

AI planning in the imagination: High-level planning on learned abstract search spaces

Carlos Martin¹ and Tuomas Sandholm^{1,2,3,4}

cgmartin@cs.cmu.edu, sandholm@cs.cmu.edu

¹Carnegie Mellon University

²Strategy Robot, Inc.

³Optimized Markets, Inc.

⁴Strategic Machine, Inc.

Abstract

Search and planning algorithms have been a cornerstone of artificial intelligence since the field’s inception. Giving reinforcement learning agents the ability to plan during execution time has resulted in significant performance improvements in various domains. However, in real-world environments, the model with respect to which the agent plans has been constrained to be grounded in the real environment itself, as opposed to a more abstract model which allows for planning over compound actions and behaviors. We propose a new method, called PiZero, that gives an agent the ability to plan in an abstract search space that the agent learns during training, which is completely decoupled from the real environment. Unlike prior approaches, this enables the agent to perform high-level planning at arbitrary timescales and reason in terms of compound or temporally-extended actions, which can be useful in environments where large numbers of base-level micro-actions are needed to perform relevant macro-actions. In addition, our method is more general than comparable prior methods because it seamlessly handles settings with continuous action spaces, combinatorial action spaces, and partial observability. We evaluate our method on multiple domains, including the traveling salesman problem, Sokoban, 2048, the facility location problem, and Pacman. Experimentally, it outperforms comparable prior methods without assuming access to an environment sim-

ulator at execution time.

1 Introduction

In many domains, planning at execution time significantly improves performance. In games like chess and Go, and single-agent domains like Sokoban, Pacman, and 2048, all state-of-the-art approaches use planning. No planning-free, reactive approach has matched their performance.

We present a new method that gives agents the ability to plan in a learned abstract search space that is completely decoupled from the real environment. Unlike prior approaches, this allows agents to perform *high-level planning* at arbitrary timescales, and reason in terms of compound or temporally-extended actions, which can be useful in environments where many “micro” actions are needed to perform relevant “macro” actions.

Lookahead search and reasoning is a central paradigm in artificial intelligence. Traditionally, the search space is first formulated and then solved^{1;2;3;4;5;6}. Here, the formulation of the search space happens during the solve. This breaks the traditional paradigm because it does not require the search space to be formulated up front.

Our method augments a standard neural-network-based agent with a *planning module* that it can query before selecting actions in the real environment. The planning module uses a learned *dynamics model* and a learned *pre-*

diction model. The dynamics model takes a state and action as input and returns a reward and new state as output. The prediction model takes a state as input and returns an estimated abstract value and abstract action probabilities. The states, actions, and rewards of the planning module are purely abstract and do not need to have any direct relation or correspondence with those of the real environment. They need not have the same dimensionality or even type (discrete versus continuous).

In each step of an episode, the following occurs. First, the agent encodes its current memory and observation into an *abstract state* for its planning module (where the encoding itself is learned). Second, the planning module performs Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) in an *abstract search space* created by a learned abstract dynamics model. In our case, we assume the abstract action space is a discrete set of k actions, where k is a fixed hyperparameter. Third, the results of the MCTS subroutine are passed into another network which outputs an action for the real environment. Fourth, the observation and generated action are used to update the agent’s memory.

In §4, we describe prior algorithms in the literature and related research. In §2, we formulate the problem we are tackling in detail. In §3, we motivate and describe our method. In §5, we present our experiments. In §6, we present conclusions and future research.

2 Background

We use the following notation throughout the paper: $\Delta\mathcal{X}$ is the set of probability distributions on \mathcal{X} , $[n] = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, $a \parallel b$ is the concatenation of vectors a and b , $\dim \mathcal{X}$ is the dimensionality of a space \mathcal{X} , and $|\mathcal{X}|$ is the cardinality of a set \mathcal{X} .

A *finite-horizon partially-observable Markov decision process* (FH-POMDP), henceforth called an *environment*, is a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, \rho, \delta, H)$ where \mathcal{S} is a state space, \mathcal{O} is an observation space, \mathcal{A} is an action space, $\rho : \Delta\mathcal{S}$ is an initial state distribution, $o : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is an observation function, $\delta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R})$ is a transition function, and $H \in \mathbb{N}$ is a horizon.

An *agent* is a tuple (\mathcal{M}, m_0, π) where \mathcal{M} is a memory space, $m_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ is an initial memory, and $\pi : \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{M})$ is a transition function. The agent’s memory can implicitly encode the history of past observations and

actions.


An episode or *trajectory* $\tau = (m, s, o, a, r)$ is a tuple of sequences of memories, states, actions, and rewards. A trajectory is generated as follows. First, an initial state $s_0 \sim \rho$ is sampled. Then, the agent and environment are updated in tandem for all $t \in [H]$: The agent is updated with environment’s observation, $a_t, m_{t+1} \sim \pi(o(s_t), m_t)$, and the environment is updated with agent’s action, $s_{t+1}, r_t \sim \delta(s_t, a_t)$. The *score* or *return* of a trajectory is the sum of its rewards, $R = \sum_{t \in [H]} r_t$. Given an environment, our goal is to obtain an agent that maximizes the expected return $\mathbb{E}_\tau R$.

3 Proposed method

In this section, we describe our proposed method.

3.1 Agent architecture

The core architecture of the agent is illustrated below.



The agent’s current memory and observation constitute the agent’s *concrete state*. The concrete state is passed to an *encoder*, which transforms it into an *abstract state*. This is a state in an abstract space whose dynamics is learned by the agent. The abstract state is passed to a *planner*, which performs planning in the abstract space and returns an *abstract action*. The abstract action is passed to a *decoder*, which transforms it into a *concrete action* for the real environment.¹ The agent’s memory is then

¹If stochastic actions are desired, the abstract action can be concatenated with *latent noise*, e.g. from a standard normal distribution, before being passed to the decoder. There are situations where randomizing over actions is beneficial, e.g., when the agent has imperfect recall or the environment is adversarial (e.g., due to the presence of other agents). The approach of feeding noise as input to induce a stochastic output is called an implicit density model or deep generative model in the literature⁷, and has the advantage of creating flexible classes of distributions. For example, sampling from a categorical distribution is equivalent to perturbing its logits with Gumbel noise and applying argmax.

updated with the resulting action and input observation.

