

# Simulation-Driven Balancing of Competitive Game Levels with Reinforcement Learning

Florian Rupp , Manuel Eberhardinger , Kai Eckert 

**Abstract**—The balancing process for game levels in competitive two-player contexts involves a lot of manual work and testing, particularly for non-symmetrical game levels. In this work, we frame game balancing as a procedural content generation task and propose an architecture for automatically balancing of tile-based levels within the PCGRL framework (procedural content generation via reinforcement learning). Our architecture is divided into three parts: (1) a level generator, (2) a balancing agent, and (3) a reward modeling simulation. Through repeated simulations, the balancing agent receives rewards for adjusting the level towards a given balancing objective, such as equal win rates for all players. To this end, we propose new swap-based representations to improve the robustness of playability, thereby enabling agents to balance game levels more effectively and quickly compared to traditional PCGRL. By analyzing the agent’s swapping behavior, we can infer which tile types have the most impact on the balance. We validate our approach in the Neural MMO (NMMO) environment in a competitive two-player scenario. In this extended conference paper, we present improved results, explore the applicability of the method to various forms of balancing beyond equal balancing, compare the performance to another search-based approach, and discuss the application of existing fairness metrics to game balancing.

**Index Terms**—PCG, game balancing, reinforcement learning, simulation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Level design is a key concept when creating games. In order to keep players engaged, a balance must be struck between a challenging and enjoyable experience. This is generally not an easy task, as it also depends on the skill and experience of the players [1]. In addition, game levels for competitive multiplayer games must be designed to be balanced towards equal initial win chances for all players. Imbalanced games will lead to boredom or frustration, and players will quit playing [2], [3].

To ensure balance through level design, game designers often rely on nearly (point) symmetric map architectures. This can be seen in popular competitive e-sports titles such as League of Legends, DotA 2 or Starcraft 2, but also in other competitive tile-based games such as Advance Wars or Bomberman. In addition to symmetric levels, alternative approaches are also possible. Non-symmetric levels offer more variety and can create new ways for playful creativity to be entertaining and challenging.

We formulate the level balancing task as a procedural content generation (PCG) task. In previous works, several approaches have been proposed using (PCG) for level balancing, such as search-based approaches [4], [5], evolutionary




Fig. 1: In our game environment, two players must forage for resources like food (dark green) and water (blue) to survive longest. By swapping the highlighted tiles (red), the trained model achieved a more balanced game in simulated game runs.

algorithms [6]–[10] or graph grammars [11]. In this work, we introduce the use of reinforcement learning (RL) to balance tile-based levels. Once a RL model is trained, it can generate levels fast and is less dependent on randomness compared to evolutionary methods. We apply RL for balancing by designing a reward function based on multiple simulation runs using scripted agents. While this approach becomes computationally intensive due to the simulations for each reward calculation, the advantage of RL over other search-based approaches is that it learns during training. This reduces the need for unnecessary simulations in the inference step, unlike e.g., evolutionary algorithms, which start over each time. In addition, we design our method to be domain independent, unlike graph grammars or search-based approaches.

Therefore, we use the Procedural Content Generation via Reinforcement Learning framework (PCGRL) [12] which has recently been introduced for the generation of tile-based levels. Together with the newly introduced swapping representations, our method can be viewed as a fine-tuning task to optimize a generated level towards a certain balance. Our method is evaluated on the open-source Neural Massively Multiplayer Online (NMMO) environment [13] which was designed for competitive multiplayer research. We frame the problem as a resource gathering and survival game. Figure 1 shows an example of how our method balanced a generated level (left) by swapping highlighted tiles (right). The code used in this research is available on Github<sup>1</sup>.

Our contributions are:

- A domain-independent architecture for learning to automatically alter game levels towards a specified balance with RL.

This research was supported by the Volkswagen Foundation (Project: Consequences of Artificial Intelligence on Urban Societies, Grant 98555).

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/FlorianRupp/pcgri-simulation-driven-balancing>

- A novel swap-based representation pattern to frame the problem as a Markov decision process.
- An experimental study to evaluate the proposed architecture against the original PCGRL method.

This paper is an extended version of the conference paper [14]. We provide improved results, a detailed discussion of how existing fairness metrics can be transferred to game balancing, a comparison with a search-based approach, and a study of how this can be used for any balancing and not just equal balancing. Therefore, we revise the reward function and explain its derivation from the statistical parity metric [15].

The structure of this paper is as follows: We give a brief overview of related work (II) and the background (III). In Section IV the method is described and the implementation details in V subsequently. Experiments and results are presented in VI, followed by an extended study on the generalized approach of an arbitrary balancing in VII. The discussion is in Section VIII, the conclusion in IX.

## II. RELATED WORK

Several methods for balancing multiplayer games have been proposed in the past. One approach is to balance the configuration of game entities such as characters, weapons, or items [1]. To this end, the gaming industry uses pipelines to gain data-driven insights from games played and to adjust the balance on a regular basis<sup>2</sup>.

Evolutionary algorithms are further widely applied for game balancing. Morosan et al. balance a real-time strategy game (RTS) [6] and Sorochan et al. generate new and balanced units for an RTS game [5]. Volz et al. balance decks for a card game and, similar to this work, they evaluate the quality with a simulation-driven approach [16]. De Mesentier Silva et al. optimize cards for the game Hearthstone [10] to balance the metagame. Pfau et al. train models with data from played games to replicate human behavior for automated entity balancing [17].

A level's balance is furthermore affected by its design. This refers e.g., to the position of game entities in relation to the players' initial spawn position. As aforementioned, in many games this is ensured with (point) symmetric map architectures. Contrary to the intended balance, players' perceptions may differ. A survey revealed that the prevailing opinion among highly experienced players is that only symmetric levels can actually be balanced [18].

To automatically construct balanced levels with PCG, several works using evolutionary algorithms have been introduced [7], [8]. In contrast to this work, the fitness for balancing is evaluated using rule-based heuristics or metrics. These metrics are either hand-crafted or rely on a data-driven method using played games. Karavolos et al. extend this with a convolutional neural network to predict game related information which are then used in the fitness function of an evolutionary algorithm to produce balanced levels [9]. A different approach is the usage of graph grammars [11]. The balance here is constructed by the rule-based placement of strategic game

entities, which is, however, highly domain-dependent. Rupp et al. present GEEvo, a framework for generating and balancing graph-based game economies [19]. An evolutionary algorithm is used to balance the weights on the edges of the graph to a given value. Similar to this work, fitness is evaluated by running multiple simulations.

