

Title: Adversarial Search
AIMA: Chapter 6 (Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3)

Introduction to Artificial Intelligence
CSCE 476-876, Spring 2005
URL: www.cse.unl.edu/~choueiry/S05-476-876

Berthe Y. Choueiry (Shu-we-ri)
choueiry@cse.unl.edu, (402)472-5444

Outline

- Introduction
- Minimax algorithm
- Alpha-beta pruning

Context

- In an MAS, agents affect each other's welfare
- Environment can be cooperative or competitive
- Competitive environments yield adversarial search problems (games)
- Approaches: mathematical game theory and AI games

Game theory vs. AI

- AI games: fully observable, deterministic environments, players alternate, utility values are equal (draw) or opposite (winner/loser)

In vocabulary of game theory: deterministic, turn-taking, two-player, zero-sum games of perfect information

- Games are attractive to AI: states simple to represent, agents restricted to a small number of actions, outcome defined by simple rules

Not croquet or ice hockey, but typically board games

Exception: Soccer (Robocup www.robotcup.org/)

Board game playing: an appealing target of AI research

Board game: Chess (since early AI), Othello, Go, Backgammon, etc.

- Easy to represent
- Fairly small numbers of well-defined actions
- Environment fairly accessible
- Good abstraction of an enemy, w/o real-life (or war) risks :—)

But also: Bridge, ping-pong, etc.

Characteristics

- ‘Unpredictable’ opponent: contingency problem (interleaves search and execution)
- Not the usual type of ‘uncertainty’:
no randomness/no missing information (such as in traffic)
but, the moves of the opponent expectedly non benign
- Challenges:
 - huge branching factor
 - large solution space
 - Computing optimal solution is infeasible
 - Yet, decisions must be made. Forget A*...

Discussion

- What are the theoretically best moves?
- Techniques for choosing a good move when time is tight
 - ✓ Pruning: ignore irrelevant portions of the search space
 - × Evaluation function: approximate the true utility of a state without doing search

Two-person Games

- 2 player: Min and Max
- Max moves first
- Players alternate until end of game
- Gain awarded to player/penalty give to loser

Game as a search problem:

- Initial state: board position & indication whose turn it is
- Successor function: defining legal moves a player can take
Returns {(move, state)*}
- Terminal test: determining when game is over
states satisfy the test: terminal states
- Utility function (a.k.a. payoff function): numerical value for outcome e.g., Chess: win=1, loss=-1, draw=0

Usual search

Max finds a sequence of operators yielding a terminal goal scoring winner according to the utility function


Game search

- Min actions are significant
Max must find a strategy to win regardless of what Min does:
→ correct action for Max for each action of Min
- Need to approximate (no time to envisage all possibilities difficulty): a huge state space, an even more huge search space
e.g., chess: $\begin{cases} 10^{40} \text{ different legal positions} \\ \text{Average branching factor}=35, 50 \text{ moves/player}= 35^{100} \end{cases}$
- Performance in terms of time is very important

Example: Tic-Tac-Toe

Max has 9 alternative moves


Terminal states' utility: Max wins=1, Max loses = -1, Draw = 0



Example: 2-ply game tree

Max's actions: a_1, a_2, a_3

Min's actions: b_1, b_2, b_3



Minimax algorithm determines the optimal strategy for Max
→ decides which is the best move

Minimax algorithm

- Generate the whole tree, down to the leaves
- Compute utility of each terminal state
- Iteratively, from the leaves up to the root, use utility of nodes at depth d to compute utility of nodes at depth $(d - 1)$:

MIN 'row': minimum of children

MAX 'row': maximum of children

MINIMAX-VALUE (n)

$$\begin{cases} \text{UTILITY}(n) & \text{if } n \text{ is a terminal node} \\ \max_{s \in \text{Succ}(n)} \text{MINIMAX-VALUE}(s) & \text{if } n \text{ is a Max terminal node} \\ \min_{s \in \text{Succ}(n)} \text{MINIMAX-VALUE}(s) & \text{if } n \text{ is a Min node} \end{cases}$$

Minimax decision

- MAX's decision: minimax decision maximizes utility under the assumption that the opponent will play perfectly to his/her own advantage
- Minimax decision maximizes the worst-case outcome for Max (which otherwise is guaranteed to do better)
- If opponent is sub-optimal, other strategies may reach better outcome better than the minimax decision

Minimax algorithm: Properties


- m maximum depth
 b legal moves
- Using Depth-first search, space requirement is:
 $O(bm)$: if generating all successors at once
 $O(m)$: if considering successors one at a time
- Time complexity $O(b^m)$
Real games: time cost totally unacceptable

Multiple players games

UTILITY(n) becomes a vector of the size of the number of players

For each node, the vector gives the utility of the state for each player

to move
A



Alliance formation in multiple players games

How about alliances?

- A and B in weak positions, but C in strong position
A and B make an alliance to attach C (rather than each other
→ Collaboration emerges from purely selfish behavior!
- Alliances can be done and undone (careful for social stigma!)
- When a two-player game is not zero-sum, players may end up automatically making alliances (for example when the terminal state maximizes utility of both players)

Alpha-beta pruning

- Minimax requires computing all terminal nodes: unacceptable
- Do we really need to do compute utility of all terminal nodes?
... No, says John McCarthy in 1956:

It is possible to compute the correct minimax decision without looking at every node in the tree, and yet get the correct decision

- Use pruning (eliminating useless branches in a tree)

Example of Alpha-beta pruning

