

Formalizing Feint Actions, and Example Studies in Two-Player Games

JUNYU LIU, User-Centric Computing Group, China
WANGKAI JIN, User-Centric Computing Group, China
XIANGJUN PENG, User-Centric Computing Group, China

Feint actions refer to a set of deceptive actions, which enable players to obtain temporal advantages from their opponents. Such actions are regarded as widely-used tactic in most non-deterministic Two-player Games (e.g. boxing and fencing). However, existing literature doesnot provide comprehensive and concrete formalization on Feint actions, and their implications on Two-Player Games. We argue that a full exploration on Feint actions is of great importance towards more realistic Two-player Games. In this paper, we provide the first comprehensive and concrete formalization of Feint actions. The key idea of our work is to (1) allow automatic generation of Feint actions, via our proposed Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions; and (2) provide concrete principles to properly combine Feint and attack actions. Based on our formalization of Feint actions, we also explore the implications on the game strategy model, and provide optimizations to better incorporate Feint actions. Our experimental results shows that accounting for Feint actions in Non-Deterministic Games (1) brings overall benefits to the game design; and (2) has great benefits on on either game animations or strategy designs, which also introduces a great extent of randomness into randomness-demanded Game models.

1 INTRODUCTION

Two-player (Adversarial) Game¹ is one of the fundamental abstractions to an extensive amount of real-world combating events. Most Two-player Games can be categorized into Deterministic and Non-Deterministic Games, according to the extent of their internal randomness. In Deterministic Games, there is few randomness as the players' actions are often predictable. Some representative games are turn-based games such as go and tic-tack-toe. Since most games may yield a certain extent of randomness, Non-Deterministic Games (NDGs) can be a more general abstraction for real-world scenarios. This is because their high extent of the randomness exist since the actions of players are unpredictable, due to naturally-fused randomness within some actions (e.g. Rolling a Dice), or simultaneous decision-making procedures of both players (e.g. boxing and fencing). The effectiveness of the NDG designs, to properly model the real-world events, demands since the higher the randomness, more realistic the designs.

Feint actions, as an important feature in Two-player Games, have received a limited amount of attention and lack detailed studies. Feint actions is first mentioned in [Wampler et al. 2010] as a proof-of-concept, to construct animations for nuanced game strategies with enhanced unpredictability. More recently, [Won et al. 2021] provides a set of pre-defined Feint actions for model animation, to optimize game strategies through training and generation via Reinforcement Learning. However, all prior works (1) lacks a detailed formalization of Feint actions, to identify the notable differences between Feint actions and attack actions; and (2) lacks an comprehensive exploration of potential implications of Feint actions on the designs of game strategies. Given the potential enhancements of Feint actions on NDGs (i.e. potential increase of the randomness), it's important to provide a comprehensive and concrete formalization on Feint actions.

Our goal in this paper is to formalize Feint actions in NDGs, and incorporate key takeaways from the formalization with game strategy designs. its impacts on run-time game animations and strategies. To formalize Feint actions, we formalize Feint actions based on the relationships between timespots and position coordinates, and

¹Since Feint actions refer to a set of deceptive actions, we use Two-player Game throughout the paper for the simplicity.

Authors' addresses: Junyu Liu, User-Centric Computing Group, Ningbo, China; Wangkai Jin, User-Centric Computing Group, Ningbo, China; Xiangjun Peng, User-Centric Computing Group, Ningbo, China.

2024. XXXX-XXXX/2024/3-ART \$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

- Junyu Liu, Wangkai Jin, and Xiangjun Peng

propose **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions** for automatic generations of Feint actions based on attack actions. Our formalization is based on two major findings. First, every attack action can be decomposed into three stages, which are Stretch-out Stage (Stage 1), Damage Stage (Stage 2) and Retract Stage (Stage 3). Second, the body movement of a Feint action highly resembles a palindrome, which contains (close-to-)symmetric movements during Stretch-out and Retract stage. Therefore, we can leverage the similar-yet-reversely-ordered frames in Stage 1 and Stage 3 for effective Feint actions generation. Beyond the formalization, we derive two major considerations for our formalization, to combine Feint actions and attack actions more appropriately. (Section 3)

We also examine the implications on how to fuse Feint actions with existing strategy models. We first introduce the baseline game model for Two-player Games, Zero-sum Markov Game Model, and observe that the responsiveness in a short time interval is the major obstacle to fuse Feint actions with these strategies. To better fuse Feint actions with this strategy, we propose new optimizations for strategies in Two-player Games, with the focus on a future lookahead time interval to select the best one from a series of choices with Feint actions. The key idea is two-folded. First, we slightly extend the length of the time interval, to maximize the possible effectiveness of Feint actions; and second, we rectify the reward matrix to better account for the combinations of Feint-attack-actions, rather than attack actions solely. (Section 4)

We evaluate our formalization and fusion of Feint actions under a simulation of boxing games, a representative Non-Deterministic Two-player Games. We show that our approach can bring overall benefits by appropriately incorporating Feint actions. We also perform sensitivity studies to examine (A) the impacts on strategy of Feint actions; and (B) the comparisons among different lengths of Feint actions. Our results suggest that Feint actions can improve the combating rewards in general; increase the diversity of strategy choices to provide more realistic simulation; and improve the flexibility in terms of different choices on effective lengths for Feint actions. (Section 5)

We make the following three major contributions in this paper:

