

Six - AlphaGo

A landmark achievement in artificial intelligence.

IBM Deep Blue



Figure 1: First defeat of a world chess champion by a machine in 1997

Deep Blue was handcrafted by programmers & chess grandmasters

AlphaGo *learnt* from human moves & self play

AlphaGo evaluated fewer positions

- **width** - policy network select states more intelligently
- **depth** - value function evaluate states more precisely

Why Go?

Long held as the most challenging classic game for artificial intelligence

- massive search space
- more legal positions than atoms in universe
- difficult to evaluate positions & moves
- sparse & delayed reward

Difficult to evaluate positions

- chess you can evaluate positions by summing the value of all the peices
- go - it's just stones on the board, equal numbers each side

Components of the AlphaGo agent

Three policy networks $\pi(s)$

- fast rollout policy network – linear function
- supervised learning policy – 13 layer convolutional NN
- reinforcement learning policy – 13 layer convolutional NN

One value function $V(s)$ - convolutional neural network

Combined together using Monte Carlo tree search





Figure 2: **Neural network training pipeline and architecture.** **a**, A fast rollout policy p_π and supervised learning (SL) policy network p_σ are trained to predict human expert moves in a data set of positions. A reinforcement learning (RL) policy network p_ρ is initialized to the SL policy network, and is then improved by policy gradient learning to maximize the outcome (that is, winning more games) against previous versions of the policy network. A new data set is generated by playing games of self-play with the RL policy network. Finally, a value network v_θ is trained by regression to predict the expected outcome (that is, whether the current player wins) in positions from the self-play data set. **b**, Schematic representation of the neural network architecture used in AlphaGo. The policy network takes a representation of the board position s as its input, passes it through many convolutional layers with parameters σ (SL policy network) or p (RL policy network), and outputs a probability distribution $p_\sigma(a|s)$ or $p_p(a|s)$ or represented by a probability map over the board. The value network similarly uses many convolutional layers with parameters θ , but outputs a scalar value $v_\theta(s')$ that predicts the expected outcome in position s' .

Monte Carlo Tree Search

Value & policy networks combined using MCTS

Basic idea = analyse most promising next moves

Planning algorithm - simulated (not actual experience) - roll out to end of game (a simulated Monte Carlo return)



https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monte_Carlo_tree_search

Figure 3: fig




Figure 4: MCTS in AlphaGo

AlphaGo, in context – Andrej Karpathy

Convenient properties of Go

- fully deterministic
- fully observed




Figure 5: fig





Figure 6: fig



We are averaging across all visits in the simulation

After all simulations finished - select the most visited action from the root state

Figure 7: fig

- discrete action space
- access to perfect simulator
- relatively short episodes
- evaluation is clear
- huge datasets of human play

DeepMind take advantage of properties of Go that will not be available in real world applications of reinforcement learning.

AlphaGo Zero

Key ideas

- simpler
- search
- adversarial
- machine knowledge only

Training time & performance

- AG Lee trained over several months
- AG Zero beat AG Lee 100-0 after 72 hours of training

Computational efficiency

- AG Lee = distributed w/ 48 TPU
- AG Zero = single machine w/ 4 TPU




Figure 8: **Performance of AlphaGo Zero. Learning curve for AlphaGo Zero using a larger 40-block residual network over 40 days.** The plot shows the performance of each player α_{θ_i} from each iteration i of our reinforcement learning algorithm. Elo ratings were computed from evaluation games between different players, using 0.4 s per search (see Methods).

! [Empirical evaluation of AlphaGo Zero. a, Performance of self play reinforcement learning.

