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Announcements

- Written Assignment 1:
  - Due Tuesday in lecture!
  - No late days for written assignments
  - Printed copies will be here after class
- Countdown to math:
  - Markov decision processes are 3 lectures away
- Project 2:
  - Posted tonight; due Wednesday, 2/18
  - Material from today and next Tuesday
  - Midterm on Thursday, 3/19, at 6pm in 10 Evans

Game Playing

- Many different kinds of games!
- Axes:
  - Deterministic or stochastic?
  - One, two or more players?
  - Perfect information (can you see the state)?
- Want algorithms for calculating a strategy (policy) which recommends a move in each state

Example: Peg Game

Jump each tee and remove it:
- Leave only one -- you're genius
- Leave two and you're purty smart
- Leave three and you're just plain dumb
- Leave four or mor'n you're an EG-NO-RA-MOOSE

Looks like a search problem:
- Has a start state, goal test, successor function
- But the goal cost is not the sum of step costs!
- Are all of our search algorithms useless here?

Deterministic Single-Player

- Deterministic, single player, perfect information games:
  - Start state, successor function, terminal test, utility of terminals
- Max search:
  - Each node stores a value: the best outcome it can reach
  - This is the maximal value of its children (recursive definition)
  - No path sums; utilities at end
- After search, can pick move that leads to the best outcome

Properties of Max Search

- Terminology: terminal states, node values, policies
- Without bounds, need to search the entire tree to find the max
- Computes successively tighter lower bounds on node values
- With a known upper bound on utility, can stop when the global max is attained
- Nodes are max nodes because one agent is making decisions
- Caching max values can speed up computation
Uses of a Max Tree

- Can select a sequence of moves that maximizes utility
- Can recover optimally from bad moves
- Can compute values for certain scenarios easily

Deterministic Two-Player

- Deterministic, zero-sum games:
  - tic-tac-toe, chess, checkers
  - One player maximizes result
  - The other minimizes result
- Minimax search:
  - A state-space search tree
  - Players alternate
  - Each layer, or ply, consists of a round of moves
  - Choose move to position with highest minimax value: best achievable utility against a rational adversary

Minimax Example

Adversarial Search

Purty smart
Plain dumb
Ignoramus

Tic-tac-toe Game Tree

Minimax Search

function Max-Value(state) returns a utility value
if Terminal-Test(state) then return Utility(state)
v ← −∞
for a, s in Successors(state) do v ← MAX(v, Min-Value(s))
return v

function Min-Value(state) returns a utility value
if Terminal-Test(state) then return Utility(state)
v = ∞
for a, s in Successors(state) do v ← MIN(v, Max-Value(s))
return v
Minimax Properties

- Optimal against a perfect player. Otherwise?
- Time complexity?
  - $O(b^m)$
- Space complexity?
  - $O(bm)$
- For chess, $b \approx 35$, $m \approx 100$
  - Exact solution is completely infeasible
  - Lots of approximations and pruning

Resource Limits

- Cannot search to leaves
- Depth-limited search
  - Instead, search a limited depth of tree
  - Replace terminal utilities with an eval function for non-terminal positions
- Guarantee of optimal play is gone
- More plies makes a BIG difference
  - [DEMO: limitedDepth]
- Example:
  - Suppose we have 100 seconds, can explore 10K nodes/sec
  - So can check 1M nodes per move
  - $\alpha \beta$ reaches about depth 8 – decent chess program
  - Deep Blue sometimes reached depth 40+

Evaluation Functions

- Function which scores non-terminals
- Ideal function: returns the utility of the position
- In practice: typically weighted linear sum of features:
  $$Eval(s) = w_1f_1(s) + w_2f_2(s) + \ldots + w_nf_n(s)$$
- e.g. $f(s) = (\text{num white queens} - \text{num black queens})$, etc.

Evaluation for Pacman

- [DEMO: thrashing, smart ghosts]
- $$Eval(s) = w_1f_1(s) + w_2f_2(s) + \ldots + w_nf_n(s)$$

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

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.

This works for single-agent search as well

Why do we want to do this for multiplayer games?
**α-β Pruning Example**

```
          A
         / \
        A_1 A_2
       /    / \
      A_3  A_4 A_5
     /     /     / \
    3  12  8  2  4  6  14  5  2
```

**α-β Pruning**

- **General configuration**
  - $\alpha$ is the best value that MAX can get at any choice point along the current path
  - If $n$ becomes worse than $\alpha$, MAX will avoid it, so can stop considering $n$'s other children
  - Define $\beta$ similarly for MIN

**α-β Pruning Pseudocode**

```python
function MAX-VALUE(state) returns a utility value:
    if TERMINAL-TEST(state) then return UTILITY(state)
    $\alpha <- -\infty$
    for $a \in$ SUCCESSORS(state) do
        $\beta <- \text{MIN-VALUE}(a)$
    return $\max(\alpha, \beta)$
```

**α-β Pruning Properties**

- This pruning has no effect on final result at the root
- Values of intermediate nodes might be wrong
- Good move ordering improves effectiveness of pruning
- With "perfect ordering":
  - Time complexity drops to $O(b^{m/2})$
  - Doubles solvable depth
- Full search of, e.g. chess, is still hopeless!
- This is a simple example of metareasoning

**More Metareasoning Ideas**

- Forward pruning – prune a node immediately without recursive evaluation
- Singular extensions – explore only one action that is clearly better than others. Can alleviate horizon effects
- Cutoff test – a decision function about when to apply evaluation
- Quiescence search – expand the tree until positions are reached that are quiescent (i.e., not volatile)

**Game Playing State-of-the-Art**

- **Checkers**: Chinook ended 40-year reign of human world champion Marion Tinsley in 1994. Used an endgame database defining perfect play for all positions involving 8 or fewer pieces on the board, a total of 463,748,401,247 positions. Checkers is now solved!
- **Chess**: Deep Blue defeated human world champion Gary Kasparov in a six-game match in 1997. Deep Blue examined 200 million positions per second, used very sophisticated evaluation and undisclosed methods for extending some lines of search up to 40 ply.
- **Othello**: human champions refuse to compete against computers, which are too good.
- **Go**: human champions refuse to compete against computers, which are too bad. In go, $b > 300$, so most programs use pattern knowledge bases to suggest plausible moves.
- **Pacman**: unknown
GamesCrafters

http://gamescrafters.berkeley.edu/