- We formalize Feint actions by proposing a new method called, **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions**, to automatically generate a series of Feint actions rather than using a limited number of pre-defined actions, and suggesting potential approaches to combine Feint actions and attack actions.
- We propose new optimizations to effectively fuse Feint actions with game strategies. More specifically, we slightly extend the time interval size, and rectify the reward matrix to better account for the combination of Feint-attack actions.
- We evaluate our proposed formalization and optimization under a boxing scenario. Our experimental results justify the benefits of our proposal, and show that that Feint actions can balance different choices of Feint-attack actions in different game strategies, which increase the randomness and diversity of the overall game.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, the **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions** of Feint actions animation and its application with other attack actions is introduced in Section 3. Then, the new strategy model with future lookahead is illustrated in Section 4. Next, we introduce our implementations details in Section 5.1. After that, We then showcase our experiments and three key findings, in terms of the increased variety and strategy choices in strategy making, the generality and flexibility in Feint actions formulation choices and the overall improvement on reward-gaining and randomness in simulated combat scenes in Section 5. Finally, we conclude the paper and present possible future work in Section 7.

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In this section, we introduce the background and motivation of our work. We first introduce existing techniques for humanoid animation generation, in terms of patch-based generation and learning-based generation (Section 2.1).

Then, we present the mainstream game strategy models for Non-deterministic Two-Player Games (Section 2.2). Finally, we showcase our motivation of this paper, which aims to fulfill the gap of the missing feint formulation and study its practical values in fusion with other attack actions (Section 2.3).

2.1 Muti-character Physics-based Animation

The Humanoid Animation for different characters plays a significant role in computer graphic animations in the film and game industry [Diego and Bonisolli 2020; Farzinnejad et al. 2021; Zhang 2021]. The major principle for building Humanoid Animation in different scenarios is to facilitate the physical constraints of human bodies and guarantees the smooth transitions between adjacent frames during the animation. There are two mainstream approaches to generate animation: ❶ Patch-based generation, in which complex actions are produced from pre-defined basic actions [Lee and Lee 2006; Shum et al. 2008; Yersin et al. 2009]; and ❷ Learning-based generation, which all action animations are learned and generated based on the input sources (e.g. video stream of basic Humanoid Animations clips) [Lee et al. 2021; Peng et al. 2021; Won et al. 2021].

❶ **Patch-based generation:** The key idea of patch-based generation is that complex actions can be directly formed by combining pre-defined actions [Won et al. 2021]. This approach is widely adopted in the industry due to its high efficiency in production, supported by an extensive amount of animation libraries (e.g. Mixamo [Stefano Corazza and Nazim Kareemi 2022]) [Lee and Lee 2006; Shum et al. 2008; Yersin et al. 2009]. Such supports allow developers to easily and efficiently create a variety of Humanoid Animations. However, since there are infinite combinations to create new animation clips by using patch-based generation, safeguarding the principles of Humanoid Animation is notoriously hard. This is because additional validations have to be carried out to address the frames with the violation and guarantee the usefulness of the generated animation clips. Such an issue can be further amplified by account for Feint in the context of Humanoid Animation.

❷ **Learning-based generation:** The other approach is to generate new animations via Machine Learning algorithms, which are trained with given resources of basic and complex actions (i.e. usually derived from video streams) [Won et al. 2021]. Learned models can automatically produce animations to mimic the styles of learned actions from the training inputs. This technique has been mainly used in scenario-specific animations, such as animation for certain kinds of sports via the body movements of some athletes. This is because many detailed and nuanced actions are required in those scenarios [Lee et al. 2021; Peng et al. 2021]. Creating Feint actions animation in such a context brings even more challenges since the focus of this approach deals with actions at a smaller granularity than basic actions.

2.2 Game Strategy Models in Non-Deterministic Two-Player Games

Game Strategy models in Non-Deterministic Two-player Games are often complex since two players can simultaneously perform any available actions. Therefore, the outcomes for different choices of performed actions can vary greatly. This type of game introduces more unpredictability and randomness, compared with Deterministic Games. Therefore, enabling fast decision-making mechanisms is essential during such a game [Shum et al. 2008; Treuille et al. 2007]. The state-of-the-art approach in the context of Non-Deterministic Two-Player Games is Zero-Sum Markov Game [Wampler et al. 2010]: characters make decisions based on probabilistic values, derived from potential rewards of elementary actions. Prior works attempt to optimize this approach by enabling preferences into characters [Trichili et al. 2021; Zhang and Li 2021], but the underlying structure is similar for quantitative evaluations in terms of potential rewards. Thus, nuance and quick movements for tactical purposes (e.g. Feint) are demanded in such Game Models, to provide more accurate, proper and realistic simulation. However, this also indicates that there is an outstanding challenge to fuse tactical actions in such a context, on how to properly design Game Strategy.

2.3 Motivation

Our work is motivated by the missing formalization and potential obstacles for appropriate fusions of Feint actions in Two-Player Games, which can be briefly summarized into the following two aspects. First, the missing formalization of Feint, regardless of different types for animation generations, restricts the designs and developments of Feint actions. Given the fact that Feint actions are critical to enabling realistic simulations, a formalization of Feint actions can enable automatic generation, to improve the overall efficiency and transparency. Second, given any formalization of Feint actions, it's unclear how these actions can be effectively fused into existing Two-Player Game models, so that the benefits of Feint actions can be fully exploited. Given the fact that current Game Models already account for a considerable of randomness, the fusion of Feint actions can amplify the extent of randomness. Such an increase of the randomness makes the policy designs for characters' decision-making procedures even more challenging, which require a careful revisit to ensure an appropriate fusion of Feint actions and guarantee fast responsiveness.

