**Intro To AI, HW2:**

Part A – Improved-Greedy:

1. The definition of the game is such that:

In our case, it was given that . Therefore:

1. In order to define a smart heuristic that leads to a good outcome, we’re going to take into account the following variables of the environment into consideration:
2. The number of steps we have left until the end of the game in relation to the Manhattan distance from the nearest package drop off location, we’ll call this parameter: feasibility. What is meant by this, is: feasibility = num\_steps – drop\_off\_cost.
3. The Manhattan distance from the drop off location of the package in case the agent is currently holding a package, we’ll call this parameter: delivery\_cost.
4. The distance of the adversary from the nearest package in terms of Manhattan-distance in case both agents are currently looking for packages, we’ll call this parameter: pick\_up\_cost.

And the formula we’re going to use is:

1. The main disadvantage of using Greedy as opposed to Minimax is, in Greedy the agent takes the locally optimal decision at every step of the game. Whereas in Minimax we explore the game tree (to a certain depth or until a final state has been reached) such that at each step we try maximizing the utility of the agent and minimizing the utility of the adversary. Thus, a possible outcome is that while using Greedy we might take a step that maximizes the utility of our agent locally but in doing so, we reach a state that results in our loss. Whereas in minimax the algorithm would’ve looked a few steps ahead and decided to take step in a different direction that will pay off in the future and eventually win the game.

Part B – RB-Minimax:

1. Using an easy-to-calculate heuristic in RB-Minimax is advantageous because it doesn’t waste much time on computing the heuristic value. Therefore, we would be able to delve deeper into the game tree and obtain better results than those computed at a lower depth which we would most likely have stopped at if we had used a heuristic that is difficult-to-calculate. However, it could also be disadvantageous in some cases. For instance, when the heuristic is very misleading, it can waste precious time on taking bad steps that might result in a draw or a loss. In contrast, a more informed but difficult-to-calculate heuristic can provide actual good steps and lead to a win.
2. The behavior in Dana’s algorithm doesn’t necessarily mean she has a bug. For example, in case there are 2 goals such that one is 1 step away and the second goal is 2 steps away such that the utility that’s gained from the second goal is a lot bigger than that of the first goal. In such a case the algorithm will choose to take the path to the second goal even though it was possible to reach one of the goals in one step and end the game. The reason for which is to maximize the agent’s utility by reaching the “better” goal.
3. Minimax algorithm with K players in a zero-sum game:
4. In this case, each agent wants to win. Therefore, each agent will play as a “MAX” player in order to maximize his utility. While assuming that all other agents want to minimize his utility. In order to account for the fact that there is other player trying to minimize his utility and not just one, in the “MIN” loop we will calculate the minimum value after taking 1 step for each of the adversary agents and calculate the min value after wards. Such that the minimum value that is calculated takes into account all possible moves by the other agents and picks the one with the minimum value, such that our agent takes into account the worst-case scenario. In short, the min-value that we calculated corresponds to a tuple of moves by other adversaries. To clarify, for each agent, his adversaries are the other agents which differ from agent to agent.
5. In this case, all other agents want us to lose. Therefore, we will consider all of the other

agents as a collective to be our adversary such that whenever one of the agents win, we lose. Our agent is trying to win therefore he will act as a “MAX” player and our adversary is also trying to win therefore they will act as a “MIN” player such that our adversary includes agents such that a move by our adversary represents an individual move by each of the agents that make up our adversary. To clarify, in this section the adversary that includes agents is constant and doesn’t change based on the agent in opposition to the previous section.

1. In this case, each agent wants the agent next in line to win.

Part C – Alpha-Beta:

1. Yes, the Alpha-Beta agent might behave differently from the minimax agent that we implemented in the previous section. The reason for the difference in behavior is due to the fact that the alpha-beta agent doesn’t explore all sub trees and prunes those that it knows will not affect the result of its decision. Therefore, within the same time limit the alpha-beta agent will reach a greater depth than that reached by the minimax agent. Which could result in different choices because a greater depth means that the agent is more informed and is able to make better choices. In addition to the potential difference in choices, there’s a difference in the speed for which solutions are computed for a given depth that are in favor of the alpha-beta agent.

Part D – Expectimax:

1. In such a case where we are playing against a completely random agent, I would use a uniform probability to explore all sub-trees equally because there is an equal chance to pick each one of the legal operators at every step and therefore we shouldn’t prioritize one over the other.