

University of Groningen

## Exploration methods for connectionist Q-learning in bomberman

Kormelink, J.G.; Drugan, M.M.; Wiering, Marco

*Published in:*

ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence

*DOI:*

[10.5220/0006556403550362](https://doi.org/10.5220/0006556403550362)

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Kormelink, J. G., Drugan, M. M., & Wiering, M. A. (2018). Exploration methods for connectionist Q-learning in bomberman. In ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence (pp. 355-362). (ICAART 2018 - Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence; Vol. 2). SciTePress. DOI: 10.5220/0006556403550362

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

# Exploration Methods for Connectionist Q-learning in Bomberman

Joseph Groot Kormelink<sup>1</sup>, Madalina M. Drugan<sup>2</sup> and Marco A. Wiering<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Engineering, University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

<sup>2</sup>*ITLearns.Online, The Netherlands*

**Keywords:** Reinforcement Learning, Computer Games, Exploration Methods, Neural Networks.

**Abstract:** In this paper, we investigate which exploration method yields the best performance in the game Bomberman. In Bomberman the controlled agent has to kill opponents by placing bombs. The agent is represented by a multi-layer perceptron that learns to play the game with the use of Q-learning. We introduce two novel exploration strategies: Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  and Interval-Q, which base their explorative behavior on the temporal-difference error of Q-learning. The learning capabilities of these exploration strategies are compared to five existing methods: Random-Walk, Greedy,  $\epsilon$ -Greedy, Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy, and Max-Boltzmann. The results show that the methods that combine exploration with exploitation perform much better than the Random-Walk and Greedy strategies, which only select exploration or exploitation actions. Furthermore, the results show that Max-Boltzmann exploration performs the best in overall from the different techniques. The Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  exploration strategy also performs very well, but suffers from an unstable learning behavior.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) methods are computational methods that allow an agent to learn from its interaction with a specific environment. After perceiving the current state, the agent reasons about which action to select in order to obtain most rewards in the future. Reinforcement learning has been widely applied to games (Mnih et al., 2013; Shantia et al., 2011; Bom et al., 2013; Szita, 2012). To deal with the large state spaces involved in many games, often a multi-layer perceptron is used to store the value function of the agent, where the value function forms the basis of most RL research. An aspect which has received little attention from the research community is the question which exploration strategy is most useful in combination with connectionist Q-learning to learn to play games.

We use Q-learning (Watkins and Dayan, 1992) with a multi-layer perceptron to let an agent learn to play the game Bomberman. Bomberman is a strategic maze game where the player must kill other players to become the winner. The player controls one of the Bomberman players and must, by means of placing bombs, kill the other players. To get to the other players, one first removes a set of walls by placing bombs. Afterwards, the agent needs to navigate to its opponents and trap them by strategically placing bombs.

The player wins the game if all opponents have died due to exploding bombs in their vicinity.

We study how different exploration strategies perform when combined with connectionist Q-learning for learning to play Bomberman. We introduce two novel exploration strategies: Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  and Interval-Q, which use the TD-error of Q-learning to change their explorative behavior. These exploration strategies will be compared to five existing techniques: Random-Walk, Greedy,  $\epsilon$ -Greedy, Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy and Max-Boltzmann. The agent plays a huge number of games against three fixed opponents that use the same behavior to measure its performance. For this, the average amount of points gathered by the adaptive agent is measured together with its win rate over time. The results show that the methods that only rely on exploration (Random-Walk) or exploitation (Greedy) perform much worse than all other methods. Furthermore, Max-Boltzmann obtains the best results in overall, although the proposed Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  strategy performs best during the first 800,000 training games out of a total of 1,000,000 games. The problem of Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  is that it can become unstable, which negatively affects its performance when trained for longer times.

In Section 2, we describe the implementation of the game together with the used state representation for the adaptive agent and the implemented fixed be-




Figure 1: Starting position of all Bombermen. Brown walls are breakable, grey walls are unbreakable. The  $7 \times 7$  grid is surrounded by another unbreakable wall, which is not shown here.

havior of the opponent agents. In Section 3, we explain reinforcement learning algorithms and in Section 4 we present the different exploration methods that are compared. Section 5 describes the experimental setup and the results, and the paper is concluded in Section 6.