For the agent’s memory, we use a recurrent unit. Many recurrent units have been proposed in the literature^{8;9}. Among the most popular are Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)¹⁰ and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU)^{11;12}. We use GRU since it is simpler, faster, and has comparable performance to LSTM^{13;14;15}. For the encoder and decoder, we use standard feedforward networks.

3.2 Planner architecture

Our planner performs MCTS in an abstract space learned by the agent. More precisely, let \mathcal{S} be a state space and \mathcal{A} be an action space (we use $\mathcal{A} = [n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$). The dynamics function $\delta : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{S}$ maps a state and action to a reward and new state. The prediction function $\phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ maps a state to a predicted value and action logits. The parameters of both of these functions are learned. The planner runs an MCTS algorithm (described in the next section) on the resulting space, starting at the abstract state fed into the planner, and outputs the abstract action returned by the MCTS algorithm.

For δ , we use a GRU and apply a one-hot encoding to its input action. For ϕ , we use a standard feedforward network. For the MCTS algorithm, we use the open-source JAX¹⁶ library called `mctx`¹⁷.

This architecture is inspired by MuZero¹⁸, but there are some important differences that we describe in §4.

3.3 Planning algorithm

PiZero uses variant of MCTS introduced by Silver et al.¹⁹. This algorithm iteratively constructs a search tree starting from some given state s_0 . Each node in this search tree contains a state s and, for each action a from s , the visit count $N(s, a)$, value estimate $Q(s, a)$, prior probability $P(s, a)$, reward $R(s, a)$, and successor state $S(s, a)$. Each iteration of the algorithm consists of 3 phases: *selection*, *expansion*, and *backpropagation*.

Selection The tree is traversed starting from the root node until a leaf edge is reached. At each internal node s the algorithm selects the action a which maximizes the upper confidence bound proposed in Silver et al.²⁰ and

shown in Equation 1.

$$Q(s, a) + P(s, a) \frac{\sqrt{1 + \sum_b N(s, b)}}{1 + N(s, a)} \times \left(c_1 + \log \frac{\sum_b N(s, b) + c_2 + 1}{c_2} \right) \quad (1)$$

Here, c_1, c_2 are constants that control the relative importance of the value estimates and prior probabilities. We use the same values as sAntonoglou et al.²¹. After a is selected, the reward $r = R(s, a)$ and successor state $s' = S(s, a)$ are queried from the node’s lookup table, and the successor state’s node becomes the new node.

Expansion When a leaf edge is reached, the reward and successor state $(r, s') = g_\theta(s, a)$ are computed from the dynamics function and stored in the node’s lookup table. The policy and value are computed by the prediction function $(p, v) = f_\theta(s)$. A new node is created corresponding to s' and added to the search tree. The lookup table is initialized, for each action a , with $N(s, a) = 0, Q(s, a) = 0, P(s, a) = p$.

Backpropagation The value estimate of the newly added edge is backpropagated up the tree along the trajectory from the root to the leaf using an n -step return estimate. Specifically, from $t = T$ to 0, where T is the length of the trajectory, we compute a $T - t$ -step estimate of the cumulative discounted reward that bootstraps from the value function v_l : $G_t = \sum_{t=0}^{l-1-t} \gamma^t r_{t+1+t} + \gamma^{T-t} v_l$. For each such t , we also update the statistics for the edge (s_t, a_t) as follows: $Q(s_t, a_t) := \frac{N(s_t, a_t)Q(s_t, a_t) + G_t}{N(s_t, a_t) + 1}$, $N(s_t, a_t) := N(s_t, a_t) + 1$. This algorithm can be extended to include *chance nodes* in the search tree, as described in Antonoglou et al.²¹. The action probabilities at a chance node are output by a learned function.

3.4 Training procedure

Once we have fixed an architecture for the agent, we seek to find parameters that maximize its expected return in the environment. One way to do this is by using stochastic gradient ascent. Stochastic gradient ascent requires an estimator of the gradient of the expected return with respect to the parameters. This is called the policy gradient.

There is a vast literature on policy gradient methods, including REINFORCE²² and actor-critic methods^{23;24}.

However, there is a problem: Most of these methods assume that the policy is *differentiable*—that is, that its output (an action distribution) is differentiable with respect to the parameters of the policy. However, our planning policy uses MCTS as a subroutine, and standard MCTS is not differentiable. Because our policy contains a non-differentiable submodule, we need to find an alternative way to optimize the policy’s parameters.

Fortunately, we can turn to black-box (*i.e.*, zeroth-order) optimization. Black-box optimization uses only function evaluations to optimize a black-box function with respect to a set of inputs. In particular, it does not require gradients. In our case, the black-box function maps our policy’s parameters to a sampled episode score.

There is a class of black-box optimization algorithms called evolution strategies (ES)^{25;26;27} that maintain and evolve a population of parameter vectors. Natural evolution strategies (NES)^{28;29;30} represent the population as a distribution over parameters and maximize its average objective value using the score function estimator.

For many parameter distributions, such as Gaussian smoothing, this is equivalent to evaluating the function at randomly-sampled points and estimating the gradient as a sum of estimates of directional derivatives along random directions^{31;32;33;34}.

ES has been shown to be a scalable alternative to standard reinforcement learning³⁵. Lenc et al.³⁶ show that ES is also a viable method for learning non-differentiable parameters of large supervised models. We use OpenAI-ES³⁵, an NES algorithm that is based on the identity $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}} f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}) \mathbf{z}$, where \mathcal{N} is the standard multivariate normal distribution with the same dimension as \mathbf{x} . The algorithm computes works as follows. Let \mathcal{I} be a set of indices. For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ in parallel, sample $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathcal{N}$ and compute $\delta_i = f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}_i)$. Finally, compute the pseudogradient $\mathbf{g} = \frac{1}{\sigma|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_i \mathbf{z}_i$. To reduce variance, like Salimans et al.³⁵, we use antithetic sampling³⁷, also called mirrored sampling³⁸, which uses pairs of perturbations $\pm \sigma \mathbf{z}_i$. The resulting gradient estimate is fed into a standard optimizer. For the latter, we use Adaptive Momentum (Adam)³⁹.

OpenAI-ES is massively parallelizable. Each δ_i can be evaluated on a separate worker. Furthermore, the entire

Algorithm 1 Distributed training.

The following algorithm runs on each worker. All workers are initialized with the same random seed.

