Learning Game Board Evaluation

CSE 60171 – Al Semester Project

Allison Regier Shawn O'Neil

The Problem

In a MiniMax framework, designing evaluation functions for games can be difficult.

Can we develop an evaluation function which learns relative utilities over board states by playing games repeatedly?



Solution 1: StringEval

Learns utilities over each board state, has no opinion about boards it hasn't seen. Unable to generalize across boards.

Solution 2: FeaturesEval

Learns utilities over individual features of board states, combines features utilities to get board utility. Able to generalize features across similar boards.

The Solution

Solution 3: NeuralEval

Use a neural network to predict the utility of a given board state.

Inputs: Each square on the board is an input Outputs: Probability of white winning, probability of a tie

Hidden layer with some number of nodes. Utility based on some combination of the outputs of the neural network.

The Solution



StringEval Overview

Board States Encoded Uniquely As Strings:



And Associated With a Utility:

- 0:-1:-1:1:1:0:-1:0:-1 0.75
- 1:-1:1:1:-1:-1:0:0 1.50
- -1:-1:0:1:-1:1:-1:0:1 0.50

StringEval Overview

At End of Game, Adjust Utilities For States Seen Based on Winner and Move Number:



 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$

FeaturesEval Overview

Board States Encoded As Array of Features

			Num 1's:	3
			Num -1's:	3
			Longest Row 1's:	3
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	$\left \bigcirc\right.$	Longest Row -1's:	2
			•••	

Each Value For Each Feature is Given Utility:

Num 1's:	Num 1's:	Longest Row 1's:	
1: 0.75	1:-0.10	1: 1.57	•••
2:-1.25	2:2.35	2: 0.01	
3: 0.96	3:5.07	3: 2.53	

FeaturesEval Overview

Compute Board Utility as Sum of Feature Utils:



Update Util's For Feature/Value's by History



TicTacToe StringEval



"Cat's Game" - Ties are Optimal Medium/Large State Space Hand Trained Explores Important States

Pawns 3x3 StringEval



Also "Cat's Game" - Ties are Optimal Small State Space – Quick Learning

Pawns 6x6 StringEval



Very Large State Space No Learning (In 2K Training Games...)

Pawns 4x4 StringEval Exploring



Learning curve is much slower with exploring.

Pawns 4x4 StringEval Exploring



More compressed learning with smaller explore factor

Othello 8x8 StringEval



Another Very Large State Space Some Wins/Ties By Chance (Search depth 4)

TicTacToe FeaturesEval(0)



"Cat's Game" - Ties are Optimal Very Quick Initial Learning – Despite # States Erratic Changes in Hand Trained?

Pawns 3x3 FeaturesEval(0)



Again, "Cat's Game" - Ties are Optimal Quick Initial Learning Again, Erratic Changes with Hand Trained

Pawns 6x6 FeaturesEval(0)



No Learning For Self Trained Minimal Learning on Hand Trained Hand Trained Dropoff ~ Over Learning?

Othello 8x8 FeaturesEval(0)



Decent/Good Performance Very Quick Initial Learning Some Slower Learning Over Next ~200 Games

Pawns 4x4 NeuralEval



Seems pretty random

Relatively good performance with no training??

Possible Uses

Because of the speed of learning with the FeaturesEval, it may be possible to use it to learn to play against a human at about their own level. Having an opponent of about equal skill level is usually more fun.

Unanswered Questions

Why didn't our neural net learner work? Given the good results with TDGammon, we expected this to work better.

Not enough time to adjust parameters (hidden layers, learning factor, lamda)

Unlike backgammon, our games have no stochastic factor (dice roll). Not exploring enough of the state space? Utility function "less" continuous?

Unanswered Questions

When does overlearning occur? How can we prevent it?

If we wanted to actually play against these players, we would want to stop the training phase before they start overlearning.

Possibly: Keep a periodic snapshot and record the record, choose the best snapshot.

Demo: Othello 6x6 FeaturesEval(0)



Demo: Uses Hand Trained FeaturesEval Trained on 500 Games