


# More on games (Ch. 5.4-5.6)



# Announcements


Writing 1 grades up

-2 weeks for regrades (3/16)

-should have comments

HW 3 posting bit late...(due after spring break)

# Review: Minimax



# Minimax

This representation works, but even in small games you can get a very large search tree

For example, tic-tac-toe has about  $9!$  actions to search (or about 300,000 nodes)

Larger problems (like chess or go) are not feasible for this approach (more on this next class)

# Minimax


“Pruning” in real life:

Snip branch



“Pruning” in CSCI trees:

Snip branch



# Alpha-beta pruning

However, we can get the same answer with searching less by using efficient “pruning”

It is possible to prune a minimax search that will never “accidentally” prune the optimal solution

A popular technique for doing this is called alpha-beta pruning (see next slide)

# Alpha-beta pruning

Consider if we were finding the following:  
 $\max(5, \min(3, 19))$

There is a “short circuit evaluation” for this, namely the value of 19 does not matter

$\min(3, x) \leq 3$  for all  $x$

Thus  $\max(5, \min(3, x)) = 5$  for any  $x$

Alpha-beta pruning would not search  $x$  above

# Alpha-beta pruning

This can apply to max nodes as well, so we propagate the best values for max/min in tree

Alpha-beta pruning algorithm:

Do minimax as normal, except:

Going down tree: pass “best max/min” values

min node: if parent's “best max” greater than

current node, go back to parent immediately


max node: if parent's “best min” less than

current node, go back to parent immediately



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let's solve this with alpha-beta pruning



# Alpha-beta pruning

$\max(\min(1,3), 2, \min(0, ??)) = 2$ , should pick action F


Order:

1<sup>st</sup>. Red

2<sup>nd</sup>. Blue

3<sup>rd</sup>. Purp


action F



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”

Branches L to R:






# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:



# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”


Branches L to R:




# Alpha-beta pruning

Let best max be “ $\uparrow$ ” and best min be “ $\downarrow$ ”

Branches L to R:



# $\alpha\beta$ pruning



Solve this problem  
with alpha-beta pruning:

# Alpha-beta pruning

In general, alpha-beta pruning allows you to search to a depth  $2d$  for the minimax search cost of depth  $d$

So if minimax needs to find:  $b^m$   
Then, alpha-beta searches:  $b^{m/2}$

This is exponentially better, but the worst case is the same as minimax

# Alpha-beta pruning

Ideally you would want to put your best (largest for max, smallest for min) actions first

This way you can prune more of the tree as a min node stops more often for larger “best”

Obviously you do not know the best move, (otherwise why are you searching?) but some effort into guessing goes a long way (i.e. exponentially less states)

# Side note:

In alpha-beta pruning, the heuristic for guess which move is best can be complex, as you can greatly effect pruning

While for  $A^*$  search, the heuristic had to be very fast to be useful  
(otherwise computing the heuristic would take longer than the original search)



# Alpha-beta pruning

This rule of checking your parent's best/worst with the current value in the child only really works for two player games...

What about 3 player games?

# 3-player games

For more than two player games, you need to provide values at every state for all the players

When it is the player's turn, they get to pick the action that maximizes their own value the most


(We will assume each agent is greedy and only wants to increase its own score... more on this next time)

# 3-player games

(The node number shows who is max-ing)

What should player 1 do?

What can you prune?



# 3-player games

How would you do alpha-beta pruning in a 3-player game?

# 3-player games

How would you do alpha-beta pruning in a 3-player game?

TL;DR: Not easily

(also you cannot prune at all if there is no range on the values even in a zero sum game)

This is because one player could take a very low score for the benefit of the other two

# Mid-state evaluation

So far we assumed that you have to reach a terminal state then propagate backwards (with possibly pruning)

More complex games (Go or Chess) it is hard to reach the terminal states as they are so far down the tree (and large branching factor)

Instead, we will estimate the value minimax would give without going all the way down

# Mid-state evaluation

By using mid-state evaluations (not terminal) the “best” action can be found quickly

These mid-state evaluations need to be:

1. Based on current state only
2. Fast (and not just a recursive search)
3. Accurate (represents correct win/loss rate)

The quality of your final solution is highly correlated to the quality of your evaluation

# Mid-state evaluation

For searches, the heuristic only helps you find the goal faster (but  $A^*$  will find the best solution as long as the heuristic is admissible)

There is no concept of “admissible” mid-state evaluations... and there is almost no guarantee that you will find the best/optimal solution

For this reason we only apply mid-state evals to problems that we cannot solve optimally



# Mid-state evaluation

A common mid-state evaluation adds features of the state together

(we did this already for a heuristic...)