The function f samples an episode with the input parameters for the agent and outputs its score.

```

 $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \text{agent.initialize\_params}()$ 
 $S \leftarrow \text{optimizer.initialize\_state}(\mathbf{x})$ 
loop
   $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \text{optimizer.get\_params}(S)$ 
   $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \text{set of available workers}$ 
  for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ 
     $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathcal{N}$ 
     $j \leftarrow \text{own worker rank}$ 
     $\delta_j \leftarrow f(\mathbf{x} + \sigma \mathbf{z}_j) - f(\mathbf{x} - \sigma \mathbf{z}_j)$ 
    send  $\delta_j$  to other workers
    receive  $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I} - \{j\}}$  from other workers
   $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2\sigma|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_i \mathbf{z}_i$ 
   $S \leftarrow \text{optimizer.update\_state}(S, \mathbf{g})$ 

```

optimization procedure can be performed with minimal communication bandwidth between workers. All workers are initialized with the same random seed. Worker i evaluates δ_i , sends it to the remaining workers, and receives the other workers’ values (this is called an allgather operation in distributed computing). Thus the workers compute the same \mathbf{g} and stay synchronized. This process is described in Algorithm 2 of Salimans et al.³⁵. The full training process is summarized in Algorithm 1.

4 Related work

Monte-Carlo evaluation estimates the value of a position by averaging the return of several random rollouts. It can serve as an evaluation function for the leaves of a search tree. Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS)⁴⁰ combines Monte-Carlo evaluation with tree search. Instead of backing-up the min-max value close to the root, and the average value at some depth, a more general backup operator is defined that progressively changes from averaging to min-max as the number of simulations grows. This provides a fine-grained control of the tree growth and allows efficient selectivity. Świechowski et al.⁴¹ present a survey of recent modifications and applications of MCTS.

AlphaGo²⁰ used a variant of MCTS to tackle the game of Go. This variant uses a neural network to evaluate board positions *and* select moves. These networks are trained using a combination of supervised learning from human expert games and reinforcement learning from self-play. It was the first computer program to defeat a human professional player.

AlphaGo Zero⁴² used reinforcement learning alone, *without* any human data, guidance or domain knowledge beyond game rules. AlphaZero¹⁹ generalized AlphaGo Zero into a single algorithm that achieved superhuman performance in many challenging games, including chess and shogi.

MuZero¹⁸ combined AlphaZero’s tree-based search with a *learned dynamics model*. The latter allows it to plan in environments where the agent does *not* have access to a simulator of the environment at execution time. In the authors’ words, “All parameters of the model are trained jointly to accurately match the policy, value, and reward, for every hypothetical step k , to corresponding target values observed after k actual time-steps have elapsed.” In other words, unlike our method, its dynamics and prediction models are coupled to the real environment. Furthermore, since the action probabilities returned by the MCTS process are treated as fixed targets to train the prediction model, MuZero does not need to differentiate through the nondifferentiable MCTS process.

Hubert et al.⁴³ proposed Sampled MuZero, an extension of the MuZero algorithm that is able to learn in domains with arbitrarily complex action spaces (including ones that are continuous and high-dimensional) by planning over sampled actions.

Stochastic MuZero²¹ extended MuZero to environments that are inherently stochastic, partially observed, or so large and complex that they appear stochastic to a finite agent. It learns a stochastic model incorporating afterstates, and uses this model to perform a stochastic tree search. It matches the performance of MuZero in Go while matching or exceeding the state of the art in a set of canonical single and multiagent environments, including 2048 and backgammon.

Our method has some important differences to prior methods. While some prior methods use a learned dynamics model, like ours, their training objective is different. In particular, they train a model to predict accurate rewards and values *for the real environment*. In contrast,

our method *completely decouples* the dynamics and evaluation models from the real environment. This gives agents the ability to perform arbitrarily *high-level planning* in a learned *abstract search space* whose rewards and values are not tied to those of the real environment in any way.

Since neither states, actions, rewards, nor values in the abstract space are tied to the timescale of the environment, the agent has the ability to reason in terms of compound, temporally-extended actions or behaviors. This is useful in environments, such as real-time strategy (RTS) games, where it takes a very large number of “micro-actions” to perform “macro-actions” that are relevant to planning, such as reaching a target across the map and destroying it. Because they are so fine-grained, performing MCTS on the environment’s real “micro-actions” would not yield useful information for any reasonable simulation budget.

Another difference to prior methods is that ours can straightforwardly handle continuous-action environments *and* does not require computing probabilities of actions. Computing action probabilities for continuous action distributions requires constraining to a model class such as a parametric distribution or a normalizing flow^{44;45}.

In terms of the optimization objective, a crucial difference between PiZero and prior methods like AlphaZero and MuZero is that, while the latter try to minimize a *planning loss* for the value and policy networks, ours simply tries to *directly maximize the episode score* in any way it can, which more directly corresponds to the overarching goal of reinforcement learning and brings advantages.

For example, our method can straightforwardly handle partially-observable environments where the agent must also *learn what to remember* from observations, as opposed to having access to some *fixed* representation of the observation history that is not learned. Since PiZero learns to maximize the episode score in an end-to-end fashion, it can learn what to remember without requiring any separate loss or objective function.

Table 1 summarizes some of the differences between our method and prior ones. Additional related work can be found in the appendix.

5 Experiments

We evaluate our method on multiple domains. We note that we are not trying to develop the best special-purpose

	AlphaZero	MuZero	Sampled MuZero	Stochastic MuZero	PiZero
No simulator	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stochastic model	X	X	X	✓	✓
Continuous actions	X	X	✓	X	✓
No observation storage	X	X	X	X	✓
No action probabilities	X	X	X	X	✓
Low bandwidth	X	X	X	X	✓
No episode storage	X	X	X	X	✓
Backprop-free	X	X	X	X	✓

Table 1: Comparison to prior methods.

solver for any one of these benchmarks. Rather, our goal is to create a *general* agent that can tackle a wide range of environments. Unless otherwise noted, our experimental hyperparameters are those listed in Table 2. In our plots, solid lines indicate the mean across trials. Bands indicate a confidence interval for this mean with a confidence level of 0.95. The latter is computed using bootstrapping⁴⁶, specifically the bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) method⁴⁷.

