

# Formal Verification of Minimax Algorithms

Wieger Wesselink<sup>1</sup>[0009–0001–6746–5115],  
Kees Huizing<sup>1</sup>[0000–0002–4713–7253], and  
Huub van de Wetering<sup>1</sup>[0000–0002–0517–1322]

Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands  
{j.w.wesselink,h.v.d.wetering,c.huizing}@tue.nl

**Abstract.** Using the Dafny verification system, we formally verify a range of minimax search algorithms, including variations with alpha-beta pruning and transposition tables. For depth-limited search with transposition tables, we introduce a witness-based correctness criterion and apply it to two representative algorithms. All verification artifacts, including proofs and Python implementations, are publicly available.

**Keywords:** Formal Verification · Dafny · Minimax · Alpha-Beta Pruning · Depth-limited search · Transposition Tables.

## 1 Introduction

Game tree search algorithms, such as minimax and its optimization via alpha-beta pruning, compute optimal moves by recursively evaluating all possible outcomes under the assumption of perfect play. These algorithms assign values to game states based on the principle that one player seeks to maximize the evaluation, while the opponent seeks to minimize it. The alpha-beta pruning technique, which may significantly improve the efficiency of minimax by pruning branches that cannot affect the final decision, was analyzed in detail by Knuth and Moore in their seminal work [5]. Various theoretical frameworks have been applied to minimax and related algorithms, including lattice theory [1] and AND/OR tree representations [9]. Several variations of alpha-beta pruning exist. In [5], the *fail-hard* variant of alpha-beta pruning is discussed, while Fishburn introduced *fail-soft* variants in [3, 4]. More recently, Nipkow et al. have verified implementations of several minimax variants in a functional programming setting using the Isabelle proof assistant [8]. Their work includes a verified transposition-table-based algorithm, but only in the setting of depth-unlimited search. This setting avoids many of the subtleties that arise in depth-limited search, where partially explored subtrees and varying depths complicate the formulation and verification of correctness criteria for transposition table usage. In this paper, we focus on the formal verification of minimax and negamax [9] algorithms in an imperative setting using Dafny, a programming language and verifier designed for writing provably correct programs [6]. Dafny is grounded in Floyd-Hoare logic and supports automated reasoning through constructs such as preconditions, postconditions, assertions, loop invariants, and lemmas. Beyond basic minimax,

negamax, and alpha-beta, we also verify depth-limited variants and explore extensions that incorporate transposition tables, a widely used optimization in practical game-playing engines. Transposition-table-based algorithms are known to be subtle and error-prone, and even small implementation differences can lead to incorrect behavior. Our work shows how formal verification can provide a robust foundation for understanding and reasoning about their correctness.

## 2 Definitions

A game tree is a rooted directed acyclic graph representing the possible evolutions of a two-player game. Each node corresponds to a game position, and each edge to a legal move. Nodes are colored by the player to move: white for the maximizer and gray for the minimizer, as illustrated in Figure 1. Formally, a node is defined as a record with three attributes:

$$\text{Node} = \mathbf{record} \begin{cases} eval & : \text{evaluation value} \\ color & : \text{player to move } (\pm 1) \\ children & : \text{ordered child list} \end{cases}$$

The *eval* field encodes an integer value of a game state: the maximizer ( $color=1$ ) favors higher, while the minimizer ( $color=-1$ ) favors lower values. Internal nodes use heuristic evaluations, while leaves reflect game-theoretic values. The *children* list defines the successors of a node  $u$  in a fixed order, inducing edges  $(u, v)$  iff  $v \in u.children$ . A fixed order is not strictly necessary, but it is commonly used and enables deterministic execution. We assume acyclicity, as repetition rules in games like chess and draughts preclude infinite loops in practice. Nodes abstract from concrete game states: equality is structural, requiring identical *eval*, *color*, and isomorphic subtrees. This suffices for search correctness while avoiding full state representation. Since a node  $u$  implicitly defines the subtree rooted at  $u$ , we use the terms node and game tree interchangeably. For a game tree  $u$  we recursively define  $\text{minimax}(u)$  as

$$\begin{cases} u.eval & \text{if } |u.children| = 0 \\ \min\{\text{minimax}(v) \mid v \in u.children\} & \text{if } |u.children| > 0 \text{ and } u.color = -1 \\ \max\{\text{minimax}(v) \mid v \in u.children\} & \text{if } |u.children| > 0 \text{ and } u.color = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

and  $\text{negamax}(u)$  as

$$\begin{cases} u.color \cdot u.eval & \text{if } |u.children| = 0 \\ \max\{-\text{negamax}(v) \mid v \in u.children\} & \text{if } |u.children| > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

