## CSE 473: Artificial Intelligence

## Adversarial Search

Dan Weld


Based on slides from
Dan Klein, Stuart Russell, Pieter Abbeel, Andrew Moore and Luke Zettlemoyer (best illustrations from ai.berkeley.edu)

## Outline

- Adversarial Search
- Minimax search
- $\alpha-\beta$ search
- Evaluation functions
- Expectimax
- Reminder:

- Project 2 due in 5 days


## Types of Games

| deterministic |
| :---: |
| chance |
| perfect <br> information |
| chess, checkers, <br> go, othello |
| backgammon, <br> monopoly |
| imperfect <br> information |
| stratego | | bridge, poker, |
| :---: |
| scrabble, nuclear |
| war |,

Number of Players? 1, 2, $\ldots$ ?

## Deterministic Games

- Many possible formalizations, one is:
- States: S (start at $\mathrm{s}_{0}$ )
- Players: $\mathrm{P}=\{1$...N $\}$ (usually take turns)
- Actions: A (may depend on player / state)
- Transition Function: S x A $\rightarrow$ S
- Terminal Test: S $\rightarrow\{t, f\}$
- Terminal Utilities: $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{P} \rightarrow \mathrm{R}$
- Solution for a player is a policy: $S \rightarrow A$


## Tic-tac-toe Game Tree



## Minimax Values

States Under Agent's Control: States Under Opponent's Control:


Terminal States:

$$
V(s)=\text { known }
$$

Slide from Dan Klein \& Pieter Abbeel - ai.berkeley.edu

## Minimax Implementation

def max-value(state):
if leaf?(state), return U(state)
initialize $v=-\infty$
for each c in children(state) $v=\max (v$, min-value(c))
return $v$

$$
V(s)=\max _{s^{\prime} \in \operatorname{successors}(s)} V\left(s^{\prime}\right)
$$

def min-value(state):
if leaf?(state), return U(state) initialize $v=+\infty$ for each c in children(state) $v=\min (v$, max-value(c)) return $v$

$$
V\left(s^{\prime}\right)=\min _{s \in \text { sucessoror }\left(s^{\prime}\right)} V(s)
$$

## $\alpha-\beta$ Pruning Example

Max:

Min:


## Alpha-Beta Quiz

Min:



## $\alpha-\beta$ Pruning

- $\alpha$ is MAX's best choice on path to root
- If $n$ becomes worse than $\alpha$, MAX will avoid it, so can stop considering n's other children
- Define $\beta$ similarly for MIN


Opponent


## Min-Max Implementation



## Alpha-Beta Implementation

## a: MAX's best option on path to root <br> $\beta$ : MIN's best option on path to root

def max-val(state, $\alpha, \beta$ ):
if leaf?(state), return U(state) initialize $v=-\infty$
for each $c$ in children(state):
$v=\max (v, \min -v a l(c, \alpha, \beta))$
def min-val(state , $\alpha, \beta$ ):
if leaf?(state), return U(state) initialize $v=+\infty$ for each c in children(state):

$$
v=\min (v, \max -v a l(c, \alpha, \beta))
$$

return v

## Alpha-Beta Implementation

a: MAX's best option on path to root
$\beta$ : MIN's best option on path to root
def max-val(state, $\alpha, \beta$ ):
if leaf?(state), return U(state) initialize $v=-\infty$
for each $c$ in children(state):
$v=\max (v, \min -\mathrm{val}(c, \alpha, \beta))$
if $v \geq \beta$ return $v$
$\alpha=\max (\alpha, v)$
return v
def min-val(state, $\alpha, \beta$ ):
if leaf?(state), return U(state) initialize $v=+\infty$
for each $c$ in children(state):

$$
v=\min (v, \max -v a l(c, \alpha, \beta))
$$

$$
\text { if } v \leq \alpha \text { return } v
$$

$$
\beta=\min (\beta, v)
$$

return $v$

## Alpha-Beta Pruning Example

Prune if $\mathrm{v} \geq \beta$;
Else update $\alpha=\max (\alpha, v)$


At min node:
$\alpha$ is MAX's best alternative here or above $\beta$ is MIN's best alternative here or above

## Alpha-Beta Pruning Properties

- This pruning has no effect on final result at the root
- Values of intermediate nodes might be wrong!
- but, they are correct bounds
- Good child ordering improves effectiveness of pruning
- With "perfect ordering":
- Time complexity drops to $O\left(b^{m / 2}\right)$
- Doubles solvable depth!
- (But complete search of complex games, e.g. chess, is still hopeless...


## Resource Limits

- Problem: In realistic games, cannot search to leaves!
- Solution: Depth-limited search
- Instead, search only to a limited depth in the tree
- Replace terminal utilities with an evaluation function for non-terminal positions
- Example:
- Suppose we have $3 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{move}$, can explore 1M nodes / sec
- So can check 200M nodes per move
- $\alpha-\beta$ reaches about depth $10 \rightarrow$ decent chess program
- Guarantee of optimal play is gone
- More plies makes a BIG difference



## Depth Matters

- Evaluation functions are always imperfect
- The deeper in the tree the evaluation function is buried, the less the quality
 of the evaluation function matters
- Good example of the tradeoff between complexity of features and complexity of computation



## Iterative Deepening

Iterative deepening uses DFS as a subroutine:

1. Do a DFS which only searches for paths of length 1 or less. (DFS gives up on any path of length 2)
2. If " 1 " failed, do a DFS which only searches paths of length 2 or less.

3. If "2" failed, do a DFS which only searches paths of length 3 or less.
....and so on.

Creates an anytime algorithm

## Heuristic Evaluation Function

- Function which scores non-terminals

- Ideal function: returns the true utility of the position
- In practice: need a simple, fast approximation
- typically weighted linear sum of features:
- e.g. $f_{1}(s)=$ (num white queens - num black queens), etc.
$\operatorname{Eval}(s)=w_{1} f_{1}(s)+w_{2} f_{2}(s)+\ldots+w_{n} f_{n}(s)$


## Evaluation for Pacman



What features would be good for Pacman?

$$
\operatorname{Eval}(s)=w_{1} f_{1}(s)+w_{2} f_{2}(s)+\ldots+w_{n} f_{n}(s)
$$

## Which algorithm?

## $\alpha-\beta$, depth 4 , simple eval fun

QuickTime ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and a
are needed to see this picture.

## Which algorithm?

## $\alpha-\beta$, depth 4 , better eval fun

## Why Pacman Starves

- He knows his score will go up by eating the dot now
- He knows his score will go up just as much by eating the dot later on

- There are no point-scoring opportunities after eating the dot
- Therefore, waiting seems just as good as eating