3 FORMALIZING FEINT IN TWO-PLAYER GAMES

In this section, we introduce our formalization of Feint actions regarding (1) how Feint actions can be automatically generated from existing elementary actions; and (2) how generated Feint actions can be combined with elementary actions. We first introduce our methodology to automatically generate Feint actions, by exploiting our newly-revealed insight called **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions** (Section 3.1). Next, we illustrate details on how to combine the generated Feint actions with elementary actions, which forms the foundation for the further designs of Feint-accounted strategy designs in Two-Player Games (Section 3.2).

3.1 Feint Action Formalization

We explore available sources of elementary actions in such games, including hook, punch, and block. Based on our exploration, we derive two key findings from an extensive amount of elementary actions (for attacks). First, every action can be decomposed in three stages, which are Stretch-out Stage (Stage ❶), Damage Stage (Stage ❷) and Retract Stage (Stage ❸). We elaborate on each stage in detail. Stage ❶ delineates all the actions, by approaching one's opponents before actually getting into touch with them; Stage ❷ contains the short period of involving physical contacts with the opponents to hurt; and Stage ❸ retracts one's fists back to the original position. Second, body movements in Stage 1 and Stage 3 are usually symmetric yet reverse-order action patterns in the timeline. This finding reveals that the action track can be the same but one's body parts move in an opposite direction. Since Feint actions aim to provide deceptive attacks, Feint actions expect to be a subset of existing attack actions.

Under the above three-stage decomposition of attack actions, Feints can be directly derived by only accounting for Stage ❷. Based on such a derivation, we summarize two requirements that a Feint action must follow: (1) Feint actions follow symmetrical patterns in terms of the animation. Using boxing as a motivating example, a human player must retract the stretched-out limbs to the relative original position, before stretching out to perform an actual attack action. This is because the retraction requires recharging the force to contracted muscles; and (2) transitions between adjacent Feint actions are expected to be smooth, as action generation may make Feint-action animation clips inconsistent.

To satisfy the above two requirements, we propose a Feint action generator called **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions**, by extracting subsets of symmetrical frames from an attack real action then synthesizing them as a Feint action. As shown in Figure 1, an attack action is displayed as a series of sub-action frames over a time period, and it can be observed that symmetric sections of frames are obtained. ❶ by extracting subsets of action frames from an attack action, a Feint action can be considered as a semi-finished real action. This ensures the high similarity of a generated Feint action with an attack action; and ❷ by synthesizing symmetric actions frame sections, the overall movements can be connected smoothly and the naturalness of humanoid actions

can be guaranteed. Within our proposed generator **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions**, there are two key design choices in practice: (1) frame-extraction position for Feint synthesis; and (2) frame-extraction length for Feint duration. We provide details on these two key design choices.




Fig. 1. An example of Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions. Snapshots of action frames for demonstration of three frame-extraction methods: ❶ demonstrate extracting frames from both stage 1 and stage with an identical frame; and ❷ demonstrates extracting from stage 1 and synthesizing with corresponding flashback frames; and ❸ demonstrates extracting from stage 3 and synthesizing with corresponding flashback frames.

(1) **Frame-extraction Position for Feint synthesis:** Determining which position to extract the subsets of frames need to ensure that the frames of extracted actions are symmetrical and allow natural synthesis. To this end, we provide three methods to exploit the patterns of actions from Stage ❶ and Stage ❸ within any attack actions: (A) if there are identical frames, which refer to the positions of all joints and stretching angles are identical (as shown in ❶ of Figure 1), frames before the first identical frame and after the second identical

frame can be extracted and directly synthesized as a Feint action; (B) by cutting once at any time point in Stage 1, action frames before the selected point and the corresponding flashback frames can be synthesized as a Feint action (as shown in ② of Figure 1); and (C) similar to the second situation, by cutting once at any time point in stage 3, action frames after the selected point and the corresponding flashback can be synthesized as a Feint action (as shown in ③ of Figure 1). Note that all the above frame-extraction methods guarantee the naturalness of continuous movements via symmetrical patterns.

(2) **Frame-extraction Length for Feint synthesis:** The choices for the length of extracted frames can vary greatly, since multiple attack-action frames can be extracted based on different time ranges. We start from considering Feint actions as independent actions, any time length of action-frames in proper ranges (e.g. Stage ① or Stage ③ in Figure 1) can be used to construct a morphologically reasonable Feint action. Note that it's also possible to construct nested Feint actions, given to a large number of feasible extraction positions.

3.2 Feint in Action Combinations

The first part of our formalization for standalone Feint actions provides a large number of possible Feint actions. However, not all these morphologically reasonable Feint actions can be directly combined for proper animation in combating scenarios. Therefore, certain constraints/restrictions are demanded to construct effective combinations of Feint actions and attack actions. Hereby, we introduce two major considerations and then propose relevant restrictions, to enable naturalistic and suitable combinations of Feint actions and attack actions.




Fig. 2. Dual-action Model - snapshots of the full process

(1) **Physical Constraints:** Physical constraints need to be accounted for when synthesizing Feint actions and attack actions. For example, if a virtual character finishes Feint actions with the left foot forward, but the following attack action starts with the right foot forward, the synthesis of these two actions is inappropriate since this combination is physically unrealistic. Such a constraint is due to the infeasibility of a teleporting movement for the jointly-connected body (e.g. the stepped-out left foot at the beginning/end of a Feint action).




