

Approximate Exploitability: Learning a Best Response

Finbarr Timbers
DeepMind
finbarrtimbers@google.com

Edward Lockhart
DeepMind

Marc Lanctot
DeepMind

Martin Schmid
DeepMind

Julian Schrittwieser
DeepMind

Thomas Hubert
DeepMind

Michael Bowling
DeepMind and University of Alberta

Abstract

A standard metric used to measure the approximate optimality of policies in imperfect information games is exploitability, i.e. the performance of a policy against its worst-case opponent. However, exploitability is intractable to compute in large games as it requires a full traversal of the game tree to calculate a best response to the given policy. We introduce a new metric, approximate exploitability, that calculates an analogous metric using an approximate best response; the approximation is done by using search and reinforcement learning. This is a generalization of local best response, a domain specific evaluation metric used in poker. We provide empirical results for a specific instance of the method, demonstrating that our method converges to exploitability in the tabular and function approximation settings for small games. In large games, our method learns to exploit both strong and weak agents, learning to exploit an AlphaZero agent.¹

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence research has long used games as a venue for progress, including results in Checkers [25], Chess [12], Jeopardy [14], Poker [22], [9], and Go [26], among other results. Using standard metrics, such as the game score in the Atari Learning Environment [6], has helped in fair and rigorous evaluation of algorithms, driving progress in (deep) reinforcement learning. In this paper we study two-player, zero-sum games, which have been the focus of much research, and have been used as common benchmarks in AI since the field’s inception. In perfect information games, head-to-head play or statistics derived from head-to-head matches, such as the Elo rating system, is commonly used as the central evaluation metric; if two agents play some number of games against each other, and one beats the other, then the winning agent is ranked higher than the losing agent, and either win rates are reported or ratings are computed from such match outcomes.

However, match results only provide a relative ranking, and the order of the ranking can be affected by a variety of small details, including the population of agents [4]. Head to head play is also problematic when agent performance is not strictly transitive [3, 23], which is not uncommon in imperfect information games. Absolute metrics, such as **exploitability**, which measures the distance of a joint policy from a Nash Equilibrium, requires a significant engineering effort to calculate in large games [18]. Exploitability provides guarantees for the worse-case performance of agents, however, while it is (barely) feasible for Heads-up Limit Texas Hold’em (HULH), having roughly 10^{14} decision points, other games are much, much larger, such as Heads-up No Limit Texas Hold’em

¹This is not the same AlphaZero used in the original paper, but a version trained separately by the authors for this paper.

(HUNL) (with around 10^{160} decision points [17]) or Go (approximately 10^{170} decision points [1]). In these games, computing a best response strategy, which is at the heart of exploitability, is intractable.

As computing a best response strategy is intractable, the computer poker community has proposed an algorithm to compute a lower-bound using a **local best response** (LBR) [21]. LBR combines explicit inference about the opponent’s private state with a shallow search and simple poker-specific heuristic value function. While LBR has proven to work surprisingly well in poker, it relies on a hand-designed poker heuristic and so is not a domain independent metric.

We propose a domain-independent alternative that replaces the domain-specific search procedure with a guided search trained explicitly to exploit the agent to be evaluated. Fixing one agent’s policy makes the environment a single agent one [7]. One can thus use standard reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms to compute a best response [15]. Learning a best response has another, potentially very appealing, benefit. Exploitability itself does not tell the full story about the strength of an agent. A strong chess agent that could be beaten by a particularly clever line of play is a better chess player than an agent that always resigns. Yet, both of these agents have the same exploitability (i.e. both are maximally exploitable). By learning the best response, we can assess the strength of the agent by looking at how difficult it is to learn to exploit it (e.g., by how much training is required.)

We present a large-scale implementation of this framework, where we learn an *approximate best response* in a variety of games of both perfect and imperfect information. Our experimental section includes small games where comparing to the exact best response is tractable, as well as results in large games of perfect information, where exact exploitability is neither feasible nor useful.

2 Background and Terminology

An **extensive-form game** is a sequential interaction between **players** $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \cup \{c\}$, where c is the **chance player**, i.e. a player following a static, stochastic policy to define the transition probabilities given states and actions. We use $-i$ to refer to every player other than i and the chance player. In this paper, we focus on the 2 player setting, and in particular, the two-player, zero-sum setting where beliefs about the opponent’s private state are tractable, i.e. sufficiently small to be represented in memory. The game starts in the root (or empty) history $h = \emptyset$. On each turn, a player i chooses an action $a \in \mathcal{A}_i$, changing the history to $h' = ha$.² Here h is called a prefix history of h' , denoted $h \sqsubset h'$. The full history is sometimes also called a *ground* state because it uniquely identifies the true state, since chance’s actions are included. In poker, a history includes all the players’ private cards in addition to the sequence of actions taken. We define an **information state** $s \in \mathcal{S}$ for player i as the state as perceived by an agent which is consistent with its observations. Formally, each s is a set of histories, specifically $h, h' \in s \Leftrightarrow$ the sequence of player i ’s observations along h and h' are equal. Informally, this consists of all the histories which the player cannot distinguish from each other given the information available to them. In poker, an information state groups together all the histories that differ only in the private cards of $-i$.

