

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ICgL1OWsn58

Adversarial Search

CS151 David Kauchak Fall 2010

Some material borrowed from : Sara Owsley Sood and others

Admin

- Reading?
- Assignment 2
	- On the web page
	- 3 parts

- Anyone looking for a partner?
- Get started!
- Written assignments
	- Post solutions to W1 today
	- Post next written assignment soon

A quick review of search

- Rational thinking via search determine a plan of actions by searching from starting state to goal state
- Uninformed search vs. informed search
	- what's the difference?
	- what are the techniques we've seen?
	- pluses and minuses?
- Heuristic design
	- admissible?
	- dominant?

Why should we study games?

- Clear success criteria
- Important historically for AI
- Fun \odot
- Good application of search
	- $-$ hard problems (chess 35¹⁰⁰ nodes in search tree, 1040 legal states)
- Some real-world problems fit this model
	- game theory (economics)
	- multi-agent problems

What are some of the games you've played?

Types of games: game properties

- single-player vs. 2-player vs. multiplayer
- Fully observable (perfect information) vs. partially observable
- Discrete vs. continuous
- real-time vs. turn-based
- deterministic vs. non-deterministic (chance)

Strategic thinking $\stackrel{.}{=}$ intelligence ?

For reasons previously stated, two-player games have been a focus of AI since its inception…

Begs the question: Is strategic thinking the same as intelligence?

Strategic thinking $\frac{?}{?}$ intelligence

Humans and computers have different relative strengths in these games:

good at evaluating the strength of a board for a player

good at looking ahead in the game to find winning combinations of moves

Strategic thinking $\frac{?}{?}$ intelligence

How could you figure out how humans approach playing chess?

humans

good at evaluating the strength of a board for a player

An experiment (by deGroot) was performed in which chess positions were shown to novice and expert players…

- experts could reconstruct these perfectly
- novice players did far worse…

An experiment (by deGroot) was performed in which chess positions were shown to novice and expert players…

- experts could reconstruct these perfectly
- novice players did far worse…

Random chess positions (not legal ones) were then shown to the two groups

 - experts and novices did just as badly at reconstructing them!

People are still working on this problem…

Example of eye movements (presentation time = 5 seconds)

http://people.brunel.ac.uk/~hsstffg/frg-research/chess_expertise/

Tic Tac Toe as search

How can we pose this as a search problem?

Tic Tac Toe as search

Tic Tac Toe as search

Eventually, we'll get to a leaf

The **UTILITY** of a state tells us how good the states are.

Defining the problem

- INITIAL STATE board position and the player whose turn it is
- SUCCESSOR FUNCTION– returns a list of (move, next state) pairs
- TERMINAL TEST is game over? Are we in a terminal state?
- UTILITY FUNCTION (objective or payoff func) gives a numeric value for terminal states (ie – chess – win/lose/draw $+1/-1/0$, backgammon $+192$ to -192)

Games' Branching Factors

• On average, there are \sim 35 possible moves that a chess player can make from any board configuration… $\qquad 0 \text{ Ply}$

Branching Factor Estimates for different two-player games

Games' Branching Factors

• On average, there are \sim 35 possible moves that a chess player can make from any board configuration... 0 Ply

Games' Branching Factors

1 Ply

• On average, there are \sim 35 possible moves that a chess player can make from any board configuration… 0 Ply

Games vs. search problems?

- Opponent!
	- unpredictable/uncertainty
	- deal with opponent strategy
- Time limitations
	- must make a move in a reasonable amount of time
	- can't always look to the end
- Path costs
	- not about moves, but about UTILITY of the resulting state/winning

Back to Tic Tac TOe

I'm X, what will 'O' do?

Minimizing risk

- The computer doesn't know what move O (the opponent) will make
- It can assume, though, that it will try and make the best move possible
- Even if O atually makes a different move, we're no worse off

Optimal Strategy

- An Optimal Strategy is one that is at least as good as any other, no matter what the opponent does
	- If there's a way to force the win, it will
	- Will only lose if there's no other option

How can X play optimally?

How can X play optimally?