For minimax, we allow the same player to move consecutively. For negamax, the game must be *turn-based*, i.e., for each node  $u$  the following holds:

$$\forall v \in u.children : v.color = -u.color. \quad (3)$$




Fig. 1: Game tree with white maximizer nodes and gray minimizer nodes, labeled with evaluation values.

Note that the two functions are the same up to a sign inversion.

$$\text{negamax}(u) = u.\text{color} \cdot \text{minimax}(u). \quad (4)$$

In depth-limited search, we work with *truncated game trees*. For a game tree  $u$ ,  $[u]_d$  denotes the subtree containing all nodes within distance  $d$  from the root.

## 2.1 Alpha-beta Pruning

Alpha-beta pruning is an optimization of minimax search that avoids exploring parts of the game tree which cannot affect the final decision. The algorithm maintains a window  $(\alpha, \beta)$  of values that are relevant to the outcome: values within this open interval have to be computed exactly, while values outside the window can be approximated without impacting the root decision. This allows the search to terminate early in branches that are irrelevant. We introduce several predicates used in the verification of alpha-beta pruning:

$$\text{is-negamax-ab-result}(x, u, \alpha, \beta) = \text{is-ab-result}(x, \text{negamax}(u), \alpha, \beta) \quad (5)$$

$$\text{is-ab-result}(x, e, \alpha, \beta) = (e \leq x \leq \alpha) \vee (\alpha < e = x < \beta) \vee (\beta \leq x \leq e), \quad (6)$$

where the predicate `is-ab-result` (adapted from [4]) specifies when a value  $x$  is acceptable as an approximation of an exact minimax or negamax value  $e$ . To support reasoning about partial computations, we also define

$$\text{is-partial-negamax-ab-result}(x, u, i, \alpha, \beta) = \text{is-ab-result}(x, \text{pnm}(u, i), \alpha, \beta), \quad (7)$$

where  $\text{pnm}(u, i) = \max\{-\text{negamax}(u.\text{children}[j]) \mid 0 \leq j < i\}$ .

## 2.2 Transposition Tables

A transposition table maps game states to previously computed search results and is used to avoid repeated evaluations by storing entries of the form

$$\text{TableEntry} = \text{record} \begin{cases} \text{value} & \text{approximated minimax or negamax value.} \\ \text{depth} & \text{search depth at evaluation time.} \\ \text{flag} & \text{approximation classification (see below).} \end{cases}$$

The *flag* distinguishes between

$$\begin{cases} \text{exact} & \text{value is an exact minimax value.} \\ \text{lowerbound} & \text{value is a lower bound.} \\ \text{upperbound} & \text{value is an upper bound.} \end{cases}$$

The formal semantics of transposition tables is often underspecified. The primary obstacle is the absence of precise semantics for stored entries. While the flag characterizes the relationship (lower bound, upper bound, or exact result) between the stored value and an exact minimax value, it is unclear which specific game tree this exact minimax value can be tied to. Note that we do not store best moves in the table, as our focus is on the correctness of returned values rather than on search efficiency.

---

**Algorithm 1** Minimax

---

**Input:** A game tree  $u$ .**Output:**  $\text{minimax}(u)$ .MINIMAX( $u$ ):

```

1: if  $|u.children| = 0$  then
2:   return  $u.eval$ 
3: else if  $u.color = -1$  then
4:    $value := \infty$ 
5:   for  $v \in u.children$  do
6:      $value := \min(value, \text{MINIMAX}(v))$ 
7:   return  $value$ 
8: else
9:    $value := -\infty$ 
10:  for  $v \in u.children$  do
11:     $value := \max(value, \text{MINIMAX}(v))$ 
12:  return  $value$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm 2** Negamax

---

**Input:** A game tree  $u$ .**Output:**  $\text{negamax}(u)$ .NEGAMAX( $u$ ):