We call \mathcal{Z} the set of terminal histories, which correspond to the end of a game. Each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ has a utility for each player $u_i(z)$. We also define $\tau(s)$ as the player who is choosing an action at s , and use $\mathcal{Z}(h)$ to denote the subset of terminal histories that share h as a prefix. Since players cannot observe the ground state h , policies are defined as $\pi_i : \mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A}_i)(s)$, where $\Delta(\mathcal{A}_i)(s)$ is the set of probability distributions over $\mathcal{A}_i(s)$.

As an example, in Texas No-limit Hold’em Poker, the root history is when no cards have been dealt and no betting has happened. The history includes the private cards that have been dealt, while the information state for player i includes the private cards for that player, and the information that the other player has received cards, but not which cards those are. Both the history and the information state include all public cards and all betting actions. A terminal history consists of the state when either a showdown has occurred or a player has folded. The $u_i(z)$ is then the number of chips that each player has won.

In a perfect information game such as Chess or Go, the history is identical to the information state, since everything is public. As is common in perfect information games, we use an encoding of the

²Note that we include c , chance, as a player, so this will include all chance actions, e.g. all cards (both public and private) that are dealt.

current board state (or a stack of recent ones) as input for training, following [26]. $u_i(z)$ is 0 for a loss, 1 for a win, and 0.5 for a draw when possible (e.g. in Chess).

We assume finite games, so every history h is bounded in length. The expected value of a joint policy π (all players' policies) for player i is defined as

$$v_i(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \pi}[u_i(z)], \quad (1)$$

where the terminal histories $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ are composed of actions from the joint policy. We assume that players have **perfect recall**, i.e. they do not forget anything they have observed while playing. Under perfect recall, we can obtain the distribution of the states using Bayes' rule (see [27, Section 3.2]).

2.1 Optimal Policies

The standard game-theoretic solution concept for optimal policies in two-player zero-sum games is **Nash equilibrium**, defined as a strategy profile where none of the players benefits from deviating unilaterally. A strategy profile $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2)$ is a Nash equilibrium if

$$\forall \pi'_i : v_i(\pi_i, \pi_{-i}) \geq v_i(\pi'_i, \pi_{-i}) \quad (2)$$

In two player zero sum games, this concept is equivalent to the **minmax** solution concept (this is true for both perfect and imperfect information games).

$$\max_{\pi_1} \min_{\pi_2} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \min_{\pi_2} \max_{\pi_1} v_1(\pi_1, \pi_2) = v_1^* \quad (3)$$

The unique value of (3) is referred to as the **game value** — v^* . Both solutions concepts thus optimize against the worst case opponent — the **best response**. The best response to a policy π_i is defined as $b(\pi_i) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi_{-i}} v_i(\pi_i, \pi_{-i})$. The optimal policy π_i^* is then guaranteed (on expectation) to receive at least the game value $\forall \pi'_{-i} v_i(\pi_i^*, \pi_{-i}) \geq v_i^*$.

2.2 Exploitability

For suboptimal policies, the worst-case value is strictly less than the game value: $\delta_i(\pi_i) = v_i^* - v_i(\pi_i, b(\pi_i))$. A common measure then is $\text{NASHCONV}(\pi) = \sum_i \delta_i(\pi)$ and exploitability $= \frac{\text{NASHCONV}(\pi)}{|\mathcal{N}|}$. Furthermore, the ϵ -minmax (or ϵ -Nash equilibrium) policy is one where $\max_i \delta_i(\pi) \leq \epsilon$.

While computing the game value is in general as hard as computing an optimal policy, one can compute the exploitability of a policy profile without access to the game value. Simple algebra reveals that NASHCONV (where the last operation follows since $v_1^* = -v_2^*$):

$$\text{NASHCONV}(\pi) = \sum_i \delta_i(\pi) = \sum_i v_i^* - v_i(\pi_i, b(\pi_i)) = \sum_i v_i(\pi_i, b(\pi_i)) \quad (4)$$

Exploitability thus measures the quality of a strategy profile — the closer that exploitability is to zero, the closer to the optimal policy. However, exploitability is difficult to calculate in large games, as it requires a full tree traversal. This is intractable in games such as HUNL poker, with approximately 10^{160} decision points — more than the number of atoms in the universe.

