

Adversarial Search

Seung-Hoon Na¹

¹Department of Computer Science
Chonbuk National University

2017.9.25

Minimax value

- $MINIMAX(s)$: Minimax value of a node
 - The utility of being in the corresponding state, assuming that **both players play optimally** from there to the end of the game.
 - s is a terminal state: Its utility defined.

$$MINIMAX(s) = \begin{cases} UTILITY(s) & \text{if } TERMINAL-TEST(s) \\ \max_{a \in Actions(s)} MINIMAX(RESULT(s, a)) & \text{if } PLAYER(s) = MAX \\ \min_{a \in Actions(s)} MINIMAX(RESULT(s, a)) & \text{if } PLAYER(s) = MIN \end{cases}$$


Minimax algorithm

- The algorithm first **recurses down to the leaves** of the tree, and
- Then the minimax values are **backed up** through the tree as the recursion unwinds.
- The time complexity: $\mathcal{O}(b^m)$
- The space complexity: $\mathcal{O}(bm)$ or $\mathcal{O}(m)$

Minimax algorithm: A two-play game tree

MAX


MIN



Optimal decision in multiplayer games

- Use a **vector** of values for each node
 - $\langle v_A, v_B, v_C \rangle$ in three-player game with A , B , and C .
 - For terminal state, the vector gives the utility of the state from each player's viewpoint.


to move
A



Alpha-beta pruning

- Returns the same move as minimax would, but **prunes away branches that cannot possibly influence the final decision**.
- Use two parameters – alpha and beta – that describes bounds on the backed-up values
 - α = the value of the best (i.e. **highest-value**) choice we have found so far at any choice point along the path for *MAX*.
 - β = the value of the best (i.e. **lowest-value**) choice we have found so far at any choice point along the path for *MIN*.

Alpha-beta pruning



If m is better than n for Player, n **will never be reached in actual play.**







Alpha-beta search

function ALPHA-BETA-SEARCH($state$) **returns** an action
 $v \leftarrow \text{MAX-VALUE}(state, -\infty, +\infty)$
 return the *action* in $\text{ACTIONS}(state)$ with value v


function MAX-VALUE($state, \alpha, \beta$) **returns** a utility value
 if $\text{TERMINAL-TEST}(state)$ **then return** $\text{UTILITY}(state)$
 $v \leftarrow -\infty$
 for each a **in** $\text{ACTIONS}(state)$ **do**
 $v \leftarrow \text{MAX}(v, \text{MIN-VALUE}(\text{RESULT}(s, a), \alpha, \beta))$
 if $v \geq \beta$ **then return** v
 $\alpha \leftarrow \text{MAX}(\alpha, v)$
 return v

function MIN-VALUE($state, \alpha, \beta$) **returns** a utility value
 if $\text{TERMINAL-TEST}(state)$ **then return** $\text{UTILITY}(state)$
 $v \leftarrow +\infty$
 for each a **in** $\text{ACTIONS}(state)$ **do**
 $v \leftarrow \text{MIN}(v, \text{MAX-VALUE}(\text{RESULT}(s, a), \alpha, \beta))$
 if $v \leq \alpha$ **then return** v
 $\beta \leftarrow \text{MIN}(\beta, v)$
 return v

Alpha-beta pruning: An example




Alpha-beta pruning: An example



$$\begin{aligned} \text{MINIMAX}(\text{root}) &= \max(\min(3, 12, 8), \min(2, x, y)) \\ &= \max(3, z) \text{ where } z = \min(2, x, y) \leq 2 \\ &= 3 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Alpha-beta pruning: Move ordering



We couldn't prune any successors of D , because the worst successors were generated first.

