Homework assignment#3 (Chap5)

TA Hint: 2019-0103

Due: 2019-0110

(A) Pseudo codes documentation

Slide pages: 19, 33

(B) Exercises

5.8 Consider the two-player game described in Figure 5.17.

a. Draw the complete game tree, using the following conventions:

- Write each state as (s_A, s_B), where s_A and s_B denote the token locations.
- Put each terminal state in a square box and write its game value in a circle.
- Put *loop states* (states that already appear on the path to the root) in double square boxes. Since their value is unclear, annotate each with a "?" in a circle.

b. Now mark each node with its backed-up minimax value (also in a circle). Explain how you handled the "?" values and why.

c. Explain why the standard minimax algorithm would fail on this game tree and briefly sketch how you might fix it, drawing on your answer to (b). Does your modified algorithm give optimal decisions for all games with loops?

d. This 4-square game can be generalized to n squares for any $n > 2$. Prove that A wins if n is even and loses if n is odd.



Figure 5.17 The starting position of a simple game. Player A moves first. The two players take turns moving, and each player must move his token to an open adjacent space in either direction. If the opponent occupies an adjacent space, then a player may jump over the opponent to the next open space if any. (For example, if A is on 3 and B is on 2, then A may move back to 1.) The game ends when one player reaches the opposite end of the board. If player A reaches space 4 first, then the value of the game to A is $+1$; if player B reaches space 1 first, then the value of the game to A is -1.

5.10 Consider the family of generalized tic-tac-toe games, defined as follows. Each particular game is specified by a set $\mathcal{S}$ of *squares* and a collection $\mathcal{W}$ of *winning positions*. Each winning position is a subset of $\mathcal{S}$. For example, in standard tic-tac-toe, $\mathcal{S}$ is a set of 9 squares and $\mathcal{W}$ is a collection of 8 subsets of $\mathcal{W}$: the three rows, the three columns, and the two diagonals. In other respects, the game is identical to standard tic-tac-toe. Starting from an empty board, players alternate placing their marks on an empty square. A player who marks every square in a winning position wins the game. It is a tie if all squares are marked and neither player has won.

a. Let $N = |\mathcal{S}|$, the number of squares. Give an upper bound on the number of nodes in the complete game tree for generalized tic-tac-toe as a function of N.

b. Give a lower bound on the size of the game tree for the worst case, where $\mathcal{W} = \{\}$.

c. Propose a plausible evaluation function that can be used for any instance of generalized tic-tac-toe. The function may depend on $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{W}$.

d. Assume that it is possible to generate a new board and check whether it is a winning position in $100N$ machine instructions and assume a 2 gigahertz processor. Ignore memory limitations. Using your estimate in (a), roughly how large a game tree can be completely solved by alpha–beta in a second of CPU time? a minute? an hour?

5.13 Develop a formal proof of correctness for alpha–beta pruning. To do this, consider the situation shown in Figure 5.18. The question is whether to prune node n_j, which is a max-node and a descendant of node n_1. The basic idea is to prune it if and only if the minimax value of n_1 can be shown to be independent of the value of n_j.

a. Mode n_1 takes on the minimum value among its children: $n_1 = \min(n_2, n_{21}, \ldots, n_{2b_2})$. Find a similar expression for n_2 and hence an expression for n_1 in terms of n_j.

b. Let l_i be the minimum (or maximum) value of the nodes to the *left* of node n_i at depth i, whose minimax value is already known. Similarly, let r_i be the minimum (or maximum) value of the unexplored nodes to the right of n_i at depth i. Rewrite your expression for n_1 in terms of the l_i and r_i values.

c. Now reformulate the expression to show that in order to affect n_1, n_j must not exceed a certain bound derived from the l_i values.

d. Repeat the process for the case where n_j is a min-node.



Figure 5.18 Situation when considering whether to prune node n_j.

5.16 This question considers pruning in games with chance nodes. Figure 5.19 shows the complete game tree for a trivial game. Assume that the leaf nodes are to be evaluated in left-to-right order, and that before a leaf node is evaluated, we know nothing about its value—the range of possible values is $-\infty$ to ∞.

a. Copy the figure, mark the value of all the internal nodes, and indicate the best move at the root with an arrow.

b. Given the values of the first six leaves, do we need to evaluate the seventh and eighth leaves? Given the values of the first seven leaves, do we need to evaluate the eighth leaf? Explain your answers.

c. Suppose the leaf node values are known to lie between –2 and 2 inclusive. After the first two leaves are evaluated, what is the value range for the left-hand chance node?

d. Circle all the leaves that need not be evaluated under the assumption in (c).



Figure 5.19 The complete game tree for a trivial game with chance nodes.

5.20 In the following, a "max" tree consists only of max nodes, whereas an "expectimax" tree consists of a max node at the root with alternating layers of chance and max nodes. At chance nodes, all outcome probabilities are nonzero. The goal is to *find the value of the root* with a bounded-depth search.

a. Assuming that leaf values are finite but unbounded, is pruning (as in alpha–beta) ever possible in a max tree? Give an example, or explain why not.

b. Is pruning ever possible in an expectimax tree under the same conditions? Give an example, or explain why not.

c. If leaf values are constrained to be in the range $[0, 1]$, is pruning ever possible in a max tree? Give an example, or explain why not.

d. If leaf values are constrained to be in the range $[0, 1]$, is pruning ever possible in an expectimax tree? Give an example (qualitatively different from your example in (e), if any), or explain why not.

e. If leaf values are constrained to be nonnegative, is pruning ever possible in a max tree? Give an example, or explain why not.

f. If leaf values are constrained to be nonnegative, is pruning ever possible in an expectimax tree? Give an example, or explain why not.

g. Consider the outcomes of a chance node in an expectimax tree. Which of the following evaluation orders is most likely to yield pruning opportunities: (i) Lowest probability first; (ii) Highest probability first; (iii) Doesn't make any difference?

5.21 Which of the following are true and which are false? Give brief explanations.

a. In a fully observable, turn-taking, zero-sum game between two perfectly rational players, it does not help the first player to know what strategy the second player is using—that is, what move the second player will make, given the first player's move.

b. In a partially observable, turn-taking, zero-sum game between two perfectly rational players, it does not help the first player to know what move the second player will make, given the first player's move.

c. A perfectly rational backgammon agent never loses.