3 Approximate Best Response

By fixing the policy of one agent, the environment becomes a (stochastic) single agent environment [7]. The best response is the optimal policy in that environment, and the exploitability is then the reward that said optimal policy would achieve.

As this is a single agent environment, one can use standard reinforcement learning methods to learn an optimal policy [15], and while exploitability is defined using the optimal best-responding policy $b(\pi_i)$, we are learning to approximate this policy, and can thus define a corresponding metric. We denote the approximate best response as $\text{ABR}_i(\pi_i)$, and define the corresponding $\text{APPROXIMATE NASHCONV}$ as:

$$\text{APPROXIMATE NASHCONV}(\pi) = \text{ANC}(\pi) = \sum_i v_i(\pi_i, \text{ABR}_i(\pi_i)) \quad (5)$$

Note that since the game is zero-sum, the sum over the expected value of playing π by all players sums to 0. Approximate NashConv is thus NashConv with an approximate best response rather than the exact best response; similarly, we have approximate exploitability.

3.1 Local best response

Rather than learning the best response, the poker community has used local best response (LBR) [21] as a proxy for the full best response [22, 10]. LBR approximates the best response by performing a local search aided with a value function, which has historically been a hand-crafted heuristic function. LBR is able to exploit a surprising number of winners from the Annual Computer Poker Competition [2].

The “strength” that we discuss is almost identical to exploitability; a “strong” agent would be one that is hard to exploit, whereas a weak agent would be open to exploits. In practice, it’s impossible to calculate exploitability in large games, so we rely on approximations, such as whether or not an agent can be beat by humans (professional or otherwise), or how an agent performs against techniques that have theoretical guarantees. For instance, DeepStack [22] or Libratus [9] would be considered “strong” agents as they have both beaten professional human players and are theoretically guaranteed to converge to a Nash Equilibrium, while UniformRandom is a “weak” agent as it can be beaten by an amateur human player. Defining strength is non-trivial in this domain, so one motivation of this paper is to provide another metric that will help clarify what kind of exploits (and their severity) can be found by a learning agent enhanced with search.

There are a number of issues with LBR. Although it is a simple metric to understand, it has some issues. For instance, it’s performance varies significantly with the abstraction chosen. We have seen results that vary dramatically depending on if the “fcpa” abstraction is used or if the “fc” abstraction is used. In particular, we have seen better performance when “fc” is used, which is counter-intuitive, as the “fcpa” agent is able to make the same choices as “fc”. This can be seen in table 3 of the LBR paper, where the “56 bets (1-4)” abstraction is beaten by “fc (1-4)” in a number of contexts, despite the latter being a strict subset of the former.

3.2 Approximate Best Response Search

We now describe a particular instance of ABR where we learn the approximate best-response. LBR is a method which performs a depth-limited tree search, using a value function to truncate the search. This is similar to MCTS, which has been shown to perform remarkably well with a learned value function [26]. As such, a natural extension to LBR is to combine it with MCTS. Since we consider imperfect information games in addition to perfect information games, we use a variant of information set MCTS (IS-MCTS) to sample world states when searching [13]. In particular, the world state sampling distribution (also called the *determinization distribution*) is the exact posterior given the opponent’s policy, so the underlying search returns a true best response action given the opponent is playing according to their policy. We call this algorithm **approximate best response**, which is IS-MCTS with access to the opponent’s policy during search. See Algorithm 1.

We do not search using the real history (rather than the information state) as doing so would lead to policies where the players act as if they know the hidden information of all other players, which is more than what a best response policy is allowed to know.

\mathcal{T} is the sequence of states and actions taken starting from h . r is the return associated with that particular Monte Carlo rollout, which either comes from a terminal history if the search reaches a terminal history, or from the value network otherwise. `GETNODEFROMSEARCHTREE(s)` retrieves the node corresponding to the current information state from the search tree. Each node contains the average return received from previous simulations. `SAMPLEHISTORYFROMINFSTATE` samples a new history (i.e. private information for the opponent) from the exact belief distribution according to the opponent’s policy. `RUNIS-MCTS-SIMULATION`, `UPDATESEARCHTREE`, and `CHOOSEACTION` follow the standard MCTS algorithm following [26]; implementations of this algorithm include [20] and [24].