```

1: if  $|u.children| = 0$  then
2:   return  $u.color \cdot u.eval$ 
3: else
4:    $value := -\infty$ 
5:   for  $v \in u.children$  do
6:      $value := \max(value, -\text{NEGAMAX}(v))$ 
7:   return  $value$ 

```

---

### 3 Algorithm Pseudocode

This section introduces a selection of the game tree search algorithms that we have formally verified using Dafny. The classical MINIMAX algorithm (Algorithm 1) recursively evaluates a game tree to determine the optimal value at the root under perfect play. Each internal node loops over its children to compute either the minimum or maximum value, depending on the player to move. Instead of handling separate cases for minimizing and maximizing nodes NEGAMAX (Algorithm 2), is a reformulation of minimax that exploits symmetry between the players, using negation to unify both into a single recursive structure. We further consider two algorithms that combine depth-limited search, alpha-beta pruning, and transposition tables (TT). NEGAMAXTTW (Algorithm 3, page 10) is a version known through community sources such as Wikipedia (W), though its precise origin is unclear and likely influenced by work such as [7, 2]. NEGAMAXTTM (Algorithm 4, page 10) is a related algorithm from Marsland (M) [7] that uses a different transposition table strategy.

### 4 Verification using Dafny

The modeling of data types in Dafny is straightforward, see Listing 1. While in the pseudocode we used the value  $\infty$ , in our Dafny modeling we use a bounded integer type, where INFINITY is an unspecified positive integer constant. This is also common in practical implementations. The verifier automatically checks that variables remain within the allowed domain. Note that recursive datatypes in Dafny, such as `Node`, are free from cycles by construction. To verify correctness,

**Listing 1** The datatypes used in Dafny

---