Fig. 3. Dual-action Model - high level abstraction and demonstration of internal stage transitions

To ensure that the combinations of Feint actions and attack actions obey the physical constraints, we add a principle for the combination of a Feint action and an attack action: when selecting the corresponding actions (i.e. a Feint and then an attack action), the starting position (jointly-connected body) of the second action should be the same as the ending position of the starting action. With such a principle, the joints of a character's body can perform natural movements during the transition between these two actions. Figure 2 demonstrates a physically-realistic combination of a Feint action and an attack action. When checking the end of NPC A's Feint action and the beginning of the NPC A's real attack, both the upper and lower body parts of NPC A perform the same postures (the left arm raised and the right arm charged, performing a punch for the upper body, and the left foot forward for lower body).

(2) **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the incorporation of Feint actions is evaluated by whether the following attack actions can successfully hit the opponent. To enable a successful Feint action, the time-length difference of the combined actions is the key factor. The advantages of combining Feint actions with attack actions stem from an appropriate time difference, incurred by Feint actions to mislead the opponents' actions. If the length of a Feint action is too short, the following attack actions might not gain much advantage compared to actions combinations without Feint actions; and if the length of a Feint action is too long, the process to perform a Feint action can leave sufficient time for the opponent to react and even attack back. We provide a detailed demonstration in Section 5.4.

To ensure the effectiveness of time difference incurred by Feint actions, we propose a **Dual-action model** to enable an effective Feint-attack combination. Figure 2 demonstrates the snapshots of a full process on an example from this model, and Figure 3 provides the abstracted process of this model and highlights the internal transition of different stages. As shown in the highlighted orange box of Figure 2, the shortened time of the Feint action enables NPC A to start the attack action ahead, even before NPC B finishes its first action, thus creating a time difference. With such time difference, NPC A gains preemptive advantage over NPC B, which enables him to hit NPC B (at time t_{A2} in Figure 3) before NPC B's attack action (at time t_{B2} in Figure 3). When NPC A hit NPC B at t_{A2} , the ongoing action of NPC B will be interrupted and NPC B would be knocked down.

Note that these two constraints may restrict the overall search space of all possible combinations, the remaining space for possible combinations still justify that our formalization provides high flexibility in terms of possible

action combination. This is mainly due to the fact that the above constraints still preserve a range of choices for time points. As Feint actions fall in a wide spectrum from nuanced body movements to near-to-complete attack actions, Feint-attack combinations can have various possibilities. Based on our formalization, flexibility is guaranteed in terms of action choices, since the time interval of Feint actions can be dynamically configured from the frame-extraction process. In our **Dual-action model**, the key condition for an effective Feint-attack combination is that: the attack actions for the damage (starts at t_{A2} in Figure 3) should start before the damage of the attack action from the opponent (starts at t_{B2} in Figure 3). Any time interval of Feint actions fitting this condition can be flexibly generated, and such flexibility can enhance the unpredictability of Feint actions. Therefore, though two Feint actions can be extracted from the same stage of the same attack action, the difference in time interval can cause different effects, thus greatly improving the randomness and the possibility of complex tactics.

4 FUSING FEINT IN STRATEGIES FOR TWO-PLAYER GAMES

In this section, we examine how to fuse Feint actions with strategy designs for Two-player Games. We first introduce the baseline game model for Two-player Games, Zero-sum Markov Game Model (Section 4.1). Then, we introduce our proposed optimizations for strategies in Two-player Games, with the focus on a future lookahead time interval to select the best one from a series of choices with Feint actions (Section 4.2).

4.1 Zero-sum Markov Game Model

Zero-sum Markov Game Model is a universal model for Non-Deterministic Two-Player Games (NDTPGs) to tackle the non-determinism. In NDTPGs, one player is arbitrarily labeled as the agent and the other player is labeled as its opponent. The rewards and strategy choices are described from the view of the agent, and the corresponding choices for the opponent can be seen as the opposite of the agent's action. A reward matrix is constructed by scoring the rewards of different actions, if performed by the agent and the opponent. The row of the matrix is represented by possible choices of actions for the agent α , and the column is represented by possible choices of actions for the opponent β . Suppose there is a boxing game, the choices of actions for two players are $\alpha = \beta = \{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$, and the damage reward r for each action is $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Accordingly, the reward matrix R

for such a game is constructed as $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -2 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 2 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Each entry (m, n) is calculated by subtract the m^{th} element in r

by the n^{th} element in r (The reward for agent subtract by the reward for opponent). Since all possible actions and corresponding rewards are represented in the reward matrix, the strategy choices can be formulated by a policy vector π , in which the possibilities for choosing each possible action are listed. Assuming that the agent has policy vector π_α and the opponent has policy vector π_β , the expected reward E_α for the agent is $E_\alpha = \pi_\beta^T R \pi_\alpha$. Since the agent and opponent are treated symmetrically, the strategy for the optimal choice follows Maxmin, in which the agent choose π_α to maximise E_α while the opponent choose π_β to minimize it. Thus, the mathematical expression to compute π_α and π_β for maximizing E_α can be expressed in Equation 1

$$\max_{\pi, E_\alpha} E_\alpha, \text{ such that } \sum_i \pi_i = 1, \text{ and } \pi \geq 0, E_\alpha \leq R\pi \quad (1)$$

We elaborate the rationales behind Equation 1. The first two conditions guarantee the valid probability distribution and the $E_\alpha \leq R\pi$ ensure the inequality holds for every row in the reward matrix. Under the aforementioned case, the policy vector for each player is $\pi_\alpha = \pi_\beta = [1/6, 1/3, 1/2]$, indicating the corresponding possibilities of choosing actions from $\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$.