Imperfect real-time decision

- Replace the utility function by a heuristic **evaluation function** *EVAL*, which estimates the position's utility.
- Replace the terminal test by a **cutoff test** that decides when to apply *EVAL*, resulting in:

$$H\text{-MINIMAX}(s, d) =$$

$$\begin{cases} EVAL(s) & \text{if } CUTOFF\text{-}TEST(s, d) \\ \max_{a \in Actions(s)} H\text{-MINIMAX}(RESULT(s, a), d + 1) & \text{if } PLAYER(s) = MAX \\ \min_{a \in Actions(s)} H\text{-MINIMAX}(RESULT(s, a), d + 1) & \text{if } PLAYER(s) = MIN \end{cases}$$

Evaluation function

- In most cases, use various **features** of the state:
 - E.g.) in chess, features can include: the num of white pawns, black pawns, white queens, black queens, etc.
- These features usually define various **categories or equivalence classes** of states
 - The states in each category have the same values for all the features
- Any category will contain some states, that lead to wins, some that lead to draws, and some that lead to losses.
 - E.g.) in chess, one category contains all two-pawn vs. one-pawn endgames. Among the states of the category, 72%: win, 20%: lose, 8%: draw
 - A reasonable evaluation for states is the **expected value**:
$$(0.72) \times 1 + (0.20) \times 0 + 0.08 \times 1/2 = 0.76$$

- Mathematically, it is a **weighed linear function**:


$$EVAL(s) = w_1 f_1(s) + \cdots w_n f_n(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f_i(s) \quad (2)$$

where f_i is a feature of the position and w_i is a weight.


- E.g.) **material value** for each piece: f_i : the num of each kind of piece on the board, w_i : the value of the pieces (1 for pawn, 3 for bishop, 5 for rook, 9 for queen, etc.).

Cutting off search: The simple approach

- $CUTOFF-TEST(s, depth)$ returns *true* all *depth* greater than some fixed depth *d*
 - The depth *d* is chosen so that a move is selected within the allocated time, or an iterative deepening could be applied.
- But lead to approximate errors



(a) White to move




(b) White to move

- For a more sophisticated cutoff test, we apply the evaluation function only to **quiescent** positions.
 - that is, unlikely to exhibit wild swings in value in the near future.
 - E.g.) in chess, positions in which favorable captures can be made are not quiescent for an evaluation function that just counts material.
- **Quiescence search**: The extra search that expands nonquiescent positions until quiescent positions are reached.
 - This can also be used for dealing with the **horizon problem**

Horizon effect

Horizon effect: the program is facing an opponent's move that causes serious damage and is ultimately unavoidable, but can be temporarily avoided by delaying tactics




Singular extension

- Another possible strategy to mitigate the horizon effect
- **Singular extension**: move that is “clearly better” than all other moves in a given position.
 - Once discovered anywhere in the tree in the course of a search, **this singular move is remembered**.
 - The algorithm checks to see if the singular extension is a legal move; if it is, the algorithm allows the move to be considered.
 - Makes the tree deeper, but because there will be only few singular extensions, it does not add many total nodes to the tree.


Stochastic game

Stochastic game: The games that include unpredictable external events as random elements such as the throwing of dice



Stochastic game tree

chance nodes are further included in addition to *MAX* and *MIN* nodes.




Expecti-minimax value

$$E\text{-MINIMAX}(s) = \begin{cases} \text{UTILITY}(s) & \text{if } \text{TERMINAL-TEST}(s) \\ \max_{a \in \text{Actions}(s)} E\text{-MINIMAX}(\text{RESULT}(s, a)) & \text{if } \text{PLAYER}(s) = \text{MAX} \\ \min_{a \in \text{Actions}(s)} E\text{-MINIMAX}(\text{RESULT}(s, a)) & \text{if } \text{PLAYER}(s) = \text{MIN} \\ \sum_r P(r) E\text{-MINIMAX}(\text{RESULT}(s, r)) & \text{if } \text{PLAYER}(s) = \text{CHANCE} \end{cases}$$

Partially observable games

Kriegspiel: Partially observable chess



Partially observable games: Card games

- Card games: Gives **stochastic** partial observability – missing information is generated randomly
 - Suppose each deal s occurs with probability $P(s)$.

$$\operatorname{argmax}_a \sum_s P(s) \operatorname{MINIMAX}(\operatorname{RESULT}(s, a)) \quad (3)$$

where we run either *MINIMAX* or *H-MINIMAX*.

- Monte Carlo approximation:

$$\operatorname{argmax}_a \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \operatorname{MINIMAX}(\operatorname{RESULT}(s_i, a)) \quad (4)$$