```

1  type bounded_int = x:int | -INFINITY <= x <= INFINITY
2  datatype Color = White | Black
3  datatype Node = Node_(eval:bounded_int, color:Color, children:seq<Node>)
4  datatype Flag = Lowerbound | Upperbound | Exact
5  datatype TableEntry = TableEntry_(depth:nat, value:bounded_int, flag:Flag)
6  type TranspositionTable = map<Node, TableEntry>

```

---

we translated each algorithm from pseudocode into Dafny syntax. For example, NEGAMAXTTW in Algorithm 3 corresponds to Dafny Listing 2. Specifications are provided as annotations: **requires** (preconditions) and **ensures** (postconditions) clauses, assertions, loop invariants, and lemmas. Dafny uses an SMT solver to verify their correctness on all code paths.

**Formal Specification of Transposition Table Search** For depth-limited transposition-table-based algorithms NEGAMAXTT[W,M], the returned results may depend on values computed earlier in unrelated parts of the game tree, potentially at greater depth than required at the current node. The algorithm effectively explores an *expansion* of the truncated depth- $d$  tree by greedily reusing deeper search results via the transposition table. This behavior is illustrated in Figure 2(r), where the primary search unfolds as a triangle-shaped subtree rooted at the current node. Upon a transposition table hit, the algorithm may reuse a value previously computed in a deeper search of a different subtree. So not only the nodes in the truncated depth- $d$  tree contribute to the search result, but also recursively the nodes in these (reused) subtrees. This motivates our notion of a *witness*, a concrete expansion of the truncated tree that merges all such reused subtrees into a single game tree. Correctness is then characterized by the existence of a witness whose minimax (or negamax) value equals the value returned by the algorithm.

We now formalize this idea. For any result returned by the algorithm on input tree  $u$  and depth-limit  $d$ , there must exist a game tree  $u'$ , the witness, that justifies the returned value. The following conditions must hold:

1.  $[u]_d \subseteq u' \subseteq u$ , meaning that  $u'$  is an expansion of the truncated tree  $[u]_d$ .
2. For every node  $z$  in  $u'$ , either all the children of  $z$  in  $u$  are in  $u'$ , or none.
3.  $\text{NEGAMAXTT}[W,M](u, \alpha, \beta, \text{depth}, T) = \text{negamax}(u')$ .

In Appendix C we formalize conditions 1 and 2 in the predicate *is-aon-expansion* (*all-or-none expansion*) and express the correctness of the algorithm as follows:

$$\text{is-negamax-tt-result}(\text{result}, u, \alpha, \beta, \text{depth}) = \exists u' : \text{is-aon-expansion}(u', u, \text{depth}) \wedge \text{is-negamax-ab-result}(\text{result}, u', \alpha, \beta). \quad (8)$$




Fig. 2: Schematic truncated game tree showing the visited/pruned nodes for depth- $d$  searching without (l) and with (m) transposition table. The expansion (r) with all nodes directly and indirectly contributing to the table-based search.

Moreover, for every entry  $t$  stored in the transposition table we require the existence of a witness, justifying that entry. This is formalized as follows:

$$\text{is-valid-table-entry}(t, u) = \exists u' : \text{is-aon-expansion}(u', u, t.\text{depth}) \wedge \begin{cases} t.\text{value} \geq \text{negamax}(u'), & \text{if } t.\text{flag} = \text{upperbound} \\ t.\text{value} = \text{negamax}(u'), & \text{if } t.\text{flag} = \text{exact} \\ t.\text{value} \leq \text{negamax}(u'), & \text{if } t.\text{flag} = \text{lowerbound} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

We put no restrictions on the entries stored into the transposition table. At every iteration of the algorithm, we allow the table's contents to change arbitrarily, as long as the entries remain valid. This reflects practical implementations, where transposition tables are typically realized using hash tables: insertions may overwrite existing entries due to collisions or replacement strategies.

**Verification of NegamaxTTW** We formally verified Algorithm 3 against the correctness criteria in equations (8) and (9). Dafny checked that the implementation satisfies its specification in all cases, leaving no unverified code paths. This provides a formal guarantee that the algorithm behaves correctly for any valid input. The Dafny code for this verification spans approximately 850 lines for this algorithm alone. A major part of the effort also involved crafting suitable loop invariants, and managing Dafny's interaction with the underlying SMT solver, Z3. Proofs involving quantifiers are especially prone to excessive memory usage and solver timeouts. A substantial amount of work went into splitting proofs into smaller lemmas, along with other techniques to reduce solver load and maintain proof stability. The Dafny code for the algorithm is included in Appendix 4; the specifications and supporting lemmas, which constitute the bulk of the verification work, are available in a GitHub repository [10].

**Verification of NegamaxTTM** We also made a detailed analysis of Marsland's algorithm [7], see Algorithm 4 and Appendix B for a comparison with




Fig. 3: Counterexample to NEGAMAXTTM. Node  $v$  (with double border) is searched twice. Call (b) stores a lower bound of 3 in the transposition table. Call (c) reuses this result in a shallower search with a wider window, leading to an unexpected return value. Dotted nodes are not visited during search.

NEGAMAXTTW. This resulted in a hand-crafted counterexample, demonstrating that this variant does not satisfy our witness-based correctness criterion. The full counterexample is shown in Figure 3(a). The algorithm is invoked at the root node  $u$  with alpha-beta window  $(0, 5)$ , depth 6, and an initially empty transposition table. This call triggers two recursive calls to a shared child node  $v$  (drawn with a double border). No entries are removed during the search. The results of the calls are:

- (a)  $\text{NEGAMAXTTM}(u, \alpha = 0, \beta = 5, \text{depth} = 6, T = \emptyset) = 2$  (exact) (10)
- (b)  $\text{NEGAMAXTTM}(v, \alpha = 0, \beta = 2, \text{depth} = 4, T) = 3$  (lowerbound)
- (c)  $\text{NEGAMAXTTM}(v, \alpha = 0, \beta = 5, \text{depth} = 2, T) = 2$  (upperbound)