We use an experimental setup that is identical to [26] except where otherwise noted. We use a distributed actor/learner setup to train our neural network with parameters θ_t on training iteration t , which is trained to predict prior policy π_t via the normalized visit counts as a policy vector \mathbf{p}_t ,

Algorithm 1: Approximate best response search.

input : n — number of simulations
input : π_{-i} — fixed policy for opponent
input : s — infostate to choose an action at
input : f_θ — value and policy network
output : $a \in \mathcal{A}_i$ — action for the current infostate
1 $\mathcal{N} = \text{GETNODEFROMSEARCHTREE}(s)$
2 **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**
3 $h = \text{SAMPLEHISTORYFROMINFSTATE}(s)$.
4 $\mathcal{T}, r = \text{RUNIS-MCTS-SIMULATION}(h, \mathcal{N}, f_\theta)$
5 $\text{UPDATESEARCHTREE}(\mathcal{T}, r)$.
6 $\mathbf{p} = \text{NORMALIZEDVISITCOUNTS}(\mathcal{N})$
7 $a = \text{CHOOSEACTION}(\mathcal{N})$
8 **return** (a, \mathbf{p}) ;

| Game | Evaluator | Policy | ANC | ANC (%) | NashConv |
|-------------|------------------------|---------------|------|---------|----------|
| Liar’s Dice | Tabular | UniformRandom | 1.52 | 97.44% | 1.56 |
| Liar’s Dice | Function approximation | UniformRandom | 1.47 | 94.23% | 1.56 |
| Liar’s Dice | Function approximation | A2C | 1.53 | 96.84% | 1.58 |
| Leduc Poker | Tabular | UniformRandom | 4.72 | 99.58% | 4.74 |
| Leduc Poker | Function approximation | UniformRandom | 4.07 | 85.86% | 4.74 |
| Leduc Poker | Function approximation | A2C | 4.46 | 93.31% | 4.78 |

Table 1: ABR against UniformRandom and A2C. ANC is ApproximateNashConv (Eq. 5).

along with the expected reward v_t predicting game outcome z_t using a loss function that combines the mean-squared error, cross-entropy loss, and ℓ_2 regularization:

$$(\boldsymbol{\pi}_t, v_t) = f_{\theta_t}(s), \quad (6)$$

$$l_t = (z_t - v_t)^2 + \boldsymbol{\pi}_t^T \log \mathbf{p}_t + c \|\theta_t\|_2^2 \quad (7)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = \text{GRADDESCENT}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1}, \alpha_t, l_t) \quad (8)$$

Here, v_t is the predicted value of a state, \mathbf{p}_t is the predicted search outcome which is used as a prior, and z is the Monte Carlo return for the episode (i.e. the outcome of the self-play game). The reward and prior are learned for information states, not histories, and thus the network learns an average across histories, which should converge to the expected value of playing from s , allowing the agent to make decisions according to the information state value.

4 Experimental Evaluation

We now describe our empirical evaluation, starting with an overview of the setup. We discuss the hyper-parameter tuning and values of the hyper-parameters in the appendix. We ran ABR against UniformRandom in a number of games. In Table 1, we report the results on small imperfect information games (**IIGs**) using both the tabular and function approximation evaluators. We note that both versions came close to the exact exploitability, which is unsurprising given how small the games are.

4.1 ABR in Small Imperfect Information Games

We ran a series of experiments in small games using a neural network to learn the value and policy functions. Table 1 demonstrates the results. The ANC quickly converges to the same value as the exact best response.

Following this, we trained an A2C agent in Liar’s Dice and Leduc Poker for 100 thousand episodes, using the default hyper-parameters from [20]. As A2C is not known to produce low exploitability

| Leduc Poker | CFR+1000 | A2C |
|-------------|----------|------|
| CFR+1000 | -0.094 | 0.72 |
| A2C | -0.72 | 0.05 |

| Liar’s Dice | CFR+1000 | A2C |
|-------------|----------|-------|
| CFR+1000 | -0.03 | 0.655 |
| A2C | -0.655 | -0.06 |

Table 2: Results from playing head to head. Column is player 0, row is player 1. Reward shown is the average over 1024 games for the row player.

| Policy | ANC | ANC (%) | LBR | LBR (%) | NashConv |
|---------------|------|---------|------|---------|----------|
| AlwaysFold | 1.50 | 100 | 1.50 | 99.7 | 1.50 |
| AlwaysCall | 1.61 | 69 | 2.31 | 99.1 | 2.33 |
| UniformRandom | 8.71 | 98.9 | 5.69 | 64.6 | 8.80 |

Table 3: Results from playing ABR against various chump policies in Heads Up Limit Texas Hold’em. Units are in big blinds per game. ANC is ApproximateNashConv. ANC(%) is equal to $\text{ANC}/\text{NashConv} \cdot 100\%$.

agents in imperfect information games, we have no reason to believe this agent is strong, which is consistent with the exploitability of our agents, which was calculated to be 1.58 for Liar’s Dice, and 4.78 in Leduc Poker— worse, in both cases, than UniformRandom, indicating that these agents are highly exploitable. In the tabular setting, our agent is able to closely approximate the exact best response, with the approximation accuracy being very close to 100%. In the function approximation setting, there are some issues due to the error introduced by approximation, but our agent is able to learn a fairly accurate approximation, being roughly 85% in Leduc Poker and 97% in Liar’s Dice.