5.1 Traveling salesman problem

The traveling salesman problem (TSP) is a classic problem in combinatorial optimization. Given a set of cities and their pairwise distances, the goal is to find a shortest route that visits each city once and returns to the starting city. This problem has important applications in operations research, including logistics, computer wiring, vehicle routing, and various other planning problems⁴⁸. TSP is known to be NP-hard⁴⁹. Various approximation algorithms and heuristics⁵⁰ have been developed for it.

Our environment is as follows. We seek to learn to solve TSP in general, not just one particular instance of it. Thus, on every episode, a new problem instance is generated by sampling a matrix $M \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1]^{n \times 2})$, representing a sequence of n cities (in our experiments, we use 10 cities). At timestep $t \in [n]$, the agent chooses a city $a \in [n]$ to swap with the city in the t th position (possibly the same city, which leaves the sequence unchanged). At the end of the episode, the length of the tour through this sequence of cities (including the segment from the final city to the initial one) is computed, and treated as the *negative* score. Thus the agent is incentivized to find the

shortest tour through all the cities. The agent observes the flattened matrix M together with the current timestep.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. Dots are cities, the filled dot is the initial city, and lines constitute the path constructed so far. Results are shown in Figure 2, with equal run-time for each method. PiZero outperforms AlphaZero, despite lacking access to an environment simulator.

5.2 Sokoban

Sokoban is a puzzle in which an agent pushes boxes around a warehouse to get them to storage locations. It is played on a grid of tiles. Each tile may be a floor or a wall, and may contain a box or the agent. Some floor tiles are marked as storage locations. The agent can move horizontally or vertically onto empty tiles. The agent can also move a box by walking up to it and push it to the tile beyond, if the latter is empty. Boxes cannot be pulled, and they cannot be pushed to squares with walls or other boxes. The number of boxes equals the number of storage locations. The puzzle is solved when all boxes are placed at storage locations. In this puzzle, planning ahead is crucial since an agent can easily get stuck if it makes the wrong move.

Sokoban has been studied in the field of computational complexity and shown to be PSPACE-complete⁵¹. It has received significant interest in artificial intelligence research because of its relevance to automated planning (*e.g.*, for autonomous robots), and is used as a benchmark. Sokoban’s large branching factor and search tree depth contribute to its difficulty. Skilled human players rely mostly on heuristics and can quickly discard several fu-

tile or redundant lines of play by recognizing patterns and subgoals, narrowing down the search significantly. Various automatic solvers have been developed in the literature^{52:53:54:55}, many of which rely on heuristics, but more complex Sokoban levels remain a challenge.

Our environment is as follows. We use the unfiltered Boxoban training set⁵⁶, which contains levels of size 10×10 . At the beginning of each episode, a level is sampled from this dataset. The agent has four actions available to it, for motion in each of the four cardinal directions. The level ends after a given number of timesteps $H \in \mathbb{N}$ (we use $H = 50$). The return at the end of an episode is the number of goals that are covered with boxes. Thus the agent is incentivized to cover all of the goals.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. This image was rendered by JSoko⁵⁷, an open-source Sokoban implementation. The yellow vehicle is the agent, who must push the brown boxes into the goal squares marked with Xs. (Boxes tagged “OK” are on top of goal squares.) Results are shown in Figure 2, with equal run-time for each method. PiZero outperforms AlphaZero, despite lacking access to an environment simulator.

5.3 Collection problem

In this environment, an agent must navigate an 8×8 2D gridworld to collect as many coins as possible within a time limit. At the beginning of each episode, coins are placed uniformly at random, as is the agent. On each timestep, the agent can move up, down, left, or right. The agent collects a coin when it moves into the same tile as the latter. After 20 timesteps, the score is minus the number of remaining coins. Thus the agent is incentivized to collect as many coins as possible within the time limit. A variant of this environment was used by Oh et al.⁵⁸, §4.2 as a benchmark.

This problem resembles a traveling salesman-like problem in which several “micro” actions are required to perform the “macro” actions of moving from one city to another. (Also, the agent can visit cities multiple times and does not need to return to its starting city.) This models situations where several fine-grained actions are required to perform relevant tasks, such as moving a unit in a real-time strategy game a large distance across the map. In order to plan effectively, an agent should be able reason in

terms of such compound “macro” actions in some imagined abstract space.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. Brick tiles are walls, yellow circles are coins, and the human figure is the agent. Results are shown in Figure 2, with equal run-time for each method. PiZero outperforms even AlphaZero, despite lacking access to an environment simulator.

5.4 2048 game

We use the 2048 implementation of Jumanji⁵⁹, a library of reinforcement learning environments written in JAX¹⁶. Quoting from their documentation: “2048 is a popular single-player puzzle game that is played on a 4×4 grid. The game board consists of cells, each containing a power of 2, and the objective is to reach a score of at least 2048 by merging cells together. The player can shift the entire grid in one of the four directions (up, down, right, left) to combine cells of the same value. When two adjacent cells have the same value, they merge into a single cell with a value equal to the sum of the two cells. The game ends when the player is no longer able to make any further moves. The ultimate goal is to achieve the highest-valued tile possible, with the hope of surpassing 2048. With each move, the player must carefully plan and strategize to reach the highest score possible.” An example state is shown in Figure 1. Results are shown in Figure 2.

5.5 Facility location problem

The facility location problem (FLP) is as follows. Given a set of clients, output a set of m facilities that minimizes the maximum (or mean) distance between a client and its closest facility. This is a well-studied problem in location analysis, which is a branch of operations research and computational geometry that studies the optimal placement of facilities to minimize transportation costs. It is also used for cluster analysis. Computing an exact solution to this problem is NP-hard⁶⁰.

Formally, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of clients, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of facilities, and $d : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Euclidean distance. Then, given a set of clients $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$, the goal is to minimize $\max_{i \in n} \min_{j \in m} d(C_i, F_j)$ with respect to $F \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 2}$. (In the mean-variant of this problem, the maximum is replaced with a mean.) At the

beginning of each episode, we randomly sample n points from the unit square $[0, 1]^2$, which are the clients. On each step, the agent chooses a point on the unit square $[0, 1]^2$, which is a new facility to be placed. The final score is the max-min metric described above. Unlike previous environments, this environment has a *continuous* action space.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. Red dots are clients, blue dots are facilities placed so far, and black lines connect clients to their closest facility. Results are shown in Figure 2.

5.6 Pacman

This is a simplified version of the classic video game called Pacman. An example state is shown in Figure 1. The yellow circle is the player, which moves around a maze trying to eat as many dots as possible, while avoiding four colored ghosts that also move around the maze.