## 2 BOMBERMAN

Bomberman is a strategic maze-based video game developed by Hudson Soft in 1983. The goal is to finish some assignment by means of placing bombs. We focus on the multi-player variant of Bomberman where the goal is to kill other players and be the last man standing. At the beginning of the game all four players start in opposing corners of the grid, see Figure 1. The Bombermen have 6 possible moves they can take to transition through the game: up, down, left, right, wait, place bomb. The grid is filled with two types of obstacles: breakable and not breakable. Before the player can kill its opponents, the player needs to pave a path through the grid. Since the grid is filled with obstacles at the start of the game, players need to break destructible objects in order to reach other players.

We have developed a framework that implements Bomberman in a discrete manner on a  $7 \times 7$  grid. The amount of states can be approximately computed in the following way. There are 42 positions (including death) for four agents, two different states for the 28 breakable walls (empty, standing), and two states for 40 positions that determine if there is a bomb at a position or not. This results in  $42^4 \times 2^{28} \times 2^{40} \approx 10^{26}$

different states.

Every Bomberman is controlled by an agent. The game state is sent to the agents, which then determine their next moves. After the actions have been executed, the consequences of the actions are communicated to the agents in the form of rewards. The actions are executed simultaneously so that no agent has an advantage. After a bomb has been placed it will wait 5 time-steps before it explodes. If a bomb explodes all hits with players and breakable walls are calculated. An agent or wall is hit, if it either horizontally or vertically no more than 2 cells away from the position of the bomb. Players are allowed to occupy the same position or to move through each other. A turn (or time-step) therefore consists of: determining the actions, executing the actions and then calculating hits. If there is a hit with a breakable wall, the wall vanishes. If a bomb explosion hits a player, the player dies. If all players die simultaneously, no one wins. As the game progresses, agents gain more freedom due to the vanishing walls. Therefore, the agents can walk around for a long time, which poses problems because the game can last for infinity. After 150 time-steps, additional bombs are placed at random locations and the amount of bombs placed afterwards increases every time-step. This leads finally to very harsh game dynamics, in which it is impossible for all Bombermen to stay alive for a long time.

**State Representation.** The game state is transformed into an input vector for the learning agent, which will be used by the multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to learn the utility (value) of performing each possible action. The game environment is divided in  $7 \times 7$  grid cells, where every cell represents a position. The agent can fully observe the environment. Therefore for each cell 4 values are computed:

- Free, breakable, obstructed cell (1, 0, -1)
- Position contains the player (1, 0)
- Position contains an opponent (1, 0)
- Danger level of position ( $-1 \leq \text{danger} \leq 1$ )

Danger is measured as  $\frac{\text{Time passed}}{\text{Time needed to explode}}$ , where a bomb takes 5 time-steps after it is placed until it explodes. The danger value is negative if the bomb has been placed by the player and positive if it has been placed by an opponent (or environment). In this way, the agent can learn to distinct between danger areas caused by a bomb it placed itself or caused by a bomb placed by an opponent (or the environment after 150 time-steps). The state representation containing  $49 \times 4 = 196$  inputs is sent to the MLP, which will be trained using Q-learning as described in Section 3.

**Opponents.** To evaluate how well the different methods can learn to play the game, we use a fixed opponent strategy against which the adaptive agent plays. For this we implemented a hard coded opponent algorithm, which generates the fixed behavior of the three opponent agents. The opponent algorithm consists of 3 elements, see Algorithm 1, which will now be described.

1) The agent always searches for cover in the neighbourhood of a bomb. In Algorithm 1, we can see this in the first conditional statement. The agent searches for cover by calculating the utility of every action. It does this by iterating through all bombs that are within hit-range of the Bomberman. If a Bomberman is within hit-range of a bomb, a utility value is calculated for every action. We separate the x- and y-axis in the distance and utility calculations. Therefore, actions that make sure the Bomberman and the bomb are no longer on the same x and y axis get a higher utility. Finally, the action with the highest utility gets selected, if there are bombs in the agent's vicinity.

2) Next to not getting hit by exploding bombs, it is important that the agent destroys breakable walls with its bombs. If an agent is surrounded by 3 walls (including the boundaries not visible in Figure 1), it will place a bomb. If the agent is surrounded by 3 walls, there has to be at least one breakable wall. The combination of placing bombs when surrounded by walls and searching for cover in the neighbourhood of bombs works well, because it shows incentive of opening up paths while staying clear of bombs.