4.2 Head-to-Head Results

In perfect information games, a common metric is head-to-head performance (win, loss, and draw rates). In imperfect information games, head-to-head performance is not sufficient to assess the quality of a policy. In Table 2, we show the head-to-head performance of CFR+ [28] run for 1000 iterations and the trained A2C agent discussed above. CFR+ exploits the A2C policy by 0.72 in Leduc and 0.655 in Liar’s Dice. However, the NashConv and ApproximateNashConv of the A2C policy is much higher, as seen in Table 1 giving us a more accurate understanding of the quality of the policy, with ApproximateNashConv values of 4.46 in Leduc, and 1.53 in Liar’s Dice. These results demonstrate the importance of considering exploitability in the measure of the quality of an agent, since head-to-head performance alone can be misleading, and the robustness of an agent or policy is relevant to its overall assessment.

4.3 ABR against Known Strategies in Heads-Up No-Limit Poker

To compare ABR to LBR, we ran ABR on known “chump” strategies in the game of Heads-up No-Limit Poker with a fold/call/pot/all-in betting abstraction, as done in [21]. The resulting game is quite large, with $4.42 \cdot 10^{13}$ information sets. We use these strategies as the exploitability values are known, as they can be calculated analytically. Table 3 shows the approximate exploitability values found for each known strategy, and compares the approximation quality to LBR. Except for the case of AlwaysCall, ABR is able to match the exact values through learning and search, rather than using poker domain knowledge heuristics. In the case of AlwaysCall, LBR has the distinct advantage that the heuristic used corresponds to exactly what the opponent is doing. Additionally, ABR is able to fully exploit UniformRandom whereas LBR is not. This shows the shortcomings of LBR: the specific choice of heuristic can introduce bias in the bound produced, and can fail to fully exploit even weak agents.

4.4 AlphaZero

We ran ABR against an implementation of AlphaZero [26] trained from scratch in Chess and Go. See the appendix for full details on the training setup. In these experiments, ABR sampled from the

opponent’s prior during search, but played against the agent using the listed number of simulations in Figure 1. In Chess, we trained an agent for 400 thousand minibatches. ABR was able to exploit the agent after 50 thousand minibatches, but not after 100 thousand minibatches or more. We believe this is due to the lack of signal, as the network is unable to find any initial exploits, and is thus unable to win, starving the agent of learning signal. One potential way to fix this is to train the value and policy network to predict the results from running the agents in selfplay against each other, and use that to initialize the ABR network, rather than randomly initializing it. The policy network itself is quite weak, and is unable to beat a level 0 Stockfish agent, while the full agent is able to beat the level 5 Stockfish agent, but not any stronger versions. See appendix for a more detailed overview of the strength of the AlphaZero agents that were trained, as well as a discussion of the evaluation. This indicates that the 50000-step trained policy is exploitable, as one would expect.

In Go, we see much stronger results, with a caveat. The AlphaZero agent that was trained is able to beat both [5] with 100 thousand iterations and [11] 100% of the time using the policy network. ABR is able to learn a highly effective exploit against the AlphaZero agent no matter the number of simulations used by AlphaZero. As we increase the number of simulations, it takes significantly longer for ABR to find an exploit. This is consistent with the strength estimate we have of the agent; as we give it more time to search, it is harder to exploit. The high exploitability of the agent in Go occurs as ABR learns to exploit the end of game scoring behaviour of the AlphaZero network. If humans were playing, they would remove the dead stones and count this as a win for AlphaZero; however, this is not what most computer Go environments do. The appendix contains example games and a detailed overview of this behaviour.




Figure 1: ABR results in perfect information games.

We also present results using function approximation against various chump policies in Heads Up No Limit Texas Hold’em in Table 3. We see that ABR is able to come reasonably close to the exact exploitability, and compares favorably to LBR. LBR only performs better than ABR against AlwaysCall, which is unsurprising, as LBR assumes that the opponent uses AlwaysCall as their strategy, making AlwaysCall the ideal opponent for LBR. Against UniformRandom, ABR drastically outperforms LBR. This is unsurprising, as to win against UniformRandom, a multiple step lookahead is necessary, which LBR does not do. The best response for AlwaysFold is possible to calculate with a one-step lookahead—namely, to always bet—so it makes sense that LBR is able to find this.