In this work, we focus on *procedural content generation* for level generation, but the term PCG is also used in other applications such as the generation of game economies [19], [20], rules [21] or narratives [22]. PCG methods span over from dedicated algorithms [23], search-based methods [4], [7], [8] up to the use of machine learning [24] and deep learning [25]–[28]. Once trained, machine learning methods can quickly generate content on demand, but they rely on the existence of game levels from which a model can be learned. As a result, these methods are usually not efficiently applicable to the creation of new games.

In the games community, RL has been widely applied to *play* games [29], [30], but recently, it has also been applied to PCG [12], [31]–[33]. The framework we use and extend in this work is PCGRL [12], utilizing RL for PCG tasks (cf. Section III-A). Zakaria et al. compare different deep learning-based PCG approaches for the puzzle game Sokoban, with uncontrollable PCGRL showing superior quality [33]. There are already a few methods that have adapted the PCGRL method. In [34] controllable content generators were introduced, where users control the generated content with additional constraints, such as e.g., the number of players. However, we do not compare our method to it, since our goal is only a balanced level. Other approaches use evolutionary strategies on top of the PCGRL framework to achieve more content diversity [35] or adapt the method for 3D environments [36].

## III. BACKGROUND

### A. The PCGRL Framework

In this work, we use the PCGRL [12] framework for level balancing. In PCGRL, PCG is formulated as a sequential decision-making task to maximize a given reward function, where semantic constraints can be expressed and thus, no training data is needed. To apply RL, the PCG problem is formulated as a Markov decision process (MDP). Therefore, PCGRL introduces three different MDP representations for level generation. We will introduce three new swap representations based on the existing ones. Later, we will argue that they are more suitable for modifying game levels to improve the balance state. The original representations in PCGRL are:

a) *Narrow*: This representation randomly selects a tile in the grid and the agent only has to decide what type of tile to place on the selected position. The action space is small as it only consists of the different tile types.






b) *Turtle*: The *turtle* representation allows the agent to move around the map and then to decide what type of tile to place on the current position. The advantage of the narrow representation is that the agent is not restricted to the randomly assigned position and can therefore learn where to move next.

<sup>2</sup><https://www.leagueoflegends.com/en-gb/news/dev/dev-balance-framework-update/>

c) *Wide*: The *wide* representation gives the agent full control over the level generation process, since the agent can decide which tile of the entire grid should be changed. This greatly increases the action space as each position of the grid multiplied by the number of tiles represents an action. Because the agent can change everything directly according to a plan it has constructed, it is the most human-like representation.

### B. The Neural MMO Environment

As a basis for our experiments, we use the NMMO environment [13]. The NMMO environment is a Massively Multiplayer Online Battle Royal-inspired multi-agent RL environment for research. It simulates a tile-based virtual world in which agents must forage for resources to survive and prepare for battles with other agents. All agent actions are processed simultaneously per time step. The agent that survives the longest wins the game. The state of an agent is represented by its position as well as its current health, food, and water levels.

In this paper, we focus on the balancing in the PCG process of the game map. To apply and evaluate our method, we simplify the winning condition and frame the game as a forage survival game. Therefore, we disable the combat system and restrict the map tiles to the types of grass , forest , stone , and water . Agents  cannot move on stone or water tiles. Forest and water are resources that the agent can gather. When moving on a forest tile, it is automatically consumed as food and refills the agent's food indicator. In the process, the forest tile changes to the state *scrub*. Scrub tiles cannot be consumed, but there is a 2.5% chance per time step per scrub tile that it will respawn and transit back to the forest state. To refill an agent's water indicator, it must simply step on an adjacent tile. Water tiles are not depleted. If one of both resource indicators are empty, the agent loses a fixed amount of health per step. If the agent's health indicator reaches zero, the agent dies. An agent can regain health if its water and food indicators are above 50%.

For this research, the winning conditions are the same for both agents. The first agent to reach one of the two goals wins:

- Collect five food resources.
- Last agent standing: Neither starved nor died of thirst.

In this research, we fix the map size to a grid of 6x6 tiles and two players to speed up the experiments and to keep the results interpretable by human evaluators. Furthermore, the smaller grid size limits the available space and resources, which increases the competitive race of the agents. This competitive race is to be balanced in this paper.

## IV. METHOD

### A. Balancing Architecture

This paper proposes an architecture for balancing tile-based levels with RL. The idea is to reward a PCGRL agent for only altering a given playable level towards a balanced level. A balanced level is one where all player agents with the same skill have the same win rate. We focus only on game balance through level design, which excludes balancing a sequence of

levels or different play styles for instance. The architecture is shown in Figure 2. It is separated into three parts: a level generator, a balancing agent, and a game playing simulation.

The level generator constructs a playable level from random noise which is then fed to the balancing agent. In this work we use PCGRL for the generator, but other PCG methods will serve comparable at this point. The generator is trained separately before training the balancing agent.

The core idea of level balancing is not to generate a new level, but to modify the given level to satisfy the balancing constraint. At each time step, the balancing agent can decide to swap the positions of two selected tiles. If a swap (cf. Section IV-B) has been made, the level is played  $n$ -times in a simulation by player agents. Subsequently, the balancing agent is rewarded based on how this action affected the balance state in simulations (Section IV-C). The simulations can therefore be understood as the basis for a static simulation-based evaluation function as described by Yannakakis and Togelius [?]. More details are given in the implementation details (Section V).

### B. Swap-based Representation Pattern

To formulate the problem of PCG with RL as MDP, three representations have been introduced in [12]. In all of them, the agent can decide to replace a tile at a particular position. This method, however, can lead to unplayable levels at a time step. Furthermore, to move the position of e.g., a player tile somewhere else, the agent would first have to remove the player tile before creating it at a different position. In this time step, the level would not be playable for the player agents, and thus, no reward could be computed in the simulation step. Additionally, the agent would first receive a negative reward due to the number of players is now invalid. The subsequent creation at a different position under the previously given negative reward is hard to learn for RL agents.

For this reason, we introduce a swap-based representation pattern. In these representations, the agent can decide to swap the positions of two tiles per time step. Not adding or removing tiles entirely is a more robust approach to ensuring level playability.

However, there may be game domains where multiple tiles have a semantic connection, such as multiple river tiles forming a river. Swapping these tiles around can break playability. Therefore, in the balancing step, we suggest sending unplayable levels back to the generator for repair. This repair is similar to the level fixing seen in [37], but it would also involve an additional increase in computation.