3) If there are no bombs and not enough walls the algorithm produces random behaviour. When it performs a random action, it might very well be possible that the action is placing a bomb, after which the agent might search for cover again. This algorithm is called semi-random because the behaviour is mostly guided, but random at times. Note that the opponent's behavior is fairly simple, because it does not place bombs near other players, but still challenging, because of their bomb-cover behavior.

### 3 REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

Reinforcement learning (Sutton and Barto, 2015) is a type of machine learning that allows agents to automatically learn the optimal behaviour from its interaction with an environment. Each time-step the agent receives the state information from the environment and selects an action from its action space depending on the learned value function and the exploration strategy that is being followed. After executing an ac-

---

**Algorithm 1:** Semi-Random Opponent.

---

```

possibleA = ReturnPossibleActions(player)
bombList = SurroundingBombs(player)
if bombList.NotEmpty() then
    utilityList[] = possibleA.Size()
    for a : possibleA do
        for bomb : BombList do
            possiblePos = MakeAction(a, player)
            curUtility = Dist(bomb, possiblePos)
            utilityList[a] += curUtility
        end for
    end for
    bestUtility = IndexMax(utilityList)
    return(possibleA[bestUtility])
end if
SBT(obj) = SurroundedByThreeWalls(obj)
if SBT(player) == TRUE then
    return(placeBomb)
end if
return(RandomAction())

```

---

tion the agent receives a reward, which is a numerical representation of the direct consequence of the action it executed. The difference between the received reward plus the next value for the best action and the actual value for the current state is the TD-error. The goal of learning is to minimize the TD-error, so the agent can predict the consequences of its actions and select the actions that lead to the highest expected sum of future rewards.

A Markov Decision Process (MDP) is a model for fully-observable sequential decision making problems in stochastic environments.  $S$  is a finite set of states, where  $s_t \in S$  is the state at time-step  $t$ .  $A$  is a finite set of actions, where  $a_t \in A$  is the action executed at time-step  $t$ . The reward function  $R(s, a, s')$  denotes the expected reward when transitioning from state  $s$  to state  $s'$  after executing action  $a$ . The reward at time-step  $t$  is denoted with  $r_t$ . The transition function  $P(s, a, s')$  gives the probability of ending up in state  $s'$  after selecting action  $a$  in state  $s$ . The discount factor  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  assigns a lower importance to future rewards for optimal decision making.

**Tabular Q-learning.** The policy of an agent is a mapping between states and actions. Learning the optimal policy of an agent is done using Q-learning (Watkins and Dayan, 1992). For every state-action pair a Q-value  $Q(s, a)$  denotes the expected sum of rewards obtained after performing action  $a$  in state  $s$ . Q-learning updates the Q-function using the information obtained after selecting an action  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  using the following update rule:



$$Q(s_t, a_t) = Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \delta_t \quad (1)$$

with:

$$\delta_t = r_t + \gamma \max_a Q(s_{t+1}, a) - Q(s_t, a_t) \quad (2)$$

In equation 1,  $\delta_t$  is the temporal-difference error (TD-error) of Q-learning computed with equation 2. The learning rate  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  is used to regulate how fast the Q-value is pushed in a certain direction. When the next-state  $s_{t+1}$  is an absorbing final state, then the Q-values for all actions in such a state are set to 0 in equation 2. Furthermore, when a game ends, then a new game is started. Q-learning is an off-policy algorithm, which means that it learns independently of the agent's selected next action induced by its exploration policy. If the agent would try out all actions in all states an infinite amount of times, Q-learning with lookup tables converges to the optimal policy for finite MDPs.

**Multi-layer Perceptron.** A problem is that large state spaces require a lot of memory, since every state uses its own Q-value for every action. When using lookup tables, Q-learning needs to explore all actions in all states before being able to infer which action is best in a specific state.

To solve these issues regarding space and time complexity, the agent uses an MLP. An MLP is a feed-forward neural network that maps an input vector that represents the state, to an output vector, that represents the Q-values for all actions. The MLP consists of a single hidden-layer in which the sigmoid function is used as activation function. The MLP uses a linear output function for the output units, so it can also predict values outside of the [0,1] range. As input the complete game state representation containing 196 features, as described in Section 2, is presented to the MLP. The output of the MLP is a vector with 6 values, where every value represents a Q-value for a corresponding action. The MLP is initialized randomly, which means that it needs to learn what Q-values correspond to the state-action pairs. We do this by backpropagating the TD-error computed with equation 2 through the MLP to update the weights in order to decrease the TD-error for action  $a_t$  in state  $s_t$ . After training, The MLP computes the appropriate Q-values for a specific state without storing all different Q-values for all states.