We also experiment on a *partially-observable* version of Pacman where, at each step, the player can only see a fragment of the maze centered at their current position. In this situation, it is important for the agent to be able to *remember* what it has seen before (*e.g.*, where they last saw each ghost). To give the agent memory, we use a recurrent cell with a memory vector that is updated with the observation and action of the player at each step of the episode. Since our method is able to train the *entire* agent architecture in an end-to-end fashion, the agent can *learn what to remember* from previous timesteps.

An example state is shown in Figure 1. Results are shown in Figure 2.

6 Conclusions and future research

In this paper, we introduced a new method, called PiZero, that gives an agent the ability to plan in an abstract search space of its own creation that is completely decoupled from the real environment. Unlike prior approaches, it allows the agent to perform high-level planning at arbitrary timescales and reason in terms of compound or temporally-extended actions. In addition, the method is more general than comparable prior methods because it is able to handle settings with continuous action spaces




Figure 1: States for TSP, Sokoban, Collect, 2048, FLP, and Pacman.




Figure 2: Results on TSP, Sokoban, Collect, 2048, FLP, and Pacman.

and partial observability. In experiments on multiple domains, it outperformed comparable prior methods access to an environment simulator at execution time.

In the future, we would like to also apply the method to *multiagent* settings where high-level planning is useful. Such settings include *real-time strategy (RTS)* games like MicroRTS⁶¹, ELF Mini-RTS⁶², and Starcraft II^{63;64;65}. Indeed, RTS games often contain various optimization problems as subtasks, like TSP (moving units around the map), FLP (deciding how to place units or buildings), and scheduling (management of resource production and consumption).

We would also like to investigate extending our method to *partially-observable* multiagent settings, that is, imperfect-information games. One possible approach would be to replace MCTS in our method with an algorithm for solving imperfect-information games, such as *counterfactual regret minimization (CFR)*⁶⁶, its fastest modern variants *discounted CFR*⁶⁷ and *predictive CFR+*⁶⁸, techniques that use deep learning for state generalization^{69;70;71}, or *Fictitious Self-Play (FSP)*^{72;73}. Further techniques for speeding up the planning in-

side imperfect-information games could potentially also be used, such as subgame solving^{74;75;76}, depth-limited subgame solving^{6;77}, ReBeL⁷⁸, and *Student of Games (SoG)*⁷⁹. SoG uses an algorithm called *growing-tree CFR (GT-CFR)*, which expands a tree asymmetrically toward the most relevant future states while iteratively refining values and policies.

There are also challenges that need to be addressed in order to scale this approach to more complex environments. The environment may have complex action and observation spaces—including high-dimensional arrays like images—that may require more sophisticated network architectures. These include convolutional networks^{80;81}, pointer networks⁸², transformers⁸³, and scatter connections that integrate spatial and non-spatial information⁸⁴.

One may be able to get further speedups by using other ES algorithms instead^{85;86} and by reducing variance of the smoothed gradient estimator using variance reduction techniques such as importance sampling (which samples from a different distribution than that being optimized) and control variates (which add random variates with zero

mean, leaving the expectation unchanged).

Finally, some environments have very sparse rewards. This makes it difficult for the agent to learn since it receives little feedback from episode scores, especially in the initial stage of training when it acts randomly. In those cases, more sophisticated exploration techniques could be used, including approaches that seek novel observations, reward diverse behaviors, and create internal subgoals for the agent^{87:88:89}.

7 Acknowledgements

This material is based on work supported by the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship ONR N00014-23-1-2876, National Science Foundation grants IIS-1901403, CCF-1733556, RI-2312342, and RI-1901403, ARO award W911NF2210266, and NIH award A240108S001.

Appendices

A Additional related work

Value Iteration Network (VIN)⁹⁰ is a fully differentiable network with a planning module embedded within. It can learn to plan and predict outcomes that involve planning-based reasoning, such as policies for reinforcement learning. It uses a differentiable approximation of the value-iteration algorithm, which can be represented as a convolutional network, and is trained end-to-end using standard backpropagation.

Predictron⁹¹ consists of a fully abstract model, represented by a Markov reward process, that can be rolled forward multiple “imagined” planning steps. Each forward pass accumulates internal rewards and values over multiple planning depths. The model is trained end-to-end so as to make these accumulated values accurately approximate the true value function.

Value Prediction Network (VPN)⁵⁸ integrates model-free and model-based RL methods into a single network. In contrast to previous model-based methods, it learns a dynamics model with abstract states that is trained to make action-conditional predictions of future returns rather than future observations. VIN performs value it-

eration over the entire state space, which requires that 1) the state space is small and representable as a vector with each dimension corresponding to a separate state and 2) the states have a topology with local transition dynamics (such as a 2D grid). VPN does not have these limitations. VPN is trained to make its predicted values, rewards, and discounts match up with those of the real environment⁵⁸ §3.3. In contrast, we do not use any kind of supervised training against the real environment’s values, rewards, and discounts. We only seek to optimize the final episode score with respect to the policy’s parameters.

Imagination-Augmented Agent (I2A)⁹² augments a model-free agent with imagination by using environment models to simulate imagined trajectories, which are provided as additional context to a policy network. An environment model is any recurrent architecture which can be trained in an unsupervised fashion from agent trajectories: given a past state and current action, the environment model predicts the next state and observation. The imagined trajectory is initialized with the current observation and rolled out multiple time steps into the future by feeding simulated observations.

TreeQN⁹³ is an end-to-end differentiable architecture that substitutes value function networks in discrete-action domains. Instead of directly estimating the state-action value from the current encoded state, as in Deep Q-Networks (DQN)⁹⁴, it uses a learned dynamics model to perform planning up to some fixed-depth. The result is a recursive, tree-structured network between the encoded state and the predicted state-action values at the leafs. The authors also propose ATreeC, an actor-critic variant that augments TreeQN with a softmax layer to form a stochastic policy network. Unlike our method, TreeQN/ATreeC performs limited-depth search rather than MCTS, which can grow the search tree asymmetrically and focus on more promising paths, thus scaling better.

MCTSnet⁹⁵ incorporates simulation-based search inside a neural network, by expanding, evaluating and backing-up a vector embedding. The parameters of the network are trained end-to-end using gradient-based optimisation. When applied to small searches in the well-known planning problem Sokoban, it significantly outperformed MCTS baselines.