The transposition table  $T$  is updated after call (b), and its contents are reused in call (c). In particular,  $T$  contains the entry  $(v, \text{value} = 3, \text{depth} = 4, \text{flag} = \text{lowerbound})$  when call (c) begins. According to our correctness criterion, the result of a depth-2 search at  $v$  must be justified by some expansion of  $\lfloor v \rfloor_2$  whose full negamax evaluation equals 2. However, among the four possible expansions of  $\lfloor v \rfloor_2$ , the resulting values are 1, 3, 4, and 4 — none of which match the returned result. Hence, no suitable witness exists, and the correctness condition (8) is

violated. The root cause appears to be the reuse of a lower bound (3) computed with alpha-beta window (0, 2) in a search with a wider alpha-beta window (0, 5). This reuse leads to pruning of a child node with value 1, which, if unpruned, would yield a better result.

Notably, the full depth-6 search in call (a) also returns the value 2, even though the parent node of the child with value 2 has a child with value 1 that is within the search horizon. According to minimax principles, a minimizing player is expected to prefer a child with value 1 over one with value 2. Whether this outcome signals an undesirable behavior or points to the need for an alternative correctness notion remains an open question.

## 5 Results

Our first contribution is the introduction of a witness-based correctness criterion for depth-limited game tree search with transposition tables. This notion formalizes the intuitive requirement that the returned value must correspond to the exact evaluation of some fully explored subtree (the witness).

As a second contribution, we applied this correctness notion to two representative algorithms. We successfully verified the NEGAMAXTTW algorithm in Dafny, providing, to our knowledge, the first formal proof of correctness for a depth-limited transposition-table-based negamax search with alpha-beta pruning. In contrast, a variant by Marsland [7] (with best move tracking omitted) was shown to violate the criterion, based on a concrete counterexample. Whether this outcome reflects a shortcoming in the Marsland variant or highlights the need for a different correctness notion remains an open question.

Beyond these case studies, we developed and verified over 15 variations of minimax and negamax algorithms, ranging from basic recursive definitions to depth-limited and alpha-beta optimized versions. All verification artifacts, including Dafny proofs and Python implementations with randomized testing, are available on GitHub [10]. The most complex case, NEGAMAXTTW, verifies in approximately 4 seconds with Dafny 4.10.0.

## 6 Conclusions

This work illustrates the potential of formal verification in reasoning about correctness properties of game tree search algorithms, particularly when optimizations such as transposition tables are involved.

Our main contribution is a general and intuitive witness-based correctness criterion, suitable for verifying depth-limited search algorithms with or without alpha-beta pruning. We showed that this criterion is sufficient to prove the correctness of the NEGAMAXTTW algorithm, but not of a variant by Marsland [7], highlighting how small algorithmic changes can invalidate formal correctness arguments. These results demonstrate the importance of precise semantics in verifying optimized search techniques. More broadly, our work showcases Dafny's

suitability for verifying recursive, stateful algorithms with complex invariants, as commonly found in AI for games.

We propose two directions for future work. A logical continuation of our work is to include the formalization of other search algorithms such as *SSS\** and *MTD(f)*. A second direction is the extension of correctness reasoning to quantum variants of game tree search. Recent advances in quantum program verification (e.g., [12]) suggest a pathway toward bringing formal techniques to this emerging domain.

**Disclosure of Interests.** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

## References

1. Bird, R.S., Hughes, J.: The alpha-beta algorithm: An exercise in program transformation. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **24**(1), 53–57 (1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(87\)90198-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(87)90198-0)
2. Breuker, D.: Memory versus Search in Games. Ph.d. thesis, Maastricht University, Maastricht (1998). <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.19981016db>, supervised by Hendrik van den Herik
3. Fishburn, J.P.: An optimization of alpha-beta search. *SIGART Newsl.* **72**, 29–31 (1980). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1056447.1056450>
4. Fishburn, J.P.: Another optimization of alpha-beta search. *SIGART Newsl.* **84**, 37–38 (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1056623.1056628>
5. Knuth, D.E., Moore, R.W.: An analysis of alpha-beta pruning. *Artif. Intell.* **6**(4), 293–326 (1975). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702\(75\)90019-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(75)90019-3)
6. Leino, R.: Dafny: An automatic program verifier for functional correctness. In: 16th International Conference, LPAR-16, Dakar, Senegal. pp. 348–370. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (April 2010). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17511-4\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17511-4_20)
7. Marsland, T.A.: A review of game-tree pruning. *ICCA Journal* **9**(1), 3–19 (1986). <https://doi.org/10.3233/ICG-1986-9102>
8. Nipkow, T., et al.: Functional Data Structures and Algorithms: A Proof Assistant Approach. ACM Books, self-published (Jun 2024), <https://functional-algorithms-verified.org/>
9. Stockman, G.C.: A minimax algorithm better than alpha-beta? *Artif. Intell.* **12**(2), 179–196 (1979). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702\(79\)90016-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(79)90016-X)
10. Wesselink, W.: Minimax verification. <https://github.com/wiegerw/minimax> (2025), accessed: 2025-07-16
11. Wikipedia contributors: Negamax — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negamax> (2025), [Online; accessed 09-June-2025]
12. Ying, M.: Floyd-Hoare logic for quantum programs. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **33**(6), 19:1–19:49 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2049706.2049708>

---

**Algorithm 3** Transposition-table-based search from Wikipedia [11].

---

**Input:** A game tree  $u$ , an alpha-beta window  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and a transposition table  $T$ .**Output:** A value  $value$  such that  $\text{is-negamax-tt-value}(value, u, \alpha, \beta, depth)$ NEGAMAXTTW( $u, \alpha, \beta, depth, T$ ):