**Reward Function.** We transform action consequences into something that Q-learning can use to learn the Q-function by giving in-game events a numerical reward. For learning the optimal behavior, the rewards of different objectives should be set carefully so that maximizing the obtained rewards results

in the desired behavior. The used in-game events and rewards for Bomberman are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Reward Function.

Event	Reward
Kill a player	100
Break a wall	30
Perform action	-1
Perform impossible action	-2
Die	-300

These rewards have been carefully chosen to clearly distinct between good and bad actions. Dying is represented by a very negative reward. The reward of killing a player is attributed to the player that actually placed the involved bomb. The rest of the rewards promote active behaviour. No reward is given to finally winning the game (when all other players died). In order to maximize the total reward intake, the agent should learn not to die, and kill as many opponents and break most walls with its bombs. In the experiments, a discount factor of 0.95 is used.

## 4 EXPLORATION METHODS

Q-learning with a multi-layer perceptron allows the agent to approximate the sum of received rewards after selecting an action in a particular state. If the agent always selects the action with the highest Q-value in a state, the agent never explores the consequences of other possible actions in that state, and, consequently, it does not learn the optimal Q-function and policy. On the other hand, if the agent selects many exploration actions, the agent performs randomly. The problem of optimally balancing exploration and exploitation is known as the exploration / exploitation dilemma (Thrun, 1992). There are many different exploration methods, and in this paper we introduce two novel exploration strategies that we compare with 5 existing exploration methods. The best performing method is the method that gathers the most points (rewards) and obtains the highest final win rate.

### 4.1 Existing Exploration Strategies

We will now describe 5 different existing strategies for determining which action to select given a state and the current Q-function. The first method, Random-Walk, does not use the Q-function at all. The second method, Greedy, never selects exploration actions. The other three exploration strategies balance exploration with exploitation by using the Q-function and randomness in the action selection.

**Random-Walk** exploration executes a randomly chosen action every time-step. This method produces completely random behaviour, and is therefore good as a simple baseline algorithm to compare other methods to. Because Q-learning is an off-policy algorithm, for a finite MDP it can still learn the optimal policy when only selecting random actions due to the use of the max-operator in equation 2.

**Greedy** method is the complete opposite of the Random-Walk exploration strategy. This method assumes the current Q-function is highly accurate and therefore every action is based on exploitation. The agent always takes the action with the highest Q-value, because it assumes that this is the best action. Greedy tries to solve some problems of Random-Walk in the game Bomberman: if the agent dies constantly in the early game, the agent will not get to explore the later part of the game. This could be solved by taking no bad actions and this could be achieved by only taking actions with the highest Q-value, although this requires the Q-function to be very accurate, which in general it will not be. Because this method never selects exploration actions, it can often not be used for learning the optimal policy.

**$\epsilon$ -Greedy** exploration is one of the most used and simplest methods that trades off exploration with exploitation. It uses the parameter  $\epsilon$  to determine what percentage of the actions is randomly selected. The parameter falls in the range  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ , where 0 translates to no exploration and 1 to only exploration. The action with the highest Q-value is chosen with probability  $1 - \epsilon$  and a random action is selected otherwise. The MLP is initialized randomly; at the start of learning, the Q-function is not a good approximation of the obtained sum of rewards. Greedy could repetitively take a specific sub-optimal action in a state;  $\epsilon$ -Greedy solves this problem by exploring the effects of different actions.

**Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy.**  $\epsilon$ -Greedy explores with the same amount in the beginning as in the end of a simulation. We however assume the agent is improving its behaviour and thus over time needs less exploration. Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy uses a decreasing value for  $\epsilon$ , so the agent uses less exploration if the agent played more games. The exploration value is then  $curExplore = \epsilon * (1 - \frac{currentGen}{totalGens})$ . The algorithm also incorporates a minimal exploration value, i.e.  $curExplore = 0.05$ , to make sure the agent keeps exploring in the long run.  $totalGens$  stands for the amount of generations, where one generation means training for 10,000 games in our experiments.