In this work, we demonstrate the power of swapping with a simpler domain where there are no semantic relationships between multiple tiles. In addition, swapping tiles ensures that the old level isn't simply regenerated from scratch, since that is the job of the level generator. Swapping two tiles of the same type has no effect on balance. Thus, we prevent these swaps to reduce the computational effort. In these cases, the agent is rewarded with 0. Therefore, we extend the narrow, turtle and wide representations [12] with a swapping mechanism. Like in PCGRL, observations are one-hot encoded




Fig. 2: Description of the balancing architecture. It is separated into three units: A level generator, a level balancing agent, and a game playing simulation. In the latter, the game is simulated by playing it  $n$ -times with heuristic player agents. The reward  $r_t$  for training the balancing agent is computed from the balance states  $b_t$  and  $b_{t-1}$  of the simulations.

in all representations. The detailed description for each swap representation is provided below.

a) *Swap-Narrow*: At each time step two random tile positions are presented to the agent, and it can decide to swap the tiles or not. The agent’s limited positional control results in a very small action space  $A$  with only two actions: swap or do not swap.  $A$  is therefore  $A = [2]$ .

b) *Swap-Turtle*: Starting from two random positions, the agent can decide to swap the tiles at the current positions in each time step. If no change is made, it can decide to which adjacent tile to move to next. As in the original PCGRL, staying at a position and not changing a tile is not an option.  $A$  is therefore  $A = [4, 4, 2]$ , which results in 32 possible actions.

c) *Swap-Wide*: In this representation, the agent sees the entire level and can freely determine the tile positions and whether to swap them. It can be interpreted as looking at the whole level and then deciding what to move where. A drawback here is the large action space, since it scales twice with the grid width  $w$  and height  $h$ .  $A$  is therefore  $A = [w, h, w, h, 2]$ . In the case of a square grid, as in this work with a size of 6,  $A$  has 2592 possible actions.

### C. Reward Design

The reward function is crucial for the successful training of an RL agent. Heuristic approaches for evaluating the balance have been introduced in [7], [8]. These approaches, however, contain domain-specific information and are thus not transferable. To address this shortcoming, we propose the use of a more generic, game domain-independent reward function that depends only on how often each player wins. In addition, we require that the game has at least one winner at the end. Since draws also provide information about the balance, our reward function must take this into account as well.

To adequately measure the balance, we are inspired by fairness metrics from the fair machine learning community. A survey of common metrics used in that field is provided by Makhoul et al. [38]. The statistical parity metric [15] is one of them and is often used to measure fairness between two groups. The fairness for two groups  $G = 1$  and  $G = 2$  is considered as fair if the conditional probability of the same outcome  $\hat{Y}$  is the same for both groups, as seen in Eq. 1.

$$P(\hat{Y} | G = 1) = P(\hat{Y} | G = 2) \quad (1)$$

In this work, we transfer this definition of fairness to the domain of game balancing. In the context of the statistical

parity, the two groups represent the two players, and we want to optimize their win rates. However, the direct use of Eq. 1 is not applicable to RL since it requires a function that rewards the agent with positive or negative incentives per time step  $t$ . In addition, an intermediate reward design which compares  $t$  to  $t-1$  has shown good results in PCGRL. First, we therefore define the win rate  $w_{p_i t}$  per player  $p_i$ :

$$w_{p_i t} = P(w_t | p = i) \quad (2)$$

$w_{p_i t}$  is then inferred from the data of the  $n$ -runs of the player agent simulations per step. This can be seen as a sampling from the actual win rate distribution (cf. Section V-C and Fig. 3). Second, in this extended paper, we additionally want to make the reward design configurable to a certain balance state  $b$  and thus rewrite the balancing calculation  $b_t$  as:

$$b_t = |w_{p_1 t} - b| \quad (3)$$

Due to the use of the absolute value,  $w_{p_i t}$  of both players could be used in Eq. 3, since their values describe probabilities that sum up to 1.  $b_t$  is defined in  $[0, 1]$  as well, where 0 indicates that  $b_t$  is exactly equal to  $b$ ; 1 indicates the maximum deviation from  $b$ . In the example where an exact balance between both players is desired ( $b = 0.5$ ),  $b_t = 1$  indicates a particular player wins every game. With  $b_t$  in this range, there is flexibility to configure towards which player the game should be balanced against. Finally, the reward  $r_t$  is:

$$r_t = b_{t-1} - b_t + \alpha \quad (4)$$

To reward the agent additionally, a reward  $\alpha$  is given if  $b_t$  is exactly  $b$ . Otherwise,  $\alpha$  is 0. If  $\alpha > 0$ , the episode always ends since  $b_t = b$ . As a result, the reward will be positive if the agent improves the balance state, negative otherwise. For no impact on the balance state, the agent receives no reward (value 0). Using this reward design, the RL agent is gradually incentivized to reduce the absolute difference from the current balance state to the desired one.

## V. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

### A. Level Generator

The task of this unit is to generate playable levels for balancing. In this work, the generator is a model trained using the PCGRL framework. The reward for the training process is designed to reward the agent for having exactly two players and creating a valid path between them. To ensure direct competition, the latter restriction ensures that both players

have access to the same area of the game level. Additionally, it prevents single players from being locked behind stone walls.

The NMMO environment uses PCG by default to generate random levels, however, the players' spawn positions are randomly determined at the start of the game. Nevertheless, the spawn positions are crucial for the balance, so the balancing agent should be able to influence them. For this reason, player tiles representing these positions are integrated in the level generation process.

If there is a valid path between both players, the agent receives a positive reward, otherwise a negative one. Additionally, at each step the agent is rewarded with the difference of the players that are and should be (similar to [12]). We get the best results using the *wide* representation. An episode ends when both constraints are met, or when the agent exceeds a fixed number of permitted steps or changes.

After training, the model can produce levels satisfying the given constraints in 98,7% levels out of an evaluation sample of 5000. The generated levels achieve a maximum diversity at 100%, so no two levels are completely identical. An example of a generated level is shown in Figure 1 (left). The functionality of the game and tiles is given in Section III-B.

Level generation in this step continues until the agent has produced a valid level that satisfies the constraints to ensure that the balancing agent receives playable levels only. The generated levels are then passed on to the balancing agent.

### B. Balancing Agent

The balancing agent is the core component of the architecture in Figure 2. We model the agent as a PCGRL agent that can decide to alter a previously generated game level per time step. To support this process, we use swapping representations. The reward is computed from the results of a simulation of the balance state (Section IV-C).