- Start from the leaves and propagate the utility up:
	- $-$ if X's turn, pick the move that maximizes the utility
	- if O's turn, pick the move that minimizes the utility

Minimax Algorithm: An Optimal Strategy

minimax(state) =

- if state is a terminal state
	- Utility(state)
- if MAX's turn
	- return the *maximum* of minimax(...)
	- on all successors of current state
- if MIN's turn

return the *minimum* of minimax(…) on all successors to current state

- Uses recursion to compute the "value" of each state
- Proceeds to the leaves, then the values are "backed up" through the tree as the recursion unwinds
- What type of search is this?
- What does this assume about how MIN will play? What if this isn't true?

def minimax(state):

```
 for all actions a in actions(state):
```
return the a with the *largest* minValue(result(state,a))

```
def maxValue(state): 
   if state is terminal: 
     return utility(state) 
   else: 
     # return the a with the largest minValue(result(state,a)) 
    value = -\infty for all actions a in actions(state): 
       value = max(value, minValue(result(state,a)) 
     return value 
def minValue(state): 
   if state is terminal: 
     return utility(state) 
   else: 
     # return the a with the smallest maxValue(result(state,a)) 
    value = +\infty for all actions a in actions(state): 
       value = min(value, maxValue(result(state,a)) 
     return value
```
ME: Assume the opponent will try and minimize value, maximize my move

```
OPPONENT: 
Assume I will 
try and 
maximize my 
value, 
minimize his/
her move
```


Which move should be made: A_1 , A_2 or A_3 ?

Properties of minimax

- Minimax is optimal!
- Are we done?
	- For chess, b \approx 35, d \approx 100 for reasonable games \rightarrow exact solution completely infeasible
	- Is minimax feasible for Mancala or Tic Tac Toe?
		- Mancala: 6 possible moves. average depth of 40, so 6^{40} which is on the edge
		- Tic Tac Toe: branching factor of 4 (on average) and depth of 9… yes!
- ldeas?
	- pruning!
	- improved state utility/evaluation functions

Pruning: do we have to traverse the whole tree?

Pruning: do we have to traverse the whole tree?

Any others if we continue?

- An optimal pruning strategy
	- only prunes paths that are suboptimal (i.e. wouldn't be chosen by an optimal playing player)
	- returns the *same* result as minimax, but faster
- As we go, keep track of the best and worse along a path
	- alpha = best choice we've found so far for MAX
	- beta = best choice we've found so far for MIN

- alpha = best choice we've found so far for MAX
- Using alpha and beta to prune:
	- We're examining MIN's options for a ply. To do this, we're examining all possible moves for MAX. If we find a value for one of MAX's moves that is **less than alpha**, return. (MIN could do better down this path)

- beta = best choice we've found so far for MIN
- Using alpha and beta to prune:
	- We're examining MAX's options for a ply. To do this, we're examining all possible moves for MIN. If we find a value for one of MIN's possible moves that is **greater than beta**, return. (MIN won't end up down here)

Do DF-search until first leaf


```
def maxValue(state, alpha, beta): 
   if state is terminal: 
    return utility(state)
   else: 
    value = -\infty for all actions a in actions(state): 
       value = max(value, minValue(result(state,a), alpha, beta) 
       if value >= beta: 
         return value # prune! 
      alpha = max(alpha, value) # update alpha
     return value
```
We're making a decision for MAX.

• When considering the MIN's choices, if we find a value that is greater than beta, stop, because MIN won't make this choice

• if we find a better path than alpha, update alpha

```
def minValue(state, alpha, beta): 
   if state is terminal: 
     return utility(state) 
   else: 
    value = +\infty for all actions a in actions(state): 
       value = min(value, maxValue(result(state,a), alpha, beta) 
       if value <= alpha: 
         return value # prune! 
       beta = min(beta, value) # update alpha 
     return value
```
We're making a decision for MIN.

• When considering the MAX's choices, if we find a value that is less than alpha, stop, because MAX won't make this choice

• if we find a better path than beta for MIN, update beta

Baby NIM2: take 1, 2 or 3 sticks

Effectiveness of pruning

- Notice that as we gain more information about the state of things, we're more likely to prune
- What affects the performance of pruning?
	- key: which order we visit the states
	- can try and order them so as to improve pruning

Effectiveness of pruning

- If perfect state ordering:
	- $O(b^m)$ becomes $O(b^{m/2})$
	- We can solve a tree twice as deep!
- Random order:
	- $O(b^m)$ becomes $O(b^{3m/4})$
	- still pretty good
- For chess using a basic ordering
	- Within a factor of 2 of $O(b^{m/2})$