Then, we ran ABR against A2C trained for 100 thousand steps using the default hyper-parameters from [20]. We played A2C head-to-head against CFR+ [28] trained for 1000 iterations, with the results in Table 2. CFR+ has an exploitability of approximately 10^{-5} after 1000 iterations in Leduc Poker. When played head to head against an exploitable agent, CFR+ failed to fully exploit the opponent, winning 30% of the possible reward. In Liar’s Dice, CFR+ was able to win 87% of the

possible reward. This inability to fully exploit the opponent is not a property of CFR+, but a property of the ϵ -Nash Equilibrium strategy that CFR+ learns. See [19] for more details.³

Figure 1 demonstrates the result of running ABR search algorithm in Chess playing against Uniform-Random. In Go and Connect Four, ABR quickly learns to win almost 100% of the time. In Chess, the algorithm struggles with draws, and draws roughly 10% of the time. We think that the tabular results demonstrate that our method converges reasonably quickly, and the function approximation results versus A2C demonstrate that the algorithm can scale to exploit learned agents in large games. Future work will analyze the ability of ABR to exploit strong agents in large games.

4.5 Discussion

It should be noted that it is computationally expensive to train a deep RL agent to optimality. In particular, training an agent in a large game like Chess or Go requires a large distributed computation. Our experiments used 64 TPUs for acting and 4 TPUs for learning over one day. This is expensive, and as such, there is not a strong argument to prefer approximate exploitability over exploitability if calculating exploitability is feasible. ABR as a technique is preferable to exact exploitability in large games, as it scales much better. Similarly, LBR is a strong technique for poker games, and although we demonstrate slightly better results in a small number of scenarios, that is no reason to avoid LBR. It is the fact that ABR can be used in almost any two-player, zero-sum game without additional work that is the strength of the technique. For context, a best response in Leduc Poker for a tabular policy can be calculated in $30\mu s$, while our implementation takes 150s to use ABR, a factor of 5 million times more expensive, despite using a highly optimized multithreaded C++ implementation. However, it is feasible to run ABR on Go or No Limit Texas Hold'em, while calculating exploitability on such a game is nearly impossible⁴. Additionally, ABR has a meaningful interpretation in perfect information games against deterministic opponent, while exploitability does not.

5 Conclusion

We introduce a new metric to support evaluation in large games. This metric provides a lower bound on the exploitability of algorithms in a wide class of games. We hope that this metric will be used to advance the state of the art in large games research.

Additionally, there are a number of techniques that compute Nash Equilibria which have struggled to work in large-scale games of imperfect information, such as [16]. One potential area of future work is to use our method to extend [16] to large games, or as the exploiter in a setting similar to [29]. A shortcoming of our approach is that ABR can only run on tractable belief spaces as we must explicitly construct the exact belief vector. We plan to address this in future work.

6 Impact Statement

This algorithm consists of foundational research, and there are no applications in mind other than evaluating reinforcement learning algorithms in board game environments. However, algorithms can be used in many different ways, and our work could have unforeseen circumstances. This work provides a scalable evaluation metric for reinforcement learning algorithms in two-player, zero-sum settings, and as such, could be used to further the state of the art in reinforcement learning research in those settings. The authors are not aware of any such applications, but they certainly exist; one example might be to make agents that interact with humans more robust, as ABR would be a good way to find exploits for such. Phrased differently, ABR could also be used to find exploits for RL agents that interact with humans. For instance, this could be used to find exploits for bots in games. Another application might be in finance; if someone was doing algorithmic trading, ABR might be an effective way to learn to exploit that trading strategy. Conversely, a positive impact would be that ABR could be used to detect when such an agent is exploitable, and allow the developers of it to fix

³Consider Rock/Paper/Scissors; the Nash Equilibrium strategy is UniformRandom, which will tie AlwaysRock, despite AlwaysRock having a simple exploit.

⁴Taking $O(N)$ time to calculate the best response, where N is the number of states in the game, which for Heads-Up, No Limit Texas Hold'em is $O(10^{160})$.

those holes. In general, however, agents that interact with uncontrolled opponents should be designed in a robust manner, so we do not think that ABR is a particularly risky algorithm to publish.