The observation is the current level one-hot encoded. In detail, this depends on the chosen representation. As RL algorithm, we use PPO (proximal policy optimization) [39]. An episode ends when the level is either balanced, or a fixed number of steps or changes is exceeded. In PCGRL, the number of changes allowed is determined relative to the grid size (cf. change percentage). As in the original PCGRL we use a change percentage of 20%. We set the value for the number of allowed steps within an episode to 100.

### C. Player Simulation

To compute  $b_t$  for the reward (Section V-B), we run a simulation  $n$ -times of player agents playing the game. The player agents can be any solution which can simulate a player's behavior with a desired quality. In this work we use the scripted *Forage*-agent for the NMMO environment, which is publicly available<sup>3</sup>. An agent gathers the nearest available food resource. If its water indicator drops below a certain threshold, it will search for the nearest water resource to refill it. The usage of scripted agents provides the advantage of a deterministic behavior at each time step. At this point,




Fig. 3: How many times  $n$  should we run the simulation to approximate the balance state? We figure that out by calculating the mean deviation  $\mu_n$  of win rates from  $n - 2$  to  $n$  for the investigation of fluctuations in win rates.

however, the use of trained agents with e.g., RL, different skilled or types of agents would also be feasible. See the discussion (Section VIII) for further information.

Despite the simulation is run with the same player agents, the winners may differ each pass. This is due to the probabilistic mechanics that make games interesting, such as dice rolling or the respawning of resources with a certain probability. A player can win with luck, but when playing many times, skill should make the difference. The question then becomes, how often must a simulation be run to minimize the noise of the probability? Since the simulations are computationally intensive, it is of interest to find the number of minimum runs where the win rates vary at an acceptable level.

We approach this by investigating how much the win rates  $w_n$  of a given number of simulations  $n$  differ on average from  $n - 2$ . Only even values for  $n$  are applicable since otherwise a balanced game is not possible. Therefore, we run the simulation on a sample of size  $s = 500$  levels up to a number of  $N = 30$  times and compare how the win rates for  $n$  vary on average in comparison to  $n - 2$ . The average deviation  $\mu_n$  of a particular  $n$  is expressed with:  $\mu_n = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{n=0}^N |w_n - w_{n-2}|$  and its course is shown in Figure 3. In addition, the standard deviation is given with  $\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$ . It is clear that the larger  $n$ , the smaller  $\mu_n$ . To determine a reasonable  $n$ , we set the threshold:  $\mu_n + \sigma < 0.05$ . For this game with the configured number of players, this is  $n \geq 14$ . Therefore, we use  $n = 14$  in this work. This method can be used to determine  $n$  for any domain.

## VI. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

We evaluate our architecture in several steps: First, we sample a fixed dataset of levels to use for direct comparison with the generator. Second, we compare the balancing performances of the three introduced representations with the original PCGRL method as a baseline (VI-A). To generate balanced levels with the original PCGRL method, we integrated the balancing constraint into the reward function.

Subsequently, we investigate on the levels the models created (VI-B) and examine which tiles the models swapped in the level altering process (VI-C). The latter can provide insights into which tiles actually affect the balance.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/NeuralMMO/baselines>






Fig. 4: Distribution of the initial balance states based on the players’ win rates in the generated dataset of 1000 levels. We use this dataset to compare the different representations.

A. Performance Overall

We compare the performance of the swap representations against each other and against the original PCGRL as baseline<sup>4</sup>. For direct comparison, all models were trained with the same number of 200k training steps, resulting in 970 policy updates.

For the evaluation, we create a dataset of 1000 levels with our PCGRL generator. This dataset is then used for all four models for evaluation. First, we examine the distribution of the initial balance states of the levels in the dataset (see Figure 4). It is important to note that the distribution is not uniform. Except for the states 0 and 1, the levels seem to be normally distributed around the state of 0.5, indicating that both players won equally often. Initially, 13.6% of the levels are balanced. However, peaks towards maximally unbalanced levels can be observed at the outer edges of the distribution. Maximally unbalanced levels make up 26.6% of the dataset.


To evaluate the performance of the balancing method we compare the balance state before and after per representation. A general overview is given in Table I. A histogram of the balancing improvement is shown in Figure 5.

The performance of all three swap representations is of comparable quality. Each representation managed to improve the proportion of balanced levels. The swap-narrow and swap-wide representations perform slightly better than swap-turtle in terms of balancing. The original PCGRL narrow representation also improved the share of balanced levels, however, with 36.7% this share is smaller compared to the swap representations. Additionally, a proportion of 38.8% of the levels are in an unplayable state at the end of an episode (Figure 5b); whereas our methods result in 100% of playable levels in this domain in all cases. However, unbalanced levels remain in all results. The largest proportion remains for the balance states 0 and 1. For representations with a higher proportion of balanced levels, the average episode lengths are shorter. This is because the remaining unbalanced levels maximize the episode length.


B. Generated Levels

Figures 1 and 6 show examples of the different types of generated levels taken from the samples in Section VI-A. Figure 6a is an example where the balancing agent altered the given level to a balanced level by swapping only one tile.

<sup>4</sup>Only the narrow representation is shown here; the other two give similar results.



(a) Swap representations.



(b) Original PCGRL (narrow).

Fig. 5: Comparison of the balance state distributions before and after the balancing process for each representation using the dataset of 1000 levels (Figure 4). The swap representations (a) are compared to the original PCGRL implementation directly (b).

TABLE I: Performance overview of the representations. Initially balanced levels were not considered.


	S-narrow*	S-turtle*	S-wide*	PCGRL
Balanced (%)	<b>48.1</b>	42.5	<b>48.1</b>	30.4
Improved (%)	63.3	56.8	<b>64.1</b>	36.7
Avg. changes	4.6±1.9	4.7±1.9	4.9±1.9	5±1.8
Avg. ep. length	11.3±6.1	25.4±17.7	14.1±7.9	15±7.9
Size action space	2	32	2592	10

\*Swap representations are abbreviated with S.


By swapping the highlighted grass tile with the rock tile the path to the resource (forest) tiles is now blocked. This results in a more equal availability of food resources for both players. In Figure 1, the agent has balanced the level from an initial balance state of 0.3 to 0.5. By swapping the marked water tile to a more central position for both players, the balance is improved. In Figure 6b the agent failed to balance the initial level with  $b_0 = 0$ . The balancing process terminated after reaching the maximum number of changes permitted. In the end,  $b$  is still 0.

C. Impact of Tiles on Balancing

The analysis of the actual swaps made by a model gives insight into its behavior. Thus, we have shown that the model could improve the balance state of the given levels, we can further argue that the swaps made by the model have an impact on the balancing. Conversely, we can infer from this behavior which tiles in the game have the most impact on the balance.