Aleph*⁹⁶ is a model-based reinforcement learning algorithm that combines A* search with a heuristic represented by a deep neural network. The weights are learned

through reinforcement learning: interacting with a simulated environment by performing actions and earning rewards. State transitions are kept in a tree structure, and action values are backpropagated along the tree to satisfy a time-difference equation.

Guez et al.⁹⁷ propose that an entirely model-free approach, without special structure beyond standard neural network components such as convolutional networks and LSTMs, and without any strong inductive bias toward planning, can learn to exhibit many of the characteristics typically associated with a model-based planner.

Dreamer⁹⁸ is a reinforcement learning agent that solves long-horizon tasks from images purely by latent imagination. It efficiently learns behaviors by propagating analytic gradients of learned state values back through trajectories imagined in the compact state space of a learned world model.

Neural A*⁹⁹ is a data-driven search method for path planning problems. It reformulates a canonical A* search algorithm to be differentiable and couples it with a convolutional encoder to form an end-to-end trainable neural network planner. It solves a path planning problem by encoding a problem instance to a guidance map and then performing the differentiable A* search with the guidance map. By learning to match the search results with ground-truth paths provided by experts, Neural A* can produce a path consistent with the ground truth accurately and efficiently.

Ye et al.¹⁰⁰ proposed a sample efficient model-based visual RL algorithm built on MuZero, called EfficientZero. Schrittwieser et al.¹⁰¹ introduce MuZero Unplugged, which combines MuZero with Reanalyze, an algorithm which uses model-based policy and value improvement operators to compute new improved training targets on existing data points, allowing efficient learning for data budgets.

Gumbel MuZero¹⁰² is a policy improvement algorithm based on sampling actions without replacement. It replaces the more heuristic mechanisms by which AlphaZero selects and uses actions, both at root nodes and at non-root nodes. It matches the state of the art on Go, chess, and Atari, and significantly improves prior performance when planning with few simulations.

Hyperparameter	Value
Learning rate	10^{-3}
Standard deviation	10^{-1}
Batch size	10^3
Trials	5
Hidden layers	1
Neurons per layer	64
Abstract state dimension	64
Abstract actions	4
Abstract chance outcomes	3
Planing loss unrolling steps	5
Simulation budget	10

Table 2: Experimental hyperparameters.

B Experimental details

The hyperparameters we used are shown in Table 2. We ran our experiments using the Slurm Workload Manager. We used two nodes with 8 NVIDIA A100 SXM4 40 GB GPUs each.

References

- [1] Allen Newell and George Ernst. The search for generality. In *Proc. IFIP Congress*, volume 65, pages 17–24, 1965.
- [2] Peter E Hart, Nils J Nilsson, and Bertram Raphael. A formal basis for the heuristic determination of minimum cost paths. *IEEE transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, 4(2):100–107, 1968.
- [3] Nils J Nilsson. Problem-solving methods in. *Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 1971.
- [4] Peter E Hart, Nils J Nilsson, and Bertram Raphael. Correction to "a formal basis for the heuristic determination of minimum cost paths". *ACM SIGART Bulletin*, 37:28–29, 1972.
- [5] Marc Lanctot, Vinicius Zambaldi, Audrunas Gruslys, Angeliki Lazaridou, Karl Tuyls, Julien Pérolat, David Silver, and Thore Graepel. A unified

- game-theoretic approach to multiagent reinforcement learning. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017.
- [6] Noam Brown, Tuomas Sandholm, and Brandon Amos. Depth-limited solving for imperfect-information games. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- [7] Lars Ruthotto and Eldad Haber. An introduction to deep generative modeling. *GAMM-Mitteilungen*, 2021.
- [8] Hojjat Salehinejad, Sharan Sankar, Joseph Barfett, Errol Colak, and Shahrokh Valaee. Recent advances in recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.01078*, 2017.
- [9] Yong Yu, Xiaosheng Si, Changhua Hu, and Jianxun Zhang. A review of recurrent neural networks: LSTM cells and network architectures. *Neural computation*, 2019.
- [10] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 1997.
- [11] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.
- [12] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Yoshua Bengio. On the properties of neural machine translation: encoder-decoder approaches, 2014.
- [13] Rafal Jozefowicz, Wojciech Zaremba, and Ilya Sutskever. An empirical exploration of recurrent network architectures. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- [14] Shubham Khandelwal, Benjamin Lecouteux, and Laurent Besacier. *Comparing GRU and LSTM for automatic speech recognition*. PhD thesis, LIG, 2016.
- [15] Shudong Yang, Xueying Yu, and Ying Zhou. LSTM and GRU neural network performance comparison study: taking Yelp review dataset as an example. In *2020 International Workshop on Electronic Communication and Artificial Intelligence (IWECAI)*, 2020.
- [16] James Bradbury, Roy Frostig, Peter Hawkins, Matthew James Johnson, Chris Leary, Dougal Maclaurin, George Necula, Adam Paszke, Jake VanderPlas, Skye Wanderman-Milne, and Qiao Zhang. JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs, 2018.
- [17] Igor Babuschkin, Kate Baumli, Alison Bell, Surya Bhupatiraju, Jake Bruce, Peter Buchlovsky, David Budden, Trevor Cai, Aidan Clark, Ivo Danihelka, Antoine Dedieu, Claudio Fantacci, Jonathan Godwin, Chris Jones, Ross Hemsley, Tom Hennigan, Matteo Hessel, Shaobo Hou, Steven Kapturowski, Thomas Keck, Iurii Kemaev, Michael King, Markus Kunesch, Lena Martens, Hamza Merzic, Vladimir Mikulik, Tamara Norman, George Papamakarios, John Quan, Roman Ring, Francisco Ruiz, Alvaro Sanchez, Rosalia Schneider, Eren Sezener, Stephen Spencer, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Wojciech Stokowiec, Luyu Wang, Guangyao Zhou, and Fabio Viola. The DeepMind JAX Ecosystem, 2020.
- [18] Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Thomas Hubert, Karen Simonyan, Laurent Sifre, Simon Schmitt, Arthur Guez, Edward Lockhart, Demis Hassabis, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, and David Silver. Mastering atari, Go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature*, 2020.
- [19] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dhharshan 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*, 2018.
- [20] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George