4.2 Incorporating Feint actions with Reward Matrix

In the conventional Zero-sum Markov Game Models, the reward matrix only focuses on single actions. These models currently are incompatible with Feint actions, since the reward for Feint actions must be fused with attack actions to evaluate its practical values. To this end, we propose a new metric for reward matrix construction, which introduces a future lookahead time and calculates the reward for a series of future actions. We first introduce the lookahead time, which constructs the search space of available action combinations (Section 4.2.1). Next, We demonstrate how to build the reward matrix for action combinations with and without, by using the lookahead time.

To better illustrate the reward matrix construction process, we present a example scenario under the boxing game setting as follows: suppose there are 5 possible attack actions $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$, each represents a distinct action in Figure 4. The time consumption for each action are $\{1, 2, 2.5, 3.5, 5\}$ (all in unit time). The reward for each action is $\{1, 1.5, 2.5, 4, 5\}$ respectively.




Actions					
	Short Punch	Short Hook	Medium Punch	Long Punch	Cross Punch
Number Label	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5
Damage	1.0	1.5	2.5	4	5
Time Consumption	1	2	2.5	3.5	5

Fig. 4. Demonstration of our action choices in the scenario.

4.2.1 Slight Extension of the Time Interval. We slightly extend the current interval size within our Game Model, with a future lookahead time as a threshold for searching all possible action combinations. When combining actions, if the sum of the time consumption doesn't exceed the lookahead time threshold, all actions can be freely combined with any feasible orders (if the naturalness of action connections are guaranteed). From all these possible action combinations, we choose the optimal-time-utilizing combinations (the sum of time consumption equals the lookahead threshold, or the remaining time gap cannot be allocated to any action). For example, under the example case, if the lookahead threshold is set to 5.5 unit time, action combination $\{A_1, A_1, A_2, A_1\}$ (sum of time consumption is 5) satisfy the optimal-time-utilising combinations while $\{A_1, A_2, A_1\}$ (sum of time consumption is 4) doesn't satisfy. With such selection, there would be 18 different action combinations when Feint actions are not considered. If one Feint action is added and the time consumption for it is 0.5 unit time, then there would be 16 different action combinations. These action combinations construct the search space for decision-making.

4.2.2 Reward Matrix Calculation. The basic construction for the reward matrix idea is similar to the conventional Markov Game Model. However, by using the lookahead time to pick available action combinations, the reward

matrix calculates the reward towards these action combinations, instead of the rewards towards a single action. Thus, the row numbers indicate action combination choice for the agent and the column numbers indicate the action combination choice of the opponent. Each entry $(x1, y1)$ represents the relative reward for the agent when the agent chooses action combination $x1$ and the opponent chooses action combination $y1$. There are two calculation metrics for action combinations without Feint actions and for action combinations with Feint actions.

(1) **Action combinations without Feint actions:** Suppose the agent chooses action combination $\{A_1, A_3, A_4\}$ while the opponent choose action combination $\{A_5, A_2\}$. The action combinations of the agent, and the opponent are transferred into three choice-competing pairs $\{(A_1, A_5), (A_3, A_2), (A_4, 0)\}$. Inside each choice-competing pair, the duration of the Stretch-Out Stage of the two actions will be compared, and the longer one will be punished because the action with shorter stretch out time will first inflict damage (e.g. for pair (A_1, A_5) , since the stretch out time of A_1 0.4 is smaller than that of A_5 (1.3), the reward for the agent is calculated as -1). If the length of the Stretch Out time of two actions equals, the reward is calculated by contracting the damage of two actions. Additionally, if the pair contains only one action (e.g. $(A_4, 0)$), the damage of that action can be fully rewarded since the opponent doesn't have time to do any action.

(2) **Action combinations with Feint actions:** Suppose a Feint actions F_1 is added to action choices (with time consumption as 0.5 unit time), and the agent chooses the action combination of $\{F_1, A_4, A_2, A_2\}$ while the opponent choose $\{A_1, A_2, F_1, A_5\}$. The action pairs for Feint actions are modified with consideration of the following action, which are $\{(F_1 + A_4, A_2 + A_2), (A_1 + A_2, F_1 + A_5)\}$. This connection reveals the Dual-action model as covered in Section 3.2, in which the Stretch Out time for the second action is calculated together with the first one. The shorter the overall stretch-out duration of the two-action combinations would enable the first inflicting damage on the one with longer Stretch-Out duration. (e.g., For the pair $(F_1 + A_4, A_2 + A_2)$, before the damage of the opponent's second action can be inflicted, the agent can inflict the damage of A_4 because of the relatively short Feint actions time.)

5 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

In this section, we perform experimental studies on our formalization and fusion of Feint actions. We first describe the experimental methodology, with the focus on our designs and implementations (Section 5.1). Then, we study the overall benefits of Feint actions in a complete combating game (Section 5.2). Next, we examine the impacts of different strategies, when Feint actions are accounted for (Section 5.3). Finally, we perform comparisons of different configurations on the length of Feint actions (Section 5.4).

5.1 Experimental Methodology

We implement the **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions** and apply our strategy model in boxing scenarios. To ensure the complete coverage of boxing actions in the simulation, we choose a full set of 22 boxing actions as base actions from Mixamo [Stefano Corazza and Nazim Kareemi 2022], which provides open-source 3D animation models authenticated by Adobe company. As shown in Figure 5, this set of actions cover various attack actions (including hook, punch and kick etc in ❶), defend actions (including block, step backwards, step sideways etc in ❷), transition actions (including prepare, idle and pivot etc in ❸) and reaction actions (including stomach hit, center hit and head hit etc in ❹). All these action animations are mirrored into pairs to perform both the left-hand side action and the right-hand side actions. We use Unreal Engine 4 [Cataldi 2016], an open-source and real-time 3D animation tool created by Epic Game company to construct the boxing scenes. Unreal Engine 4 provides various templates for quick scenes building without concerning low-level engine details and supports C++ scripts for customization [Chu and Zaman 2021]. We implement Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions in animation and montage editors [Agrahari and Chimalakonda 2021] and we utilize the behaviour tree




Fig. 5. A demonstration of all 22 action from an attack action set within Mixamo. ❶ indicates 10 attack actions; and ❷, ❸ and ❹ demonstrate 4 actions of defense, reaction and transition respectively.

in Unreal Engine 4 to implement our strategy model, in which reward matrix with future lookahead calculation is done with C++ scripts and integrated into the engine control logic.