(a) The agent balanced a maximum unbalanced level (0) to a balanced level (0.5) by swapping one tile.



(b) The agent could not change the initial balance of 0. The generation stopped after exceeding the allowed number of changes. Since several tiles were swapped, they are not highlighted for the sake of visualization.

Fig. 6: Examples of levels modified by the balancing agent. The left column shows the generated levels before balancing. The right column levels are the results after the balancing. Swapped tiles are marked with red frames.

For comparison, for each pair of swaps, we compute the relative differences between the frequencies of random swaps and those of the models. These frequencies are then factorized with the inverse probabilities of the total tile occurrences in the dataset. Due to swapping the same tile types is prohibited by the representations, ten different combinations are possible. This is shown in Figure 7. The Figure shows that the three representations have different behaviors, but they agree on particular points. Swapping forest for stone tiles has the most impact, followed by swapping forest for water tiles. This makes sense in the context of the resource gathering win condition. Moving the resource tiles forest or water is likely to affect the balance as they are included in the win condition. A stone tile can be used to block a player’s path. Therefore, swapping forest tiles for stone tiles has an additional powerful effect. Surprisingly, swapping a player’s spawn position with other tiles is not a favored action in all cases.

## VII. EXTENDED STUDY ON OVERALL IMPROVEMENTS AND BALANCING WITH A VARIED TARGET BALANCE

In Section VI, we focused on a balance where both players win equally often. This study extends the core idea of the paper by showing that this method can also optimize given levels towards arbitrary balancing values. Furthermore, the performance of the trained models is improved.

### A. Improvement of Results

To improve the results of Section VI, we addressed two issues: First, both players’ spawn positions were previously represented by the same tile type, making it impossible for the model to distinguish between them. For this reason, we now






Fig. 7: Comparison of the swapped tiles by the model per representation on the generated 1000 levels. The comparison is made with respect to the inverse tile type distribution of all levels. This shows the difference to random swapping.

assign different tile representations to each spawn position, as our previous research has shown that these affect balance. To differentiate when drawing, we assign green to player 1  and yellow to player 2 . The different encoding of the two positions adds more information and thus slightly increases the observation space, but the action space remains the same. Training under identical conditions as described in Section VI improves the previous results to 65.6% of levels reaching balance for  $b = 0.5$ . Second, we improved the performance of our code, reducing computation time. As a result, training became more efficient, allowing for more updates (10k) to the model’s policy in the same amount of time.

In the results of the experiments in Table I, the best model could balance 48.1% and could improve 64.1% of the levels to a balance of 0.5. In this extended work, we improve the proportion of balanced levels to 68.0% compared to the baseline (Table II). The extended training could additionally lead to a slight improvement in performance (2.4 percentage points). Levels where the model could at least improve towards the desired balancing are improved to a proportion of 88.9%. A level is considered improved if the balance is equal to or comes closer to the desired state.

### B. Balancing with Different Target Values

With this set of experiments, we extend the previous research by also training models to generate levels that are not equally balanced for both players. This shows that our method is generally capable of balancing levels to a certain value.

Therefore, we use the adapted reward function (Eq. 4), which is configurable with a parameter  $b$  towards a desired balance. We investigate this by training six different models in tenth increments of possible values for  $b$  in the interval  $[0, 0.5]$ . As it performed best according to the previous results we use the swap-wide representation in combination with the improvements from Section VII-A. We refrain from implementing a single but controllable approach as in [34], as we are only experimenting with different parametrizations of the reward function. Applying controllable RL would imply an

TABLE II: Performance overview of six swap-wide models trained to optimize different balance values  $b$  over the interval  $[0, 0.5]$  of the balance metric (cf. Section IV-C). All values are given as a percentage.

$b$	Balanced to $b$	Improved towards $b$	Initial = $b$	Baseline
0.0	36.1	71.1	8.6	-
0.1	35.1	73.5	7.2	-
0.2	42.9	76.3	6.4	-
0.3	54.6	77.9	11.4	-
0.4	60.7	81.4	12.0	-
0.5	<b>68.0</b>	88.9	15.6	48.1

adaptation of the previously defined MDP, making a direct comparison with the previous results difficult. To evaluate all models, we use the same level dataset from Section VI-A to ensure comparability. An overview of the results is given in Table II.

For all values of  $b$ , a significant improvement of the respective balance state can be observed (blue). The performance, however, differs depending on  $b$ . For  $b \geq 0.3$ , the proportion of levels with the desired balance is even higher than the baseline from the previous experiments. For the value 0, which indicates levels that are heavily balanced towards a particular player, the performance is slightly worse than the baseline. In all cases, however, the models were able to improve the balancing towards the given value.

### C. Comparison with Hill Climbing Approaches

To further evaluate our method in comparison to a search-based method, we compare its performance against two hill climbing approaches. Therefore, we run these approaches on the dataset of 1000 generated levels and compare the performances to the models listed in Table II. The hill climbing approaches are similar to the PCGRL narrow representation and the swap-narrow (S-narrow) representation introduced in this paper. Since they incorporate no model to predict a position on the level to change or swap, the representations based on the wide and turtle representations are not applicable.

Our S-narrow hill climbing implementation operates as follows: During each iteration, the method randomly selects two positions and swaps the tiles. Swaps must be carried out at each iteration since there is no model to predict this behavior. We utilize the same reward function to evaluate the balancing (Eq. 4) as when using PCGRL. If the reward is negative in time step  $t$ , the level state is reverted to the state in  $t - 1$ . As in the experiments with PCGRL, levels initially matching the given balancing constraint are not considered. The execution terminates either when the desired balancing is achieved or when the maximum of 8 changes is reached. This is the same value used in our experiments with PCGRL (cf. change percentage, Section V-B). Since we consider the balancing phase as a fine-tuning stage for pre-existing content, it's crucial to restrict the number of changes. Excessive changes can lead to a total overhaul, transforming the content into an entirely new level. Moreover, adhering to the PCGRL's constraint on the number of changes also promotes content diversity, as the approach cannot consistently yield identical outcomes [35].

TABLE III: Performance comparison of PCGRL with hill climbing approaches for optimizing different balancing values  $b$ . All values are expressed as percentages.