The plot shows the performance of each MCTS player α_{θ_i} from each iteration i of reinforcement learning in AlphaGo Zero. Elo ratings were computed from evaluation games between different players, using 0.4 s of thinking time per move (see Methods). For comparison, a similar player trained by supervised learning from

human data, using the KGS dataset, is also shown. **b, Prediction accuracy on human professional moves.** The plot shows the accuracy of the neural network θf_i , at each iteration of self-play i , in predicting human professional moves from the GoKifu dataset. The accuracy measures the percentage of positions in which the neural network assigns the highest probability to the human move. The accuracy of

a neural network trained by supervised learning is also shown. **c, Mean-squared error (MSE) of human professional game outcomes.** The plot shows the MSE of the neural network θf_i , at each iteration of self-play i , in predicting the outcome of human professional games from the GoKifu dataset. The MSE is between the actual outcome $z \in -1, +1$ and the neural network value v , scaled by a factor of $\frac{1}{4}$ to the range of $0 \sim 1$. The MSE of a neural network trained by supervised learning is also shown.](..../assets/images/section_6/Zero_learning_curves.png){ width=30%, height=30% }

AlphaGo Zero innovations

Learns using only self play

- no learning from human expert games
- no feature engineering
- learn purely from board positions

Single neural network - combine the policy & value networks

MCTS only during acting (not during learning)

Use of residual networks




Figure 1 | Self-play reinforcement learning in AlphaGo Zero. **a**, The program plays a game s_1, \dots, s_T against itself. In each position s_t , an MCTS α_t is executed (see Fig. 2) using the latest neural network f_θ . Moves are selected according to the search probabilities computed by the MCTS, $a_t \sim \pi_t$. The terminal position s_T is scored according to the rules of the game to compute the game winner z . **b**, Neural network training in AlphaGo Zero. The neural network takes the raw board position s_t as its input, passes it through many convolutional layers with parameters θ , and outputs both a vector p_t representing a probability distribution over moves, and a scalar value v_t representing the probability of the current player winning in position s_t . The neural network parameters θ are updated to maximize the similarity of the policy vector p_t to the search probabilities π_t , and to minimize the error between the predicted winner v_t and the game winner z (see equation (1)). The new parameters are used in the next iteration of self-play as in **a**.

Model is trained to predict the probabilities as generated by MCTS during acting

Figure 9: Acting and learning

Search in AlphaGo Zero

Policy evaluation

Policy is evaluated through self play

This creates high quality training signals - the game result

Policy improvement

MCTS is used during acting to create the improved policy

The improved policy generated during acting becomes the target policy during training

Keynote David Silver NIPS 2017 Deep Reinforcement Learning Symposium AlphaZero

DeepMind AlphaGo AMA

AMA: We are David Silver and Julian Schrittwieser from DeepMind's AlphaGo team. Ask us anything. (self.MachineLearning)

submitted 3 days ago * (last edited 1 day ago) by David_Silver

DeepMind - announcement

this post was submitted on 17 Oct 2017

245 points (97% upvoted)

shortlink: <https://redd.it/76xjb5>

Figure 10: fig

[-]

David_Silver

DeepMind

[S]

9 points

1 day ago

↑

↓

Creating a system that can learn entirely from self-play has been an open problem in reinforcement learning. Our initial attempts, as for many similar algorithms reported in the literature, were quite unstable. We tried many experiments - but ultimately the AlphaGo Zero algorithm was the most effective, and appears to have cracked this particular issue.

permalink source embed save save-RES parent report give gold reply hide child comments

[-]

David_Silver

DeepMind

[S]

3 points

1 day ago

↑

↓

In some sense, training from self-play is already somewhat adversarial: each iteration is attempting to find the "anti-strategy" against the previous version.

permalink source embed save save-RES parent report give gold reply

[-]

David_Silver

DeepMind

[S]

13 points

1 day ago

↑

↓

Actually we never guided AlphaGo to address specific weaknesses - rather we always focused on principled machine learning algorithms that learned for themselves to correct their own weaknesses.

Of course it is infeasible to achieve optimal play - so there will always be weaknesses. In practice, it was important to use the right kind of exploration to ensure training did not get stuck in local optima - but we never used human nudges.

permalink source embed save save-RES parent report give gold reply

Figure 11: fig