

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](http://www.cse.unl.edu/~choueiry/S05-476-876)

Berthe Y. Choueiry (Shu-we-ri)  
[choueiry@cse.unl.edu](mailto: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/](http://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:  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10^{40} \text{ different legal positions} \\ \text{Average branching factor}=35, 50 \text{ moves/player}= 35^{100} \end{array} \right.$
- Performance in terms of time is very important

9


## Example: Tic-Tac-Toe

Max has 9 alternative moves

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



10

**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



## 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