**Max-Boltzmann.** One drawback of the different  $\epsilon$ -Greedy methods is that all exploration actions are chosen randomly, which means that the second best action is chosen as likely as the worst action. The Boltzmann exploration method solves this problem by assigning a probability to all actions, ranking best to worst. This method was shown to perform best in a comparison between four different exploration strategies for maze-navigation problems (Tijmsma et al., 2016).

The probabilities are assigned using a Boltzmann distribution function. The probability  $\pi(s, a)$  for selecting action  $a$  in state  $s$  is:

$$\pi(s, a) = \frac{e^{Q(s,a)/T}}{\sum_i^{|A|} e^{Q(s,a^i)/T}} \quad (3)$$

Where  $|A|$  is the amount of possible actions and  $T$  is the temperature parameter. A high  $T$  translates to a lot of exploration.

Max-Boltzmann (Wiering, 1999) exploration combines  $\epsilon$ -Greedy exploration with Boltzmann exploration. It selects the greedy action with probability  $1 - \epsilon$  and otherwise the action will be chosen according to the Boltzmann distribution. By introducing another hyperparameter, the exploration behavior can be better controlled than with  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration. This is at the cost of more experimentation time, however.

## 4.2 Novel Exploration Strategies

We will now introduce two novel exploration methods, which use the obtained TD-errors from equation 2 to control their behavior.

**The error-Driven- $\epsilon$**  exploration tries to resolve the problem of Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy for which it is necessary to specify beforehand how much the agent explores over time. To solve this problem, Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  bases the exploration rate  $\epsilon$  on the difference in average obtained TD-errors between the previous two generations during which 10,000 training games were played. During the first 2 generations,  $\epsilon$ -greedy is used, because there is no error information available in the beginning of learning. Afterwards,  $\epsilon$  is computed with:

$$\epsilon = \max\left(\left(1 - \frac{\min(err_{g-1}, err_{g-2})}{\max(err_{g-1}, err_{g-2})}\right), minExp\right) \quad (4)$$

Where  $g$  is the current generation number and the error is calculated as the average of all TD-Errors of 10,000 played games during a generation. The method also uses a minimal amount of exploration to ensure that some exploration is always performed.

The idea of this algorithm, is that when the TD-errors stay approximately the same over time, the Q-function has more or less converged so that the minimum and maximum of the average TD-errors of the two previous generations are about the same. In this case, the algorithm will use the minimum value for  $\epsilon$ . On the other hand, if the TD-errors are decreasing (or fluctuating), more exploration will be used.

**Interval-Q** is a novel exploration strategy that uses the error range of the Q-value estimates next to the prediction of the Q-values. This method is based on Kaelbling's Interval Estimation (Kaelbling, 1993), where confidence intervals were computed for solving a multi-armed bandit problems with a finite number of actions. Kaelbling's Interval Estimation is used to assess how reliable a Q-value is by learning the confidence interval (or value range) for an action. Hence, we create an MLP with 12 output units instead of 6 as in the other methods. The first 6 outputs represent the Q-values and the other 6 outputs represent the expected absolute TD-error, where the TD-error is computed with equation 2.

In this method, the action is selected that has the highest upper confidence value in the Q-value estimate. We calculate the upper confidence by adding  $\sqrt{|TD - error|}$  to the Q-value for an action  $a$  in state  $s$ . Finally, because the MLP is randomly initialized and has to learn the Q-values and expected absolute TD-errors, the method selects a random action with probability  $\epsilon$ . The pseudo-code of this method is shown in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Interval-Q( $\epsilon$ ).

---

```

rand = RandomValue(0,1)
if rand <  $\epsilon$  then
    return(RandomMove())
end if
state = GetState()
qValues = GetQValues(state)
range = GetErrorRange(state)
maxReach =  $-\infty$ 
bestAction = NULL
for (action : Actions) do
    reach = qValues[action] +  $\sqrt{\textit{range}[\textit{action}]}$ 
    if reach > maxReach then
        maxReach = reach
        bestAction = action
    end if
end for
return(bestAction)

```

---

## 5 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

We evaluated the seven discussed exploration methods in combination with an MLP and Q-learning. Every method is trained for 100 generations, where a generation consists of 10,000 training games and 100 testing games. During the test games learning is disabled and the agent does not use any exploration actions. An entire simulation consists of 100 generations of training (1,000,000 training games and 10,000 test games), which requires around one day of computation time on a common CPU. The results are obtained by running 20 simulations per method and taking the average scores. For every algorithm we examine what percentage of the games the method wins, and how many points it gathers. The amount of gathered points is the average sum of rewards obtained while playing 100 test games.