Appendices

A Hyper-parameter tuning for ABR

In our experiments, we had two separate implementations of ABR. One was used for the experiments on imperfect information games, and one was used for the experiments on the perfect information games. For the imperfect information games, we did a series of hyper-parameter sweeps. The only hyper-parameters that had a significant impact were the number of simulations, which had a massive impact, the virtual loss, and the number of threads used to run simulations. We found broadly similar results with a variety of network architectures, UCT exploration parameters, optimizers, etc. The hyper-parameters used for the experiments on imperfect information games are listed in Table 4. We used a number of iterated grid searches to find the optimal hyper-parameters, where for each one, we varied a single hyper-parameter and kept the rest constant. We varied each of the hyper-parameters listed below. We also tried decaying the learning rate but it didn’t have a substantial impact. We also tried using a convolutional network, and it didn’t have a significant impact.

| Parameter | Value |
|---------------------|-----------|
| UCT C | 2.6 |
| L2 Coefficient | $5e - 6$ |
| Num simulations | 800 |
| Virtual loss | 4 |
| Num layers | 8 |
| Num hidden units | 128 |
| Learning rate | 10^{-5} |
| Min size to learn | 512 |
| Learning batch size | 512 |
| Actor batch size | 32 |

Table 4: Hyper-parameters used in experiments for imperfect information games.

For the runs we did against AlphaZero, we used the hyper-parameters from [26]. We did not do any hyper-parameter tuning due to the cost of running experiments, and other than fixing bugs, the results we report are those from the first runs done in each setting.

As a sanity check, we did a number of additional runs against the AlphaZero Chess network to verify that we got similar results, which we did. See Fig. 2.




Figure 2: Results from 3 separate runs of ABR against AlphaZero in Chess.

B Game sizes

C AlphaZero

We implemented [26] using [8]. We ran our experiments using the hyper-parameters listed in [26], with the following modifications. We ran the experiment for 550 thousand minibatches, each of size 2048, saving the network every 500 minibatches. We used an exponentially decaying learning rate, beginning at 0.05, and decaying it exponentially with a period of 200 thousand steps and a decay rate of 0.1. This agent is quite weak as it is roughly comparable to level 0 Stockfish.

In Go, we ran the experiment for 350 thousand minibatches, each of size 4096, saving the network every 500 minibatches. We used the same learning rate schedule as [26]. The final policy network was able to win 100% of the time against [5] with 100 thousand simulations, as well as against [11] level 10. This thus appears to be a quite strong network, and with simulations, is stronger still.

In all cases, we gave each player 100ms to think per move. The AlphaZero agent used 16 threads to perform evaluations, and ran on the same machine as the opposing agent, i.e. a single Cloud TPUv2.

D Go exploits

In Fig. 3, it appears that the ABR player never passes until the board is almost filled in, then when both players pass—ending the game—the game is a win for the ABR player. However, until the end, the AlphaZero player predicted it would win. Thus, it appears that ABR was able to find a board for which AlphaZero had the value wrong. Our best guess as to why the AlphaZero player played as it did, is that, during the selfplay training, it only saw boards like this at the very start, and as such, forgot that this would lead to a loss. As such, ABR has learned to take the AlphaZero player somewhere where the network is wrong, and is able to win by exploiting this discrepancy.

To make an analogy to the adversarial example literature, this is comparable to finding a noise image that a CNN would classify as a dog; this is not finding an image of a dog that the CNN would classify as a car.

When we look at the prior that the trained AlphaZero network assigns, the network assigns very low priors to passing, and so passing does not show up in the search tree until the very end of the game. When it does, the value that is learned is wrong; the value that is assigned by the value network is wrong, as it predicts a win (specifically, it predicts a value of 1.0, which is a very confident win). Then, given the low prior value, AlphaZero is unable to do enough search to find the correct value. With enough search, the algorithm is able to find that the correct value is low, and predicts (in one instance) that it has a value of 0.23. However, given the strength of the prediction from the neural network, this is enough to overpower it, and it has so many visits, that the agent chooses pass regardless.




Figure 3: Example exploit that ABR finds in Go. This is the terminal board. Our AlphaZero agent is playing as white, and ABR (i.e. the exploiter) is playing as black.

References

- [1] V. L. Allis. *Searching for solutions in games and artificial intelligence*. PhD thesis, University of Limburg, 1994.
- [2] Annual Computer Poker Competition. website, <http://www.computerpokercompetition.org/>, 2020.
- [3] David Balduzzi, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, and Thore Graepel. Re-evaluating evaluation. *CoRR*, abs/1806.02643, 2018.
- [4] Nolan DC Bard. *Online Agent Modelling in Human-Scale Problems*. PhD thesis, University of Alberta, 2016.
- [5] Petr Baudiš and Jean-loup Gailly. Pachi: State of the art open source go program. In *Advances in computer games*, pages 24–38. Springer, 2011.
- [6] M. G. Bellemare, Y. Naddaf, J. Veness, and M. Bowling. The arcade learning environment: An evaluation platform for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:253–279, jun 2013.
- [7] Michael Bowling. *Multiagent learning in the presence of agents with limitations*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2003.
- [8] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, and Skye Wanderman-Milne. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018.
- [9] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman AI for heads-up no-limit poker: Libratus beats top professionals. *Science*, 360(6385), December 2017.
- [10] Noam Brown, Tuomas Sandholm, and Brandon Amos. Depth-limited solving for imperfect-information games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 7663–7674, 2018.