5.2 Overall Benefits of Feint Actions in a Combat Scenario

We examine the overall impacts of Feint actions under a real combat scenario, in which NPC A play against NPC B in a boxing game. We consider 3 representative scenarios: (1) both NPC A and NPC B perform only basic actions ($\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$); (2) NPC A can self-generate Feint actions while NPC B perform only basic actions; and (3) both NPC A and NPC B can self-generate Feint actions. The overall benefits of Feint actions are evaluated as scores gained throughout the whole game, and the calculation of scores are as follows. Hitting the opponent gain positive rewards ($\{1, 1.5, 2.5, 4, 5\}$ for action $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$ respectively), and being hit gain negative rewards ($\{-1, -1.5, -2.5, -4, -5\}$ for action $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$ respectively). Each scenario is set as 25 unit time and we conduct 20 simulations for each scenario and the average of the results are reported in Figure 7.

We justify that Feint actions bring benefits to the game. For scenario 1 (shown as ❶ in Figure 7), the average rewards for both NPC A and NPC B are similar, at around -2.5. For scenario 2 (shown as ❷ in Figure 7), the average rewards for NPC A are noticeably higher than NPC B, which proves that combining Feint actions with other actions can increase the general rewards even Feint actions itself has no reward. For scenario 3 (shown as ❸ in Figure 7), the average rewards for both NPC A and NPC B are similar, but generally higher than the first scenario, indicating that Feint actions can increase the variety of activity choices and enhance the general combating rewards.



Fig. 6. Demonstration of the three consequences of different Feint actions length choices. ❶ demonstrates the consequence of a very short Feint actions duration. ❷ demonstrates the consequences of a proper length Feint actions duration. ❸ demonstrates the consequences of a very long Feint actions duration.




Fig. 7. Results of scores in a real combat scenario under 3 scenarios. In scenarios ❶, both NPC A and NPC B only perform basic actions. In scenario ❷, NPC A can self-generate feints but NPC B only performs basic actions. In scenario ❸, both NPC A and NPC B self-generates Feint actions. The scores of 20 simulations for each scenario are listed and corresponding average scores are presented.

5.3 Impacts on Strategies with Feint Actions

We show that Feint actions can bring more diversity to the Game Strategies, by examine the distribution of the choices during the game. Hereby, we consider the reward matrix and corresponding strategy for two NPCs. NPC A perform only basic actions ($\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5\}$) and no Feint actions, while NPC B perform self-generated Feint actions F_1 together with the basic actions. Under the example case in Section 5.1, the reward matrix entry (possible action combinations) for NPC A and NPC B are shown in Figure 8, in which the combinations are sorted from least action number (only high-damage but time-consuming actions) to most action number (only low-damage but short actions). The reward matrix and corresponding strategies follow the mechanism we introduced in Section 4. We analyze and compare the value distributions in the reward matrix and the corresponding strategy based on their reward matrix for these two NPCs.




Fig. 8. ❶ demonstrates the reward matrix with only attack actions; and ❷ demonstrates the reward matrix with Feint. Blue outlines indicates the clustered high-positive rewards while red outlines indicates the clustered high-negative rewards. Note that both reward matrix have 16 entries, corresponding to the 16 action combinations in Figure 5

As shown in Figure 8, the positive rewards for NPC A (shown as ❶) are clustered around the left-bottom corner (outlined in blue), indicating that the combination of low-damage but short actions (e.g. $\{A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1\}$)

- Junyu Liu, Wangkai Jin, and Xiangjun Peng

Action Combination	$[A_5]$	$[A_1, A_4]$	$[A_2, A_3]$	$[A_3, A_2]$	$[A_4, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_3]$	$[A_1, A_2, A_2]$	$[A_1, A_3, A_1]$
Choice Probability	2.9%	0.8%	2.5%	2.3%	1%	4.9%	4%	5.4%
Action Combination	$[A_2, A_1, A_2]$	$[A_2, A_2, A_1]$	$[A_3, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_1, A_2]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_2, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_2, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_2, A_1, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1]$
Choice Probability	8.3%	8.3%	12%	10.8%	8.9%	11.3%	13.1%	16.5%

❶

Action Combination	$[A_5]$	$[A_1, A_4]$	$[A_2, A_3]$	$[A_3, A_2]$	$[A_4, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_3]$	$[A_1, A_2, A_2]$	$[A_1, A_3, A_1]$
Choice Probability	7%	8.8%	4.4%	7.9%	4.9%	7.3%	8.1%	4.2%
Action Combination	$[A_2, A_1, A_2]$	$[A_2, A_2, A_1]$	$[A_3, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_1, A_2]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_2, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_2, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_2, A_1, A_1, A_1]$	$[A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1, A_1]$
Choice Probability	2.7%	6.6%	7.4%	3.2%	7.4%	8.3%	7.3%	7.9%