- van den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, Sander Dieleman, Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 2016.
- [21] Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Sherjil Ozair, Thomas K Hubert, and David Silver. Planning in stochastic environments with a learned model. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [22] Ronald J. Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 1992.
- [23] Vijay Konda and John Tsitsiklis. Actor-critic algorithms. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 1999.
- [24] Ivo Grondman, Lucian Busoniu, Gabriel AD Lopes, and Robert Babuska. A survey of actor-critic reinforcement learning: standard and natural policy gradients. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 2012.
- [25] Ingo Rechenberg and Manfred Eigen. *Evolutionstrategie: optimierung technischer systeme nach prinzipien der biologischen evolution*. Frommann-Holzboog Stuttgart, 1973.
- [26] Hans-Paul Schwefel. *Numerische optimierung von computer-modellen mittels der evolutionsstrategie*. Birkhäuser Basel, 1977.
- [27] Ingo Rechenberg. Evolutionsstrategien. In *Simulationmethoden in der medizin und biologie*, pages 83–114. Springer, 1978.
- [28] Daan Wierstra, Tom Schaul, Jan Peters, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Natural evolution strategies. In *2008 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence)*, 2008.
- [29] Daan Wierstra, Tom Schaul, Tobias Glasmachers, Yi Sun, Jan Peters, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Natural evolution strategies. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2014.
- [30] Sun Yi, Daan Wierstra, Tom Schaul, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Stochastic search using the natural gradient. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2009.
- [31] John C. Duchi, Michael I. Jordan, Martin J. Wainwright, and Andre Wibisono. Optimal rates for zero-order convex optimization: the power of two function evaluations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2015.
- [32] Yurii Nesterov and Vladimir Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2017.
- [33] Ohad Shamir. An optimal algorithm for bandit and zero-order convex optimization with two-point feedback. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2017.
- [34] Albert S. Berahas, Liyuan Cao, Krzysztof Choromanski, and Katya Scheinberg. A theoretical and empirical comparison of gradient approximations in derivative-free optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2022.
- [35] Tim Salimans, Jonathan Ho, Xi Chen, Szymon Sidor, and Ilya Sutskever. Evolution strategies as a scalable alternative to reinforcement learning, 2017.
- [36] Karel Lenc, Erich Elsen, Tom Schaul, and Karen Simonyan. Non-differentiable supervised learning with evolution strategies and hybrid methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03139*, 2019.
- [37] John Geweke. Antithetic acceleration of Monte Carlo integration in Bayesian inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 1988.
- [38] Dimo Brockhoff, Anne Auger, Nikolaus Hansen, Dirk V Arnold, and Tim Hohm. Mirrored sampling and sequential selection for evolution strategies. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*,

- PPSN XI: 11th International Conference, Kraków, Poland, September 11-15, 2010, Proceedings, Part I 11*, 2010.
- [39] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [40] Rémi Coulom. Efficient selectivity and backup operators in Monte-Carlo tree search. In *Computers and Games*, 2007.
- [41] Maciej Świechowski, Konrad Godlewski, Bartosz Sawicki, and Jacek Mańdziuk. Monte Carlo tree search: a review of recent modifications and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 2023.
- [42] David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, Yutian Chen, Timothy Lillicrap, Fan Hui, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 2017.
- [43] Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Mohammadamin Barekatin, Simon Schmitt, and David Silver. Learning and planning in complex action spaces. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 4476–4486. PMLR, 2021.
- [44] Ivan Kobyzev, Simon J.D. Prince, and Marcus A. Brubaker. Normalizing flows: an introduction and review of current methods. *PAMI*, 2021.
- [45] George Papamakarios, Eric Nalisnick, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2021.
- [46] B. Efron. Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1979.
- [47] Bradley Efron. Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1987.
- [48] Rajesh Matai, Surya Prakash Singh, and Murari Lal Mittal. Traveling salesman problem: an overview of applications, formulations, and solution approaches. *Traveling salesman problem, theory and applications*, 2010.
- [49] Richard M Karp. *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*. Springer, 2010.
- [50] Christian Nilsson. Heuristics for the traveling salesman problem. *Linköping University*, 2003.
- [51] Joseph Culberson. Sokoban is PSPACE-complete, 1997.
- [52] Andreas Junghanns and Jonathan Schaeffer. Sokoban: A challenging single-agent search problem. In *IJCAI Workshop on Using Games as an Experimental Testbed for AI Research*, 1997.
- [53] Andreas Junghanns and Jonathan Schaeffer. Sokoban: Enhancing general single-agent search methods using domain knowledge. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2001.
- [54] Nils Froleyks and Tomás Balyo. *Using an algorithm portfolio to solve sokoban*. PhD thesis, Karlsruhe Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2016.
- [55] Yaron Shoham and Jonathan Schaeffer. The fess algorithm: A feature based approach to single-agent search. In *2020 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2020.
- [56] Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Karol Gregor, Rishabh Kabra, Sebastien Racaniere, Theophane Weber, David Raposo, Adam Santoro, Laurent Orseau, Tom Eccles, Greg Wayne, David Silver, Timothy Lillicrap, and Victor Valdes. An investigation of model-free planning: boxoban levels, 2018.
- [57] Matthias Meger. JSoko - website of the open source Sokoban game JSoko, 2023. Accessed: 2023-10-19.
- [58] Junhyuk Oh, Satinder Singh, and Honglak Lee. Value prediction network. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.

