (CUGS), in addition to the already mentioned Wallenberg Foundation and ECSEL/ENSYM graduate school.