We use a single hidden-layer MLP with 100 hidden nodes and 6 output nodes (except for the MLP for Interval-Q that uses 12 output nodes). The MLP is initialized randomly with weight values between -0.5 and 0.5. After running multiple preliminary experiments, 100 hidden units were found to be sufficient to produce intelligent behaviour for a grid size of  $7 \times 7$ . We also experimented with different amounts of hidden units, but removing units decreased the performance and increasing the number of hidden units only added computational time without a performance increase. Adding more hidden layers has also been investigated, but this also did not improve the performance at the cost of more computational power.

**Hyperparameters.** To find the best hyperparameters preliminary experiments have been performed. Because the large amount of time to perform a simulation of 1,000,000 training games, we could not specifically fine-tune all the parameters of the different methods. In the experiments, all MLPs were trained with a learning rate of 0.0001. Table 2 shows the exploration parameters for all methods, where  $\epsilon$  equals the exploration chance,  $\text{min-}\epsilon$  is the minimal exploration chance and  $T$  denotes the Temperature. The different algorithms use different amounts of tunable parameters (from 0 to 3).

Table 2: The parameter settings in training.

Settings	$\epsilon$	$\text{min-}\epsilon$	$T$
Random-Walk	/	/	/
Greedy	/	/	/
$\epsilon$ -Greedy	0.3	/	/
Error-Driven- $\epsilon$	/	0.05	/
Interval-Q	0.2	/	/
Diminishing $\epsilon$ -Greedy	0.3 $\rightarrow$ 0.05	0.05	/
Max-Boltzmann	0.3	/	200 $\rightarrow$ 1

**Results.** Figure 2 shows the win rate of the different exploration methods over time. We note that there is a big difference between the methods that use an exploration/exploitation trade-off and the methods that do not (Greedy, Random-walk). The different exploration strategies obtain quite good performances, although they do not improve much after 20 generations. Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  outperforms all other methods for the first 80 generations (800,000 games), but eventually gets surpassed by Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy and Max-Boltzmann. The reason is that Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  can become unstable which results in a decreasing performance.




Figure 2: Win rate of the exploration methods, where a generation consist of 10,000 training games and 100 testing games. The results are averaged over 20 simulations.

Table 3 shows the mean percentage of the games that were won and the standard error over the last 100 test games during the last generation. The results are averaged over 20 simulations. It can be seen that Max-Boltzmann performs the best, while Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  and Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy perform second

Table 3: Mean and standard error of the win rate over the last 100 games. The results are averaged over 20 simulations.

Method	Mean win rate	SE
Max-Boltzmann	0.88	0.015
Error-Driven- $\epsilon$	0.86	0.026
Diminishing $\epsilon$ -Greedy	0.86	0.022
Interval-Q	0.82	0.027
$\epsilon$ -Greedy	0.79	0.014
Greedy	0.58	0.033
Random-Walk	0.08	0.006




Figure 3: Points gathered by the methods, where a generation consist of 10,000 training games and 100 testing games. The results are averaged over 20 simulations.

best. It is quite surprising that  $\epsilon$ -Greedy performs much worse and comes on the 5-th place, only before the Random-Walk and Greedy methods.

Figure 3 shows for every method the average amount of points it gathered. The two methods without exploration/exploitation trade-off converge to a low value, while the other methods perform much better. All methods with the exploration/exploitation trade-off initially follow a similar learning curve, after which Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  performs the best for around 50 generations. In the end Max-Boltzmann performs best after increasing its performance a lot during the last 10 generations. This is caused by the decreasing temperature, which goes finally to a value of 1. More generations may help this method to increase its performance even further, which does not seem to be the case for the other algorithms.

Table 4 shows the average amount of points gathered and the standard error for every exploration method. These data were also gathered over the last 100 games. The table shows that Max-Boltzmann performs significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) better than the other methods, scoring on average 30 points more than the second best method, Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy. Again  $\epsilon$ -Greedy comes on the 5-th place.