- [59] Clément Bonnet, Daniel Luo, Donal Byrne, Shikha Surana, Vincent Coyette, Paul Duckworth, Laurence I. Midgley, Tristan Kalloniatis, Sasha Abramowitz, Cemlyn N. Waters, Andries P. Smit, Nathan Grinsztajn, Ulrich A. Mbou Sob, Omayma Mahjoub, Elshadai Tegegn, Mohamed A. Mimouni, Raphael Boige, Ruan de Kock, Daniel Furelos-Blanco, Victor Le, Arnau Pretorius, and Alexandre Laterre. Jumanji: a diverse suite of scalable reinforcement learning environments in JAX, 2023.
- [60] Robert J Fowler, Michael S Paterson, and Steven L Tanimoto. Optimal packing and covering in the plane are NP-complete. *Information processing letters*, 12(3):133–137, 1981.
- [61] Santiago Ontañón, Nicolas A Barriga, Cleyton R Silva, Rubens O Moraes, and Levi HS Leles. The first microRTS artificial intelligence competition. *AI Magazine*, 2018.
- [62] Yuandong Tian, Qucheng Gong, Wenling Shang, Yuxin Wu, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Elf: An extensive, lightweight and flexible research platform for real-time strategy games. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [63] Oriol Vinyals, Timo Ewalds, Sergey Bartunov, Petko Georgiev, Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets, Michelle Yeo, Alireza Makhzani, Heinrich Küttler, John Agapiou, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. StarCraft II: A new challenge for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04782*, 2017.
- [64] Mikayel Samvelyan, Tabish Rashid, Christian Schroeder De Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Nantas Nardelli, Tim GJ Rudner, Chia-Man Hung, Philip HS Torr, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. The StarCraft multi-agent challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04043*, 2019.
- [65] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.
- [66] Martin Zinkevich, Michael Bowling, Michael Johanson, and Carmelo Piccione. Regret minimization in games with incomplete information. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2007.
- [67] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Solving imperfect-information games via discounted regret minimization. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2019.
- [68] Gabriele Farina, Christian Kroer, and Tuomas Sandholm. Faster game solving via predictive Blackwell approachability: Connecting regret matching and mirror descent. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2021.
- [69] Michael Bowling, Neil Burch, Michael Johanson, and Oskari Tammelin. Heads-up limit hold’em poker is solved. *Science*, 347(6218), January 2015.
- [70] Noam Brown, Adam Lerer, Sam Gross, and Tuomas Sandholm. Deep counterfactual regret minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- [71] Stephen Marcus McAleer, Gabriele Farina, Marc Lanctot, and Tuomas Sandholm. ESCHER: Eschewing importance sampling in games by computing a history value function to estimate regret. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [72] Johannes Heinrich, Marc Lanctot, and David Silver. Fictitious self-play in extensive-form games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- [73] Johannes Heinrich and David Silver. Deep reinforcement learning from self-play in imperfect-information games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.01121*, 2016.
- [74] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Safe and nested subgame solving for imperfect-information games. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.

- [75] 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*, May 2017.
- [76] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman AI for heads-up no-limit poker: Libratus beats top professionals. *Science*, 359(6374):418–424, 2018.
- [77] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman AI for multiplayer poker. *Science*, 365(6456):885–890, 2019.
- [78] Noam Brown, Anton Bakhtin, Adam Lerer, and Qucheng Gong. Combining deep reinforcement learning and search for imperfect-information games. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [79] Martin Schmid, Matej Moravčík, Neil Burch, Rudolf Kadlec, Josh Davidson, Kevin Waugh, Nolan Bard, Finbarr Timbers, Marc Lanctot, G Zacharias Holland, et al. Student of games: A unified learning algorithm for both perfect and imperfect information games. *Science Advances*, 9(46):eadg3256, 2023.
- [80] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 1998.
- [81] Y. LeCun, B. Boser, J. S. Denker, D. Henderson, R. E. Howard, W. Hubbard, and L. D. Jackel. Back-propagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural Computation*, 1989.
- [82] Oriol Vinyals, Meire Fortunato, and Navdeep Jaitly. Pointer networks. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2015.
- [83] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [84] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019.
- [85] Niru Maheswaranathan, Luke Metz, George Tucker, Dami Choi, and Jascha Sohl-Dickstein. Guided evolutionary strategies: augmenting random search with surrogate gradients. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- [86] Sergey Shirobokov, Vladislav Belavin, Michael Kagan, Andrei Ustyuzhanin, and Atilim Gunes Baydin. Black-box optimization with local generative surrogates. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [87] Audrey Houillon, RC Lorenz, Wendelin Böhrer, MA Rapp, Andreas Heinz, J Gallinat, and Klaus Obermayer. The effect of novelty on reinforcement learning. *Progress in brain research*, 2013.
- [88] Arthur Aubret, Laetitia Matignon, and Salima Has-sas. A survey on intrinsic motivation in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.06976*, 2019.
- [89] Pawel Ladosz, Lilian Weng, Minwoo Kim, and Hyondong Oh. Exploration in deep reinforcement learning: A survey. *Information Fusion*, 2022.
- [90] Aviv Tamar, YI WU, Garrett Thomas, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. Value iteration networks. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2016.
- [91] David Silver, Hado van Hasselt, Matteo Hessel, Tom Schaul, Arthur Guez, Tim Harley, Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, David Reichert, Neil Rabinowitz, Andre Barreto, and Thomas Degris. The prediction: end-to-end learning and planning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017.
- [92] Sébastien Racanière, Théophane Weber, David Reichert, Lars Buesing, Arthur Guez,

- Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Oriol Vinyals, Nicolas Heess, Yujia Li, et al. Imagination-augmented agents for deep reinforcement learning. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- [93] Gregory Farquhar, Tim Rocktaeschel, Maximilian Igl, and Shimon Whiteson. TreeQN and ATreeC: Differentiable tree planning for deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [94] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Belle-mare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharmashan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 2015.
- [95] Arthur Guez, Theophane Weber, Ioannis Antonoglou, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Daan Wierstra, Remi Munos, and David Silver. Learning to search with MCTSnets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018.
- [96] Ariel Keselman, Sergey Ten, Adham Ghazali, and Majed Jubeh. Reinforcement learning with A* and a deep heuristic, 2018.
- [97] Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Karol Gregor, Rishabh Kabra, Sébastien Racanière, Théophane Weber, David Raposo, Adam Santoro, Laurent Orseau, Tom Eccles, et al. An investigation of model-free planning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 2464–2473. PMLR, 2019.
- [98] Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Jimmy Ba, and Mohammad Norouzi. Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2020.
- [99] Ryo Yonetani, Tatsunori Taniai, Mohammadamin Barekattain, Mai Nishimura, and Asako Kanezaki. Path planning using neural A* search. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- [100] Weirui Ye, Shaohuai Liu, Thanard Kurutach, Pieter Abbeel, and Yang Gao. Mastering atari games with limited data. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 34:25476–25488, 2021.
- [101] Julian Schrittwieser, Thomas Hubert, Amol Mandhane, Mohammadamin Barekattain, Ioannis Antonoglou, and David Silver. Online and offline reinforcement learning by planning with a learned model. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 34:27580–27591, 2021.
- [102] Ivo Danihelka, Arthur Guez, Julian Schrittwieser, and David Silver. Policy improvement by planning with Gumbel. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.