❷

Fig. 9. Strategy choices (in probability) for all 16 action combinations. ❶ demonstrates the strategy choices probabilities when Feint actions is not considered. ❷ demonstrates the strategy choices probabilities when Feint actions is added.

can gain more reward than high-damage but time-consuming action combinations (e.g. $\{A_5\}$). Accordingly, the strategy choice (in probability) for NPC A is calculated as ❶ in Figure 9 for each matrix entry, in which low-damage but short action combinations are favored over high-damage but time-consuming action combinations. Such a preference can lead to decreased diversity or even deadlock in combating scenes since both players would always prefer low-damage but short action combinations and might never choose high-damage but time-consuming action combinations, failing to simulate the various real combating scenes. However, when combing self-generated Feint actions, the positive rewards for NPC B (shown as ❷ in Figure 8) are distributed evenly throughout the center of the whole matrix rather than the corners, indicating that proper combinations of low-damage but short actions and high-damage but time-consuming actions can gain high rewards (e.g. the clustered high-positive scores (outlined in blue) and clustered high-negative scores (outlined in red) are distributed among the matrix). Accordingly, the strategy choice (in probability) for NPC B is calculated as ❷ in Figure 9 for each matrix entry, in which the preference is distributed in various short and long action combinations, rather than monolithic combinations. Thus, Feint actions can eliminate the choices of extreme monolithic combinations and increase the probability of various short and long action combinations. Such variety allows decent simulations for complex real-world combating scenes, suggesting positive impacts for Feint actions in strategy choices.

5.4 Comparisons among Different Lengths of Feint Actions

To thoroughly test the choices of different Feint actions duration, NPC A has been required to self-generate 15 different lengths of Feint actions from each full action and the effects of these Feint actions are examined in combating scenes with NPC B which only performs basic actions. Over 20 turns are simulated in each combating scene to prevent random consequences. From the experiments, we observe that the choices of length values mainly have three consequences in combating. We hereby select three Feint actions duration values from full action A_1 as representatives to demonstrate three consequences respectively.

We use the timeline of the two-stage action combination model in Figure 3 to analyze and evaluate the three Feint actions duration choices. We use three key time points that are highlighted in Figure 3 to explain the action process, in which t_{B_1} indicates the end of defense action while t_{A_2} indicates the estimated start of damage in second action for NPC A and t_{B_2} indicates the estimated start of damage in second action for NPC B. The three consequences mainly differ in these three key time points.

1) **Very short Feint actions duration** $t_{A_2} < t_{B_1}$: The snapshots sequence of simulation is shown as ❶ in Figure 6, in which the Feint actions duration is extremely short and the estimated start of damage in second

action for NPC A (t_{A_2}) happens when NPC B is still in the first defense action (thus $t_{A_2} < t_{B_1}$). As the snapshots shows, the second real action of NPC A would not benefit much since NPC B is still in defense.

2) **Proper length Feint actions duration** $t_{B_1} < t_{A_2} < t_{B_2}$: The snapshots sequence of simulation is shown as ❷ in Figure 6, in which the Feint actions have a moderate duration. The key difference of this duration is that the estimated start of damage in the second action for NPC A happens after the end of defense action of NPC B and before the estimated start of damage in the second action for NPC B, thus performing the time difference introduced in Section 3.2. With such time difference, NPC A gains preemptive advantage over NPC B, inflicting damage on NPC B (at time t_{A_2} in Figure 3) before NPC B's damage inflicting of second action starting (at time t_{B_2} in Figure 3). When NPC A hit NPC B at t_{A_2} , the ongoing action of NPC B will be interrupted and NPC B would be knocked down.

3) **Very long Feint actions duration** $t_{A_2} > t_{B_2}$: The snapshots sequence of simulation is shown as ❸ in Figure 6, in which the Feint actions duration is too long and the estimated start of damage in second action for NPC A (t_{A_2}) happens after the estimated start of damage in second action for NPC B (t_{B_2}). This condition has the opposite consequence of a moderate length Feint actions duration, in which NPC B can inflict damage on NPC A before NPC A's damage inflicting of the second action starting. When NPC B hits NPC A at t_{A_2} , the ongoing action of NPC A will be interrupted and NPC A would be knocked down.

Thus, the choice of the time duration for Feint actions highly depends on the action combinations and the estimation of opponents' actions, proving our observation in Section 3. With the lookahead and reward matrix calculation metric introduced in Section 4, this problem can be narrowed down to calculating possible Feint actions time ranges for entries in the reward matrix, since all action combinations and opponents actions are represented as rows and columns in the matrix.

6 RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to provide a comprehensive formalization and concrete fusion of Feint actions in Two-player Games. Only a limited amount of works have accounted for Feint actions in existing literature, and they lack detailed formalization of Feint actions and doesnot concretely examine how to fuse Feint actions with game strategy. [Wampler et al. 2010] animates Feint actions as a proof of the capability to construct nuanced game strategies with unpredictability, in which Feint actions are treated the same as other actions. More recently, [Won et al. 2021] addresses the limitation and applies several pre-defined tactical actions as Feint actions, but the methodology to form these pre-defined actions is not detailed. Our work is different from the above works by forming a general formalization of Feint actions, and how to fuse Feint actios with game strategy in a concrete manner.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose a dynamic run-time Feint actions generation mechanism, **Palindrome-directed Generation of Feint actions**, in which virtual characters can dynamically self-generate various Feint actions. We highlight the choices of frame-extraction positions and lengths, which directly decide the effectiveness of generated Feint action. Besides, we combine Feint actions into other actions, which meets the real-world meaning for Feint actions and provides future lookahead for the strategy calculation. Secondly, we propose a run-time and future-concerned strategy making mechanism. We distinguish the reward gaining mechanism (based on zero-sum Markov game) of Feint actions with other actions, in which rewards are calculated with future action combinations instead of a single action. With such future-concerned mechanism, we discovered that Feint actions can balance the choice of different actions when making strategies, increasing the possibility and success rate of powerful but time-consuming actions and increase the overall long-term rewards.

