CS 188: Artificial Intelligence

Game Trees: Adversarial Search



Instructors: Oliver Grillmeyer
University of California, Berkeley

[These slides were created by Dan Klein and Pieter Abbeel for CS188 Intro to AI at UC Berkeley (ai.berkeley.edu).
[Updated slides from: Stuart Russell and Dawn Song]

Announcements

- HW1 is due **Tuesday, July 1**, 11:59 PM PT
- HW2 is due **Thursday, July 3**, 11:59 PM PT
- HW3 is due **Tuesday, July 8**, 11:59 PM PT
- HW4 is due **Thursday, July 10**, 11:59 PM PT
- Project 1 is due **Friday, July 4**, 11:59 PM PT
- Project 2 is due **Friday, July 11**, 11:59 PM PT
- Midterm is **Wednesday July 23**, 7-9 PM PT

Outline

- History / Overview
- Minimax for Zero-Sum Games
- α-β Pruning
- Finite lookahead and evaluation



Game Playing State of the Art

- **Checkers:**
  - 1950: First computer player
  - 1959: Samuel's self-taught program
  - 1995: First computer world champion beat 40 year champion Marion Tinsley *
  - 2007: Checkers solved!
- **Chess:**
  - 1945-1960: Zuse, Wiener, Shannon, Turing, Newell & Simon, McCarthy.
  - 1960-1996: gradual improvements
  - 1997: Deep Blue defeats human champion Garry Kasparov
  - 2024: Stockfish rating 3631 (vs 2847 for Magnus Carlsen)
- **Go:**
  - 1968: Zobrist's program plays legal Go, barely (b>300!)
  - 1968-2005: various ad hoc approaches tried, novice level
  - 2005-2014: Monte Carlo tree search -> strong amateur
  - 2016-2017: AlphaGo defeats human world champions
  - 2022: Human exploits NN weakness to defeat top Go programs
- **Pacman**



Behavior from Computation



[Demo: mystery pacman (L6D1)]

Video of Demo Mystery Pacman



Adversarial Games



Types of Games

- Game = task environment with > 1 agent
- Axes:
  - Deterministic or stochastic?
  - Perfect information (fully observable)?
  - Two, three, or more players?
  - Teams or individuals?
  - Turn-taking or simultaneous?
  - Zero sum?



- Want algorithms for calculating a **strategy** (policy) which recommends a move from every possible state

Deterministic Games

- Many possible formalizations, one is:
  - States: S (start at s_0)
  - Players: P={1…N} (usually take turns)
  - Actions: A (may depend on player/state)
  - Transition function: S x A → S
  - Terminal test: S → {true, false}
  - Terminal utilities: S x P → R
- Solution for a player is a policy: S → A



Zero-Sum Games





- Zero-Sum Games
  - Agents have ***opposite*** utilities (values on outcomes)
  - Pure competition:
    - One ***maximizes***, the other ***minimizes***

- General-Sum Games
  - Agents have ***independent*** utilities (values on outcomes)
  - Cooperation, indifference, competition, shifting alliances, and more are all possible
- Team Games
  - Common payoff for all team members

Adversarial Search



Single-Agent Trees



Value of a State

Value of a state:
The best achievable outcome (utility) from that state



Non-Terminal States:

$$V(s) = \max_{s' \in \text{children}(s)} V(s')$$

Terminal States:

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

Adversarial Game Trees



Minimax Values

States Under Agent's Control:

$$V(s) = \max_{s' \in \text{successors}(s)} V(s')$$

States Under Opponent's Control:

$$V(s') = \min_{s \in \text{successors}(s')} V(s)$$



Terminal States:

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

Tic-Tac-Toe Game Tree



Adversarial Search (Minimax)

- 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 turns
  - Compute each node's minimax value: the best achievable utility against a rational (optimal) adversary



Minimax Implementation

```
def max-value(state):
    initialize v = -∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = max(v, min-value(successor))
    return v
```



```
def min-value(state):
    initialize v = +∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = min(v, max-value(successor))
    return v
```

$$V(s) = \max_{s' \in \text{successors}(s)} V(s')$$

$$V(s') = \min_{s \in \text{successors}(s')} V(s)$$

Minimax Implementation (Dispatch)

```
def value(state):
    if the state is a terminal state: return the state's utility
    if the next agent is MAX: return max-value(state)
    if the next agent is MIN: return min-value(state)
```



```
def max-value(state):
    initialize v = -∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = max(v, value(successor))
    return v
```

```
def min-value(state):
    initialize v = +∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = min(v, value(successor))
    return v
```

Minimax Example



Minimax Properties







Optimal against a perfect player. Otherwise?