$b$	PCGRL	Hill Climbing	Hill Climbing	
	S-wide	S-narrow	narrow	unplayable
0.0	<b>36.1</b>	33.7	5.4	92.4
0.1	<b>35.1</b>	31.9	10.8	85.8
0.2	<b>42.9</b>	36.6	7.9	89.5
0.3	<b>54.6</b>	39.6	8.9	88.8
0.4	<b>60.7</b>	45.2	12.2	85.9
0.5	<b>68.0</b>	59.6	14.3	83.1

The narrow hill climbing approach operates similarly, however, due to its ability to freely exchange tiles from the pool of available tiles, it may happen that levels remain unplayable after the execution has finished.

The results in Table III indicate that PCGRL using the S-wide representation balances a larger portion of levels within the prescribed limit of changes compared to both hill climbing approaches. The S-narrow hill climbing approach achieves noteworthy balancing percentages across all  $b$ -values, however, it was not able to achieve a better performance than PCGRL. In contrast, the narrow hill climbing approach shows a weak performance, still clearly lagging behind the methods using swap representations. Furthermore, a substantial number of levels remain unplayable, with this proportion being notably higher compared to the previous PCGRL narrow approach (cf. Fig. 5b).

### D. Evaluation of the Asymmetries of the Generated Levels

The motivation behind this work includes the creation of asymmetric game levels to enhance diversity for competitive play, which is also of general interest when implementing a PCG method [4]. For all generated levels per model, we therefore evaluate their diversity and asymmetry with matrix comparisons. For each  $b$ , we determine a content diversity of 100% of the balanced levels, which means that no level is identical to another one.

We evaluate the asymmetries across all generated levels of all models outlined in Section VII-B regarding their symmetric properties along the horizontal, vertical, diagonal, and counter-diagonal axes. The diagonal symmetry of an  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  can be evaluated using the Frobenius norm with  $\|M - M^T\|_F$  which computes the sum of the absolute differences of the matrix elements [40]. As we are dealing with non-numerical tile representations, we use a distance metric  $h$  which returns 1 for an element  $i$  if  $|M_i - M_i^T| > 0$ , otherwise 0. To compute symmetries along all four axes, we rotate or transpose  $M$  accordingly which yields a matrix  $M'$ . The symmetry between  $M$  and  $M'$  can then be computed using Eq. 5. Lower values indicate greater symmetry, a value of 0 indicates perfect symmetry.

$$\text{sym}(M, M') = \|h(M - M')\|_F \quad (5)$$

$M_{rot}$  denotes  $M$  rotated counterclockwise by 90 or 180 degrees respectively, and  $M^T$  the transposed matrix of  $M$ . To compute the symmetry score for the diagonal



TABLE IV: Overview of symmetry scores for generated levels across the four axes using Eq. 5. Lower values indicate more symmetry along an axis, 0 indicates perfect symmetry.

	diagonal	counter-diagonal	vertical	horizontal
Mean	4.52	4.51	4.95	4.96
Std.	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.39
Min.	2.83	2.83	3.16	3.46
Max.	5.48	5.48	6.0	6.0

axis we compute  $\text{sym}(M, M^T)$ , for the counter-diagonal  $\text{sym}(M, (M^T)_{\text{rot}180})$ , the vertical  $\text{sym}(M, (M_{\text{rot}90})^T)$ , and the horizontal  $\text{sym}(M, (M^T)_{\text{rot}90})$ . The mean, standard deviation, minimal, and maximum values are presented for the four symmetry axes in Table IV.

The results show that none of the generated levels for any model is symmetric.

### VIII. DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

Our experiments showed promising results within fewer training steps compared to the original PCGRL, while being more robust to ensure playability. There are, however, several things that need to be discussed.

The balancing agent’s reward represents the balance state of multiple simulations on the current level state. By design, this is done based on the information about which player has won how many times in the simulations. Incorporating game-specific information, such as player health, into the reward function could potentially improve the results. This is, however, not desirable since including domain-specific information creates dependencies on the particular game. In this case, a specific reward function must be developed for each game. Furthermore, including too much or the wrong information could bias the reward, resulting in poor performance or undesirable behavior of the model. Consequently, the model would not learn what *really* affects the balance, or it might exploit unforeseen loopholes.

Splitting up the level generation and balancing process into separate units yielded much better results than doing the balancing in a single step as in the original PCGRL. The plain PCGRL may be able to achieve comparable results with longer training, but the architecture proposed in this work converges faster with fewer policy updates. This provides evidence that our architecture is more efficient by decomposing the problem into two simpler problems. In combination with the swapping representations, the balancing process can fully focus on balancing. We compared three adapted representations from the original PCGRL and evaluated them in terms of performance. All of them can improve the balance state, while swap-turtle gave slightly worse results than the other two. Since swap-narrow and swap-wide perform comparably, we recommend using the narrow representation when faster training and generation is required. In addition, it is independent of the grid size. If the focus is on performance, we recommend using the swap-wide representation.

Since we have shown that our approach can improve the balance of a level, it is possible to draw conclusions about which tile types have the most impact on the balance in terms

of their swap frequencies. For this domain, the swapping of resource tiles (e.g., forest) with blocking elements (stone) had the greatest impact. Swapping players’ spawn positions was not a favored action. We assume that this is due to the small number of available types of this type (only two) compared to resource tiles and therefore the model had less experience to learn these swaps appropriately. Further insights into the decision-making process of the balancing agent could be gained with methods for explainable RL [41].

The balance state is evaluated by simulating the game  $n$ -times with heuristic player agents. Of course, this metric depends on exactly these types of players. In multiplayer online games, the pairing of players of the same skill is often ensured by matchmaking algorithms [42] that use the Elo rating system [43]. For example, the balance would be different for players of different skill or type. This is a limitation, but also an advantage. By using different types of player agents, the level could be balanced to compensate for differences in player skill by adjusting only the level, not the players themselves. This is of great interest when balancing levels for different types of players, such as a mage and a fighter. It can be applied in e.g., role-playing games, where gear levels are an indicator of the character strength. In this way, players can use their long-farmed equipment in a competitive setting, and the game could be balanced only by the environment. Future research will extend our work in this direction. The controllable content generators [34] could be an applicable solution in this context.

A challenge with the proposed architecture is the computational effort during model training. In particular, this is due to the simulation steps required for reward computation, as multiple simulations are initiated for each swap made by the agent. RL learns throughout the training trajectories, providing an optimized approach to reduce unnecessary swaps and therefore the computational cost at inference. We compared our method to hill climbing approaches, which rely heavily on randomness and require starting from scratch with each new iteration. The comparison showed PCGRL’s superior performance in balancing levels across various balancing values within the same dataset, while adhering to the same limit on allowed changes per episode. The comparison between two hill climbing methods — one using the introduced swap narrow approach and the other using PCGRL’s narrow representation — showed notably superior performance for the swap narrow representation. This also highlights the benefit of the introduced swapping mechanism for the fine-tuning of existing content.