```

1:  $\alpha_0 := \alpha$ 
2: if  $u \in T$  then ▷ Do a lookup in the table
3:    $t := T[u]$ 
4:   if  $t.depth \geq depth$  then
5:     if  $t.flag = \text{exact}$  then return  $t.value$ 
6:     else if  $t.flag = \text{lowerbound} \wedge t.value \geq \beta$  then return  $t.value$ 
7:     else if  $t.flag = \text{upperbound} \wedge t.value \leq \alpha$  then return  $t.value$ 
8:   if  $depth = 0 \vee |u.children| = 0$  then ▷ Do a negamax search
9:     return  $u.color \cdot u.eval$ 
10:   $value := -\infty$ 
11:  for  $v \in u.children$  do
12:     $value := \max(value, -\text{NEGAMAXTTW}(v, -\beta, -\alpha, depth - 1, T))$ 
13:     $\alpha := \max(\alpha, value)$ 
14:    if  $\alpha \geq \beta$  then break
15:  if  $value \leq \alpha_0$  then  $T[u] := (value, depth, \text{upperbound})$  ▷ Update the table
16:  else if  $value \geq \beta$  then  $T[u] := (value, depth, \text{lowerbound})$ 
17:  else  $T[u] := (value, depth, \text{exact})$ 
18:  return  $value$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm 4** Transposition-table-based search from Marsland [7].

---

**Input:** A game tree  $u$ , an alpha-beta window  $(\alpha, \beta)$  and a transposition table  $T$ .NEGAMAXTTM( $u, \alpha, \beta, depth, T$ ):

```

1: if  $u \in T$  then ▷ Do a lookup in the table
2:    $t := T[u]$ 
3:   if  $t.depth \geq depth$  then
4:     if  $t.flag = \text{exact}$  then return  $t.value$ 
5:     else if  $t.flag = \text{lowerbound}$  then  $\alpha := \max(\alpha, t.value)$ 
6:     else if  $t.flag = \text{upperbound}$  then  $\beta := \min(\beta, t.value)$ 
7:     if  $\alpha \geq \beta$  then return  $t.value$ 
8:   if  $depth = 0 \vee |u.children| = 0$  then ▷ Do a negamax search
9:     return  $u.color \cdot u.eval$ 
10:   $value := -\infty$ 
11:  for  $v \in u.children$  do
12:     $value := \max(value, -\text{NEGAMAXTTM}(v, -\beta, -\max(\alpha, value), depth - 1, T))$ 
13:    if  $value \geq \beta$  then break
14:   $flag := \text{exact}$  ▷ Update the table
15:  if  $value \leq \alpha$  then  $flag := \text{upperbound}$ 
16:  if  $value \geq \beta$  then  $flag := \text{lowerbound}$ 
17:  if  $u \notin T \vee T[u].depth \leq depth$  then  $T[u] := (value, depth, flag)$ 
18:  return  $value$ 