### 5.1 Discussion

After training all methods for a long time, Max-Boltzmann performs best. In the end, Max-Boltzmann gathers on average 30 points more than the second best method, Diminishing  $\epsilon$ -Greedy, and has a 2% higher win rate. Especially the high amount of



Table 4: Mean and standard error of the gathered amount of points over the last 100 games. The results are averaged over 20 simulations.

Method	Mean points	SE
Max-Boltzmann	96	1.3
Diminishing $\epsilon$ -Greedy	66	1.1
Interval-Q	55	1
Error-Driven- $\epsilon$	32	1.5
$\epsilon$ -Greedy	3	1.2
Random-Walk	-336	0.2
Greedy	-346	1.1

points is important, because the learning algorithms try to maximize the discounted sum of rewards that relates to the amount of obtained points. A high win rate does not always correspond to a high amount of points, which becomes clear when comparing Greedy to Random-Walk. Greedy has a much higher win rate than Random-Walk whereas it gathers less points.

In the first 60 generations the temperature of Max-Boltzmann is relatively high, which produces approximately equal behaviour to  $\epsilon$ -Greedy. During the last 10 generations the exploration gets more guided resulting in an significantly increasing average amount of points. Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  exploration outperforms all other methods in the 10-70 generations interval. However this method produces unstable behaviour, which is most likely caused by the way the exploration rate is computed from the average TD-errors over generations.

We can conclude that Max-Boltzmann performs better than the other methods. The only problem with Max-Boltzmann is that it takes a lot of time before it outperforms the other methods. In Figures 2 and 3, we can see that only in the last 10 generations Max-Boltzmann starts to outperform the other methods. More careful tuning of the hyperparameters of this method may result in even better performances.

Looking at the results, it is clear that the trade-off between exploration and exploitation is important. All methods that actualize this exploration/exploitation trade-off perform significantly better than the methods that use only exploration or exploitation. The Greedy algorithm learns a locally optimal policy in which it does not get destroyed easily. The Random-Walk policy performs many stupid exploration actions, and is killed very quickly. Therefore, the Random-Walk method never learns to play the whole game.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper examined exploration methods in connec-

tionist reinforcement learning in Bomberman. We have explored multiple exploration methods and can conclude that Max-Boltzmann outperforms the other methods on both win rate and points gathered. The only aspect where Max-Boltzmann is being outperformed, is the learning curve. Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  learns faster, but produces unstable behaviour. Max-Boltzmann takes longer to reach a high performance than some other methods, but it is possible that there exist better temperature-annealing schemes for this method. The results also demonstrated that the commonly used  $\epsilon$ -Greedy exploration strategy is easily outperformed by other methods.

In future work, we want to examine how well the different exploration methods perform for learning to play other games. Furthermore, we want to carefully analyze the reasons why Error-Driven- $\epsilon$  becomes unstable and change the method to solve this.

## REFERENCES

- Bom, L., Henken, R., and Wiering, M. (2013). Reinforcement learning to train Ms. Pac-Man using higher-order action-relative inputs. In *2013 IEEE Symposium on Adaptive Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning (ADPRL)*, pages 156–163.
- Kaelbling, L. (1993). *Learning in Embedded Systems*. A Bradford book. MIT Press.
- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Graves, A., Antonoglou, I., Wierstra, D., and Riedmiller, M. (2013). Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *CoRR*, abs/1312.5602.
- Shantia, A., Begue, E., and Wiering, M. (2011). Connectionist reinforcement learning for intelligent unit micro management in starcraft. In *Neural Networks (IJCNN), The 2011 International Joint Conference on*, pages 1794–1801. IEEE.
- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (2015). *Reinforcement Learning : An Introduction*. Bradford Books, Cambridge.
- Szita, I. (2012). Reinforcement learning in games. In Wiering, M. and van Otterlo, M., editors, *Reinforcement Learning: State-of-the-Art*, pages 539–577. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Thrun, S. (1992). Efficient exploration in reinforcement learning. Technical Report CMU-CS-92-102, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Tijmsma, A. D., Drugan, M. M., and Wiering, M. A. (2016). Comparing exploration strategies for Q-learning in random stochastic mazes. In *2016 IEEE Symposium on Adaptive Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning (ADPRL)*, pages 1–8.
- Watkins, C. J. C. H. and Dayan, P. (1992). Technical note: Q-learning. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):279.
- Wiering, M. A. (1999). *Explorations in efficient reinforcement learning*. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.