In addition, we found that the reward is mostly sparse in training. This indicates that only a small subset of the action space are actions that affect the balance. Especially at the beginning of the training, the model must learn this. To speed up the training process, we consider methods that reduce the computational effort. This would also be of great interest for the application in more complex environments. One solution could be to reward the agent only after several time steps or even to use sparse rewards. Although the learning process would then be harder for the agent, simulation steps for the reward would be omitted. This would speed up the

training process and allow the agent to explore faster. Another approach could be to use a surrogate reward model to predict a level’s balance state. This would further speed up the training, but the model’s accuracy must be high enough to give appropriate rewards to ensure a correct training. Reducing the cost of reward computation thus improves the feasibility of search-based approaches. Investigating the swap-based representation pattern incorporated into e.g., the crossovers or mutations of an evolutionary algorithm is an interesting target for future research.

#### A. Discussion on the Application of Fairness Metrics for Game Balancing

We’ve automated the decision-making process of how balanced a game is, based on a function inspired by the statistical parity metric [15]. This metric is commonly used in the fair machine learning community e.g., to measure how fair automated decision-making systems based on machine learning are [38]. With this section, we want to open the discussion on how fairness metrics can be applied to game balancing in general. At this point, it is important to note that the concept of fairness is a social and ethical concept, and not a statistical one [44]. Games are, however, designed to be played by humans. Therefore, social and ethical considerations should be taken into account when applying an automated balancing process, particularly in a competitive environment with multiple players.

a) *An acceptable range of win rates:* So far, we have only considered the balancing process for a level to be successful if the metric exactly matches the predefined balancing goal (e.g.,  $b = 0.5$ ). In many cases, however, it is not possible to measure a certain value exactly by sampling. Although we have examined how often we should sample to find a balance between the number of simulation runs and minimizing the uncertainty in estimating the actual game balance, there is still a residual uncertainty. This is also a problem that often arises when collecting data about the real world, such as surveys. To address this issue, a solution is the introduction of a bias and define the optimal value not as a single value, but as a range. The *Disparate Impact* metric [45], [46] expresses fairness with the ratio of a predicted outcome of two groups. The fairest ratio here would be represented by a value of 1. A commonly used range for this metric to consider an outcome as fair is  $\geq 0.8$  as noted by Saleiro et al. [46]. That being said, applied to game balancing, values in a range to the desired value can be considered as balanced. For this work, we could define a balanced game state as:  $1 - (w_{p1t} - w_{p2t}) \geq 0.8$ . Introducing this bias would increase the range of levels considered balanced, resulting in an even better proportion of balanced levels in our method. Since this bias has a strong influence on this proportion, it should be adapted to the game domain in terms of residual uncertainty when transferred to game balancing.

## IX. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we proposed a new method to balance tile-based game levels with reinforcement learning (RL). Therefore, we introduced a novel swap-based representation family

for the PCGRL framework, where the RL agent swaps the locations of tiles in a level. Our architecture benefits from the separation of the level generation and balancing process into two subsequent processes. The latter can thus be considered as a task for fine-tuning existing content. In this extended paper, we discussed the application of existing fairness metrics to game balancing and thus derived the reward function for the RL from the statistical parity metric, in order to automatically measure the balance state of a level. Furthermore, we improved the results of the conference paper on level balancing to a proportion of balanced levels of 68% and a proportion of improvements of 88.9%. Compared to the original PCGRL method (30.4%) on generated levels, our approach is easier to learn and significantly improves the results. Our RL-based method outperforms hill climbing approaches by balancing more levels within the same number of allowed changes, thus reducing the required simulation effort.

In addition, our approach is generalized, and we have shown how one can also generate levels with a specific balance in order to generate unbalanced levels that favor a specific player. This opens up new perspectives for creating levels when e.g., adults play against children or for players with different gear levels. Finally, by analyzing which tiles are frequently swapped, it is possible to infer which tile types are most likely to affect the balance. This provides game designers with additional empirical evidence about how the game system itself actually behaves.

For future work, we plan to empirically evaluate the heuristically estimated balance using human playtests. Additionally, we are interested in balancing for different types of players, such as a mage versus an archer, by changing only the game level. Moreover, we believe that this method is applicable not only to games, but also to other domains as well. In subsequent research, we are interested in applying it to urban planning for fair infrastructure distribution.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Christoph Kern, Frederic Gerdon, Jakob Kappenberger, and Lea Cohausz for their feedback and discussions on fairness metrics. We would also like to thank Patrick Takenaka for additional feedback and comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ian Schreiber and Brenda Romero. *Game Balance*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, August 2021.
- [2] Gustavo Andrade, Geber Ramalho, Alex Gomes, and Vincent Corruble. Dynamic Game Balancing: an Evaluation of User Satisfaction. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 2:3–8, 2006.
- [3] Alexander Becker and Daniel Görlich. What is Game Balancing? - An Examination of Concepts. *ParadigmPlus*, 1:22–41, 2020.
- [4] Julian Togelius, Georgios N. Yannakakis, Kenneth O. Stanley, and Cameron Browne. Search-Based Procedural Content Generation: A Taxonomy and Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games*, 3:172–186, 2011.
- [5] Kynan Sorochan and Matthew Guzdial. Generating Real-Time Strategy Game Units Using Search-Based Procedural Content Generation and Monte Carlo Tree Search, 2022. arXiv:2212.03387.
- [6] Mihail Morosan and Riccardo Poli. Automated Game Balancing in Ms PacMan and StarCraft Using Evolutionary Algorithms. In *Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 377–392, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.