- Junyu Liu, Wangkai Jin, and Xiangjun Peng

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the anonymous reviewers from SIGGRAPH 2023 for feedback. This work is a foundation of a follow-up work, available at [Liu et al. 2024]. The submitted version of the video preview can be found hereby.

REFERENCES

- Vartika Agrahari and Sridhar Chimalakonda. 2021. What’s Inside Unreal Engine? - A Curious Gaze!. In *ISEC 2021: 14th Innovations in Software Engineering Conference, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India, February 25-27, 2021*, Durga Prasad Mohapatra, Samaresh Mishra, Tony Clark, Alpana Dubey, Richa Sharma, and Lov Kumar (Eds.). ACM, 21:1–21:5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452383.3452404>
- Luis Cataldi. 2016. Content creation using UE4. In *Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference, SIGGRAPH ’16, Anaheim, CA, USA, July 24-28, 2016*, Studio. ACM, 10:1. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2929484.2970275>
- Eric Chu and Loutfouz Zaman. 2021. Exploring alternatives with Unreal Engine’s Blueprints Visual Scripting System. *Entertain. Comput.* 36 (2021), 100388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcom.2020.100388>
- Arna Diego and Leonardo Bonisoli. 2020. The Animation of Togo: Achieving hyper realism for 11 CG dogs. In *SIGGRAPH ’20: Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference, Talks, Virtual Event, USA, August, 2020*. ACM, 53:1–53:2. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3388767.3408944>
- Forouzan Farzinnejad, Jafar Habibi, and Nilufar Baghaei. 2021. Playbook: An Animation-Based Game for Improving Children’s Creativity and Problem Solving Skills. In *EICS ’21: ACM SIGCHI Symposium on Engineering Interactive Computing Systems, Virtual Event, The Netherlands, 8-11 June 2021*, Panos Markopoulos, Jun Hu, and Philippe A. Palanque (Eds.). ACM, 12–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459926.3464748>
- Jehee Lee and Kang Hoon Lee. 2006. Precomputing avatar behavior from human motion data. *Graph. Model.* 68, 2 (2006), 158–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gmod.2005.03.004>
- Seyoung Lee, Sunmin Lee, Yongwoo Lee, and Jehee Lee. 2021. Learning a family of motor skills from a single motion clip. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 40, 4 (2021), 93:1–93:13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450626.3459774>
- Junyu Liu, Wangkai Jin, and Xiangjun Peng. 2024. Feint in Multi-Player Games. Technical Report-Feb-24 at User-Centric Computing Group, University of Nottingham Ningbo China.
- Xue Bin Peng, Ze Ma, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Angjoo Kanazawa. 2021. AMP: adversarial motion priors for stylized physics-based character control. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 40, 4 (2021), 144:1–144:20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450626.3459670>
- Hubert P. H. Shum, Taku Komura, and Shuntaro Yamazaki. 2008. Simulating interactions of avatars in high dimensional state space. In *Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on Interactive 3D Graphics, SI3D 2008, February 15-17, 2008, Redwood City, CA, USA*, Eric Haines and Morgan McGuire (Eds.). ACM, 131–138. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1342250.1342271>
- Stefano Corazza and Nazim Kareemi. 2022. Mixamo. <https://www.mixamo.com/#/>
- Adrien Treuille, Yongjoon Lee, and Zoran Popovic. 2007. Near-optimal character animation with continuous control. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 26, 3 (2007), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1276377.1276386>
- Abderrahmen Trichili, Amr Ragheb, Dmitrii Briantcev, Maged Abdullah Esmail, Majid Altamimi, Islam Ashry, Boon S. Ooi, Saleh Al-Shebeili, and Mohamed-Slim Alouini. 2021. Retrofitting FSO Systems in Existing RF Infrastructure: A Non-Zero Sum Game Technology. *CoRR abs/2105.07543* (2021). arXiv:2105.07543 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.07543>
- Kevin Wampler, Erik Andersen, Evan Herbst, Yongjoon Lee, and Zoran Popovic. 2010. Character animation in two-player adversarial games. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 29, 3 (2010), 26:1–26:13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1805964.1805970>
- Jungdam Won, Deepak Gopinath, and Jessica K. Hodgins. 2021. Control strategies for physically simulated characters performing two-player competitive sports. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 40, 4 (2021), 146:1–146:11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450626.3459761>
- Barbara Yersin, Jonathan Maim, Julien Pettré, and Daniel Thalmann. 2009. Crowd patches: populating large-scale virtual environments for real-time applications. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Symposium on Interactive 3D Graphics, SI3D 2009, February 27 - March 1, 2009, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*, Eric Haines, Morgan McGuire, Daniel G. Aliaga, Manuel M. Oliveira, and Stephen N. Spencer (Eds.). ACM, 207–214. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1507149.1507184>
- Chengke Zhang and Fangchao Li. 2021. Non-zero sum differential game for stochastic Markovian jump systems with partially unknown transition probabilities. *J. Frankl. Inst.* 358, 15 (2021), 7528–7558. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfranklin.2021.07.050>
- Rong Zhang. 2021. Computer Vision-Based Art Color in the Animation Film Performance Characteristics and Techniques. *J. Sensors* 2021 (2021), 5445940:1–5445940:12. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5445940>