$\text{eval}(\text{START})=20$

2	6	1
	7	8
3	5	4

GOAL

1	2	3
4	5	6
7	8	

We summed the distances to the correct spots for all numbers

# Mid-state evaluation

We then minimax (and prune) these mid-state evaluations as if they were the correct values

You can also weight features (i.e. getting the top row is more important in 8-puzzle)

A simple method in chess is to assign points for each piece: pawn=1, knight=4, queen=9... then sum over all pieces you have in play

# Mid-state evaluation

What assumptions do you make if you use a weighted sum?

# Mid-state evaluation

What assumptions do you make if you use a weighted sum?

A: The factors are independent  
(non-linear accumulation is common if the relationships have a large effect)

For example, a rook & queen have a synergy bonus for being together is non-linear, so queen=9, rook=5... but queen&rook = 16

# Mid-state evaluation

There is also an issue with how deep should we look before making an evaluation?

# Mid-state evaluation

There is also an issue with how deep should we look before making an evaluation?

A fixed depth? Problems if child's evaluation is overestimate and parent underestimate (or visa versa)

Ideally you would want to stop on states where the mid-state evaluation is most accurate

# Mid-state evaluation

Mid-state evaluations also favor actions that “put off” bad results (i.e. they like stalling)

In go this would make the computer use up ko threats rather than give up a dead group

By evaluating only at a limited depth, you reward the computer for pushing bad news beyond the depth (but does not stop the bad news from eventually happening)

# Mid-state evaluation

It is not easy to get around these limitations:

1. Push off bad news
2. How deep to evaluate?

A better mid-state evaluation can help compensate, but they are hard to find

They are normally found by mimicking what expert human players do, and there is no systematic good way to find one



# Forward pruning

You can also use mid-state evaluations for alpha-beta type pruning

However as these evaluations are estimates, you might prune the optimal answer if the heuristic is not perfect (which it won't be)

In practice, this prospective pruning is useful as it allows you to prioritize spending more time exploring hopeful parts of the search tree

# Forward pruning

You can also save time searching by using “expert knowledge” about the problem

For example, in both Go and Chess the start of the game has been very heavily analyzed over the years

There is no reason to redo this search every time at the start of the game, instead we can just look up the “best” response

# Random games


If we are playing a “game of chance”, we can add chance nodes to the search tree

Instead of either player picking max/min, it takes the expected value of its children

This expected value is then passed up to the parent node which can choose to min/max this chance (or not)

# Random games

Here is a simple slot machine example:





$$V(\text{chance}) = -1 \cdot \frac{999}{1,000} + 100 \cdot \frac{1}{1,000} = -0.899$$

# Random games

You might need to modify your mid-state evaluation if you add chance nodes

Minimax just cares about the largest/smallest, but expected value is an implicit average:



# Random games

Some partially observable games (i.e. card games) can be searched with chance nodes

As there is a high degree of chance, often it is better to just assume full observability (i.e. you know the order of cards in the deck)

Then find which actions perform best over all possible chance outcomes (i.e. all possible deck orderings)

# Random games

For example in blackjack, you can see what cards have been played and a few of the current cards in play

You then compute all possible decks that could lead to the cards in play (and used cards)

Then find the value of all actions (hit or stand) averaged over all decks (assumed equal chance of possible decks happening)

# Random games

If there are too many possibilities for all the chance outcomes to “average them all”, you can sample

This means you can search the chance-tree and just randomly select outcomes (based on probabilities) for each chance node

If you have a large number of samples, this should converge to the average