- [7] Pier Luca Lanzi, Daniele Loiacono, and Riccardo Stucchi. Evolving maps for match balancing in first person shooters. In *2014 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games*, 2014. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [8] Raúl Lara-Cabrera, Carlos Cotta, and Antonio J. Fernández-Leiva. On balance and dynamism in procedural content generation with self-adaptive evolutionary algorithms. *Natural Computing*, 13:157–168, 2014.
- [9] Daniel Karavolos, Antonios Liapis, and Georgios N. Yannakakis. Using a Surrogate Model of Gameplay for Automated Level Design. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*, 2018. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [10] Fernando de Mesentier Silva, Rodrigo Canaan, Scott Lee, Matthew C. Fontaine, Julian Togelius, and Amy K. Hoover. Evolving the Hearthstone Meta. In *IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2019. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [11] Jakub Kowalski, Radosław Miernik, Piotr Pytlík, Maciej Pawlikowski, Krzysztof Piecuch, and Jakub Sekowski. Strategic Features and Terrain Generation for Balanced Heroes of Might and Magic III Maps. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*, 2018. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [12] Ahmed Khalifa, Philip Bontrager, Sam Earle, and Julian Togelius. Pcgrl: Procedural content generation via reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, volume 16, pages 95–101, 2020.
- [13] Joseph Suarez, Yilun Du, Phillip Isola, and Igor Mordatch. Neural MMO: A Massively Multiagent Game Environment for Training and Evaluating Intelligent Agents, 2019. arXiv:1903.00784.
- [14] Florian Rupp, Manuel Eberhardinger, and Kai Eckert. Balancing of competitive two-player Game Levels with Reinforcement Learning. In *2023 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2023. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [15] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, ITCS '12, pages 214–226, New York, NY, USA, January 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [16] Vanessa Volz, Günter Rudolph, and Boris Naujoks. Demonstrating the Feasibility of Automatic Game Balancing. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO)*, pages 269–276. Association for Computing Machinery, 2016.
- [17] Johannes Pfau, Antonios Liapis, Georg Volkmar, Georgios N. Yannakakis, and Rainer Malaka. Dungeons & Replicants: Automated Game Balancing via Deep Player Behavior Modeling. In *IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, pages 431–438, 2020. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [18] Julian Togelius, Mike Preuss, Nicola Beume, Simon Wessing, Johan Hagelbäck, and Georgios N. Yannakakis et al. Controllable procedural map generation via multiobjective evolution. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines*, 14:245–277, 2013.
- [19] Florian Rupp and Kai Eckert. GEvo: Game Economy Generation and Balancing with Evolutionary Algorithms. In *2024 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 1–8, 2024.
- [20] Katja Rogers, Vincent Le Claire, Julian Frommel, Regan Mandryk, and Lennart E. Nacke. Using Evolutionary Algorithms to Target Complexity Levels in Game Economies. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 15(1):56–66, March 2023. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Games.
- [21] Michael Cook, Simon Colton, Azalea Raad, and Jeremy Gow. Mechanic Miner: Reflection-Driven Game Mechanic Discovery and Level Design. In *Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 284–293. Springer, 2013.
- [22] Alberto Alvarez and Jose Font. TropeTwist: Trope-based Narrative Structure Generation. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games*, pages 1–8, Athens Greece, September 2022. ACM.
- [23] Mojang. Minecraft. Mojang and Microsoft Studios, 2011.
- [24] Adam Summerville, Sam Snodgrass, Matthew Guzdial, Christoffer Holmgård, Amy K. Hoover, and Aaron Isaksen et al. Procedural Content Generation via Machine Learning (PCGML). *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 10:257–270, 2018.
- [25] Jialin Liu, Sam Snodgrass, Ahmed Khalifa, Sebastian Risi, Georgios N. Yannakakis, and Julian Togelius. Deep learning for procedural content generation. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 33:19–37, 2021.
- [26] Edoardo Giacomello, Pier Luca Lanzi, and Daniele Loiacono. Doom level generation using generative adversarial networks. In *2018 IEEE Games, Entertainment, Media Conference (GEM)*, pages 316–323, 2018.
- [27] Maren Awiszus, Frederik Schubert, and Bodo Rosenhahn. TOAD-GAN: Coherent Style Level Generation from a Single Example. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 16:10–16, 2020.
- [28] Shyam Sudhakaran, Miguel González-Duque, Claire Glanois, Matthias Freiberger, Elias Najarro, and Sebastian Risi. Prompt-Guided Level Generation. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, GECCO '23 Companion, pages 179–182. Association for Computing Machinery, 2023.
- [29] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, and Arthur Guez et al. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science*, 362:1140–1144, 2018.
- [30] Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, and Junyoung Chung et al. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575:350–354, 2019.
- [31] Philip Bontrager and Julian Togelius. Learning to Generate Levels From Nothing. *IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2021.
- [32] Linus Gisslén, Andy Eakins, Camilo Gordillo, Joakim Bergdahl, and Konrad Tollmar. Adversarial Reinforcement Learning for Procedural Content Generation. In *2021 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2021. ISSN: 2325-4289.
- [33] Yahia Zakaria, Magda Fayek, and Mayada Hadhoud. Procedural Level Generation for Sokoban via Deep Learning: An Experimental Study. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, 15(1):108–120, March 2022.
- [34] Sam Earle, Maria Edwards, Ahmed Khalifa, Philip Bontrager, and Julian Togelius. Learning Controllable Content Generators. *IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 2021.
- [35] Ahmed Khalifa, Julian Togelius, and Michael Cerny Green. Mutation Models: Learning to Generate Levels by Imitating Evolution. In *FDG '22: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games*. ACM, 2022.
- [36] Zehua Jiang, Sam Earle, Michael Green, and Julian Togelius. Learning Controllable 3D Level Generators. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games*, 2022.
- [37] Matthew Siper, Ahmed Khalifa, and Julian Togelius. Path of Destruction: Learning an Iterative Level Generator Using a Small Dataset. In *2022 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, pages 337–343, 2022.
- [38] Karima Makhlof, Sami Zhioua, and Catuscia Palamidessi. On the Applicability of Machine Learning Fairness Notions. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 23(1):14–23, 2021.
- [39] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms, 2017. arXiv:1707.06347.
- [40] Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. JHU press, 2013.
- [41] Manuel Eberhardinger, Johannes Maucher, and Setareh Maghsudi. Learning of generalizable and interpretable knowledge in grid-based reinforcement learning environments. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, 19(1):203–214, Oct. 2023.
- [42] Josh Alman and Dylan McKay. Theoretical Foundations of Team Matchmaking. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, AAMAS '17, pages 1073–1081, Richland, SC, 2017.
- [43] Arpad E Elo. *The rating of chessplayers, past and present*. Arco Pub., 1978.
- [44] Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair Prediction with Disparate Impact: A Study of Bias in Recidivism Prediction Instruments. *Big Data*, 5(2):153–163, June 2017. Publisher: Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., publishers.
- [45] Michael Feldman, Sorelle A. Friedler, John Moeller, Carlos Scheidegger, and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. Certifying and Removing Disparate Impact. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '15, pages 259–268. Association for Computing Machinery, 2015.
- [46] Pedro Saleiro, Benedict Kuester, Loren Hinkson, Jesse London, Abby Stevens, and Ari Anisfeld et al. Acquitias: A Bias and Fairness Audit Toolkit, 2018. arXiv:1707.06347.