- [11] Daniel Bump, G Farneback, A Bayer, et al. Gnu go, 2008.
- [12] Murray Campbell, A Joseph Hoane Jr, and Feng-hsiung Hsu. Deep blue. *Artificial intelligence*, 134(1-2):57–83, 2002.
- [13] Peter I. Cowling, Edward J. Powley, and Daniel Whitehouse. Information set monte carlo tree search. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games*, 4(2):120–143, 2010.
- [14] David A Ferrucci. Introduction to “this is watson”. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 56(3.4):1–1, 2012.
- [15] Amy Greenwald, Jiayu Li, and Eric Sodomka. Solving for best responses and equilibria in extensive-form games with reinforcement learning methods. In *Rohit Parikh on Logic, Language and Society*, pages 185–226. Springer, 2017.
- [16] Johannes Heinrich and David Silver. Deep reinforcement learning from self-play in imperfect-information games. *CoRR*, abs/1603.01121, 2016.
- [17] Michael Johanson. Measuring the size of large no-limit poker games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.7008*, 2013.
- [18] Michael Johanson, Kevin Waugh, Michael Bowling, and Martin Zinkevich. Accelerating best response calculation in large extensive games. In *Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2011.
- [19] Michael Johanson, Martin Zinkevich, and Michael Bowling. Computing robust counter-strategies. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 721–728, 2008.
- [20] Marc Lanctot, Edward Lockhart, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Vinicius Zambaldi, Satyaki Upadhyay, Julien Pérolat, Sriram Srinivasan, Finbarr Timbers, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, Daniel Hennes, Dustin Morrill, Paul Muller, Timo Ewalds, Ryan Faulkner, János Kramár, Bart De Vylder, Brennan Saeta, James Bradbury, David Ding, Sebastian Borgeaud, Matthew Lai, Julian Schrittwieser, Thomas Anthony, Edward Hughes, Ivo Danihelka, and Jonah Ryan-Davis. OpenSpiel: A framework for reinforcement learning in games. *CoRR*, abs/1908.09453, 2019. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.09453>.
- [21] Viliam Lisý and Michael H. Bowling. Equilibrium approximation quality of current no-limit poker bots. *CoRR*, abs/1612.07547, 2016.
- [22] Matej Moravčík, Martin Schmid, Neil Burch, Viliam Lisý, Dustin Morrill, Nolan Bard, Trevor Davis, Kevin Waugh, Michael Johanson, and Michael Bowling. Deepstack: Expert-level artificial intelligence in heads-up no-limit poker. *Science*, 358(6362), October 2017.
- [23] Shayegan Omidshafiei, Christos Papadimitriou, Georgios Piliouras, Karl Tuyls, Mark Rowland, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Marc Lanctot, Julien Perolat, and Remi Munos. α -rank: Multi-agent evaluation by evolution. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):9937, 2019.
- [24] Gian-Carlo Pascutto. Leela zero, 2017.
- [25] Jonathan Schaeffer, Robert Lake, Paul Lu, and Martin Bryant. Chinook the world man-machine checkers champion. *AI Magazine*, 17(1):21–21, 1996.
- [26] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharmashan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, Karen Simonyan, and Demis Hassabis. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science*, 632(6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- [27] Sriram Srinivasan, Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Julien Pérolat, Karl Tuyls, Rémi Munos, and Michael Bowling. Actor-critic policy optimization in partially observable multiagent environments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3422–3435, 2018.
- [28] Oskari Tammelin, Neil Burch, Michael Johanson, and Michael Bowling. Solving heads-up limit texas hold’em. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [29] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, Junhyuk Oh, Dan Horgan, Manuel Kroiss, Ivo Danihelka, Aja Huang, Laurent Sifre, Trevor Cai, John P. Agapiou, Max Jaderberg, Alexander S. Vezhnevets, Rémi Leblond, Tobias Pohlen, Valentin Dalibard, David Budden, Yuri Sulsky, James Molloy, Tom L. Paine, Caglar Gulcehre, Ziyu

Wang, Tobias Pfaff, Yuhuai Wu, Roman Ring, Dani Yogatama, Dario Wünsch, Katrina McKinney, Oliver Smith, Tom Schaul, Timothy Lillicrap, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Chris Apps, and David Silver. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 2019.