```

---

## A Verification of NegamaxTTW

---

**Listing 2** Dafny verification of NEGAMAXTTW
 

---

```

1 class NegamaxAlgorithm
2 {
3   var T: TranspositionTable
4
5   method Negamax(u: Node, alpha0: bounded_int, beta0: bounded_int, depth:nat)
6     returns (result: bounded_int)
7     modifies this:T
8     requires alpha0 < beta0
9     requires turn_based()
10    requires is_valid_table(T)
11    ensures is_negamax_tt_result(result, u, alpha0, beta0, depth)
12    ensures is_valid_table(T)
13  {
14    var alpha, beta := alpha0, beta0;
15    if u in T.Keys
16    {
17      var t := T[u];
18      if t.depth >= depth && ((t.flag == Lowerbound && t.value >= beta) ||
19        (t.flag == Exact) || (t.flag == Upperbound && t.value <= alpha))
20      {
21        TableLookupReturnLemma(u, alpha, beta, depth, t, T);
22        return t.value;
23      }
24    }
25    if depth == 0 || |u.children| == 0
26    {
27      DepthZeroReturnLemma(u, depth, alpha0, beta0);
28      return color(u) * u.eval;
29    }
30    var value: bounded_int := -INFINITY;
31    for i := 0 to |u.children|
32      invariant is_valid_table(T)
33      invariant 0 <= i <= |u.children|
34      invariant i == 0 ==> value == -INFINITY && alpha == alpha0
35      invariant alpha0 <= alpha < beta0
36      invariant value <= alpha0 ==> alpha == alpha0
37      invariant alpha0 < value < beta0 ==> value == alpha
38      invariant i > 0 ==> exists u': Node :: is_expansion(u', u, depth) &&
39        is_partial_negamax_ab_result(value, u', i, alpha0, beta0)
40      invariant i == |u.children| ==>
41        is_negamax_tt_result(value, u, alpha0, beta0, depth)
42    {
43      ghost var old_alpha := alpha;
44      ghost var old_value := value;
45      var v := u.children[i];
46      var negamax_v := Negamax(v, -beta, -alpha, depth - 1);
47      value := max(value, -negamax_v);
48      alpha := max(alpha, value);
49      if alpha >= beta
50      {
51        LoopBreakLemma(u, v, i, depth, alpha0, beta0, old_alpha, old_value,
52          alpha, value, negamax_v);
53        break;
54      }
55      LoopMaintenanceLemma(u, v, i, depth, alpha0, beta0, old_alpha,
56        old_value, alpha, value, negamax_v);
57    }
58    TableUpdateLemma(value, u, alpha0, beta0, depth, T);
59    if value <= alpha0 {T := T[u:=TableEntry_(depth,value,Upperbound)];}
60    else if alpha0 < value < beta0 {T:=T[u:=TableEntry_(depth,value,Exact)];}
61    else if value >= beta0 {T := T[u:=TableEntry_(depth,value,Lowerbound)];}
62    return value;
63  }

```

---

## B The NegamaxTTM Algorithm

Algorithm 4 is a slightly simplified version of the transposition-table-based search algorithm by Marsland [7]. Special handling of the best move has been removed. This algorithm differs from the Wikipedia version in Algorithm 3 in four respects:

1. **Transposition Table Lookup** (lines 1–7): Stored bounds are used to narrow the alpha-beta window rather than terminate search immediately.
2. **Value propagation** (lines 12–13): Fishburn’s fail-soft scheme [4] is used, which differs in how intermediate bounds are propagated during recursion.
3. **Flag Assignment** (line 15): Results are classified against the current  $\alpha$  rather than the initial alpha-beta window.
4. **Depth-Preserving Updates** (line 17): Existing entries are retained when their search depth exceeds that of the new result.

Verification of this algorithm was unsuccessful, as discussed in Section 4. The failure stems from the first difference: narrowing the alpha-beta window based on a stored bound can lead to unexpected pruning. In contrast, differences 2, 3, and 4 can be safely incorporated into Algorithm 3 without compromising correctness.

One subtle issue arises with difference 3 when it is applied to Algorithm 3. If the current value of  $\alpha$  is used, the three cases in the corresponding if statement may no longer be mutually exclusive. To restore correctness, the order of these cases must be adjusted: the lower bound case must precede the upper bound case. This requirement is non-obvious and difficult to detect without the aid of a formal verifier.

## C Formal definition of all-or-none expansions

In Section 4 all-or-none expansions were introduced. The formal definition is given below. For a node  $u$ , let  $C = u.children$  and  $C' = u'.children$ . The predicate *is-aon-expansion* is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{is-aon-expansion}(u', u, d) &= u.eval = u'.eval \wedge u.color = u'.color \wedge & (11) \\ &\begin{cases} (|C| = |C'| \wedge \forall i \in [0, |v|) : \text{is-aon-expansion}(C'_i, C_i, d - 1)), & \text{if } d > 0 \\ (|C'| = 0 \vee (|C| = |C'| \wedge \forall i \in [0, |v|) : \text{is-aon-expansion}(C'_i, C_i, 0))), & \text{if } d = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that every all-or-none expansion  $u'$  includes the truncated tree  $\lfloor u \rfloor_d$  as a subtree.