[Demo: min vs exp (L6D2, L6D3)]

Video of Demo Min vs. Exp (Min)



Video of Demo Min vs. Exp (Exp)



Minimax Efficiency

- How efficient is minimax?
  - Just like (exhaustive) DFS
  - Time: $O(b^m)$
  - Space: O(bm)
- Example: For chess, $b \approx 35$, $m \approx 100$
  - Exact solution is completely infeasible
  - But, do we need to explore the whole tree?



Resource Limits

Game Tree Pruning



Minimax Pruning



The order of generation matters:
more pruning is possible if good moves come first

Alpha-Beta Pruning

- General case (pruning children of MIN node)
  - We're computing the MIN-VALUE at some node *n*
  - We're looping over *n*'s children
  - *n*'s estimate of the childrens' min is dropping
  - Who cares about *n*'s value? MAX
  - Let **α** be the best value that MAX can get so far at any choice point along the current path from the root
  - If *n* becomes worse than **α**, MAX will avoid it, so we can prune *n*'s other children (it's already bad enough that it won't be played)
- Pruning children of MAX node is symmetric
  - Let **β** be the best value that MIN can get so far at any choice point along the current path from the root



Alpha-Beta Implementation

α: MAX's best option on path to root
β: MIN's best option on path to root

```
def max-value(state, α, β):
    initialize v = -∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = max(v, value(successor, α, β))
        if v ≥ β return v
        α = max(α, v)
    return v
```

```
def min-value(state , α, β):
    initialize v = +∞
    for each successor of state:
        v = min(v, value(successor, α, β))
        if v ≤ α return v
        β = min(β, v)
    return v
```

Alpha-Beta Pruning Properties

- This pruning has no effect on minimax value computed for the root!
- Values of intermediate nodes might be wrong
  - Important: children of the root may have the wrong value
  - So the most naïve version won't let you do action selection
- Good child 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 (computing about what to compute)



Alpha-Beta Quiz



Alpha-Beta Quiz 2



Resource Limits

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 100 seconds, can explore 10K nodes / sec
  - So can check 1M nodes per move
  - α-β reaches about depth 8 – decent chess program
- Guarantee of optimal play is gone
- More plies makes a BIG difference
- Use iterative deepening for an anytime algorithm



Video of Demo Thrashing (d=2)



[Demo: thrashing d=2, thrashing d=2 (fixed evaluation function) (L6D6)]

Why Pacman Starves



- A danger of replanning agents!
  - He knows his score will go up by eating the dot now (west, east)
  - He knows his score will go up just as much by eating the dot later (east, west)
  - There are no point-scoring opportunities after eating the dot (within the horizon, two here)
  - Therefore, waiting seems just as good as eating: he may go east, then back west in the next round of replanning!

Evaluation Functions



Evaluation Functions

- Evaluation functions score non-terminals in depth-limited search



- Ideal function: returns the actual minimax value of the position
- In practice: typically weighted linear sum of features:

$$Eval(s) = w_1 f_1(s) + w_2 f_2(s) + \ldots + w_n f_n(s)$$

  - E.g. $f_1(s)$ = (num white queens – num black queens), etc.
- Or a more complex nonlinear function (e.g., NN) trained by self-play RL

Evaluation for Pacman



[Demo: thrashing d=2, thrashing d=2 (fixed evaluation function), smart ghosts coordinate (L6D6,7,8,10)]

Video of Demo Smart Ghosts (Coordination)



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
- An important example of the tradeoff between complexity of features and complexity of computation





[Demo: depth limited (L6D4, L6D5)]

Video of Demo Limited Depth (2)



Video of Demo Limited Depth (10)



Synergies between Evaluation Function and Alpha-Beta?

- Alpha-Beta: amount of pruning depends on expansion ordering
  - Evaluation function can provide guidance to expand most promising nodes first (which later makes it more likely there is already a good alternative on the path to the root)
    - (somewhat similar to role of A* heuristic, CSPs filtering)

- Alpha-Beta: (similar for roles of min-max swapped)
  - Value at a min-node will only keep going down
  - Once value of min-node lower than better option for max along path to root, can prune
  - Hence: IF evaluation function provides upper-bound on value at min-node, and upper-bound already lower than better option for max along path to root
    THEN can prune

Summary

- Games are decision problems with multiple agents
  - Huge variety of issues and phenomena depending on details of interactions and payoffs
- For zero-sum games, optimal decisions defined by minimax
  - Implementable as a depth-first traversal of the game tree
  - Time complexity $O(b^m)$, space complexity $O(bm)$
- Alpha-beta pruning
  - Preserves optimal choice at the root
  - Alpha/beta values keep track of best obtainable values from any max/min nodes on path from root to current node
  - Time complexity drops to $O(b^{m/2})$ with ideal node ordering
- Exact solution is impossible even for "small" games like chess

Next Time: Uncertainty!