EVOLUTIONARY COMPUTING: STANDARD ASSIGNMENT - TASK II

September 8, 2022

Read this whole document before starting your assignment!

1 Introduction

The objective of this assignment is to gain experience with using Evolutionary Computation. To this end you will develop, apply, and compare Evolutionary Algorithms for the task of video game playing using a python framework called EvoMan. The assignment is to be done in groups of five. By the given deadline you need to deliver your code and a report of three pages. The deadline –not negotiable– is as follows:

week 6 of the course, 16-10-2022, Sunday 23:59

Each day of delay in the submission will result in a deduction of 0.5 points from your Task grade.

2 Resources

All the resources (files) you need to install/use the EvoMan framework and start your experiments are available on GitHub, including code, manual, and baseline paper.

¹ https://youtu.be/ZqaMjd1E4ZI

3 Preparation

- git clone https://github.com/karinemiras/evoman framework.git
- Install the framework and run the demo controller_generalist_demo.py (only to test the installation)
- Play the games yourself using the keyboard or joystick, with the purpose of understanding the nature and challenge of the problem. For this you can use the human demo.py

4 Supplementary material

- Manual of the framework evoman1.0-doc.pdf (on GitHub)
- Baseline paper: multi_evolution.pdf (on GitHub)
- Reporting Research (on Canvas)

5 Task

- WHAT: Implement two EA methods that use the simulation mode "Individual evolution" of the framework to train a **generalist** agent.
- HOW: Use 2 groups of enemies (games) to experiment with your algorithms. For each group, make an independent experiment evolving a generalist agent. You are free to choose the size of the groups, and which enemies to use in them. For at least one of your EAs, you are required to use the neural network (demo_controller.py) available in the script of demonstration
 - (optimization_generalist_demo.py), using one hidden layer with 10 hidden neurons.
- WHAT TO HAND IN: The report as specified below, your code, and a text file with your best solution containing the weights for the neural network with 10 hidden neurons (exported as a numpy array, as in the demo).
- HOW TO HAND IN: Submit a single compressed file named *groupnumber.zip* containing a folder with the same name, including: the report named as groupnumber.pdf, your code (include the evoman folder, but no demos), and the solution named as groupnumber.txt.

This Task will be used to do a **competition** between the student groups. Each group must submit their best* solution and all solutions will compete in a tournament. There will be two ranks in the tournament: a) the first will be based on the number of defeated enemies. Ties will be broken by the sum of player-life (number of energy points kept by the player – larger is better) and the sum of get-time (duration of the match – lower is better), in this order; b) the second will be based on the Gain measure (equation can be found in the manual or baseline paper). The best three groups of each rank get extra points to their grade (after computing all grades of both Tasks together!) as follows: the winner gets 1 point, silver medal gets 0.6 points, bronze medal gets 0.3 points. (points from ranks are non-cumulative!)

* Note that the best solution for the competition must be the one created using the provided neural network. The reason for this rule is simply making the competition feasible to be easily automatized.

6 Rules and guidelines

- You are NOT allowed to simply copy and paste the code available in the scripts optimization_#_demo.py. That is, you need to implement your own code, building from the dummy demo. Nevertheless, you may use any EA framework or library if you wish². It is both OK to use full algorithms or a combination of mechanisms.
- You are allowed, but not required, to use the default fitness functions of the framework.
- You are not allowed to make changes to the source code of the framework (anything in the 'evoman' folder). Making such changes would be qualified as fraud, leading you to FAIL the assignment.
- For the "two EA methods", you can use two different EAs, or the same EA with differences such as, the evolutionary mechanisms, parameter tuning, fitness function, etc. You can use any EA, such as ones from literature or devised by yourself.
- With both algorithms (for each group of training enemies) you must repeat your final experiments 10 times (independently) and your report should present the statistics based on these 10 runs.

 $^{^2}$ One example is DEAP, which provides multiple resources for evolutionary algorithms. http://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume13/fortin12a/fortin12a.pdf. Another example is Neat-Python https://neat-python.readthedocs.io/en/latest/.

- Compare your algorithms by training group, plotting the average/std of the mean and maximum fitness across the generations using a line-plot. Note that you need to calculate the average (over the 10 runs) of the mean and maximum (over the population in each generation). Do one plot by training group, thus, separately.
- Compare your algorithms in a test playing against all enemies, testing each enemy 5 times with your final best³ solution for each of the 10 independent runs, and present the resulting Gains in box-plots. Note that you need to calculate the mean of the 5 times for each solution of the algorithm, and that these means are the values that will be points in the boxplot.⁴ In summary, you will present two pairs of boxplots (one pair per training group, so 4 boxes), each containing 10 data points, being each point the average of 5 points. Additionally, do an statistical test to verify if the differences in the average of these means are significant between the groups of best solutions, when comparing the two algorithms.⁵
- Add a table containing the average (of 5 repetitions) energy points of player and enemy (for each of all enemies) for your VERY best solution (only one of the [10+10]*2). This is the solution you will submit to the competition.
- The environmental parameter of *level* of difficulty of the game should be 2 for all experiments, as well as the parameter *contacthurt* should be set as "player" (both these values are set by default).
- As for the other environmental parameters, you are free to choose their values, but required to report any changes to their default values.

7 Report structure

Your report should have a maximum of 3 pages (containing everything, e.g., text, figures, etc). Report format must follow the GECCO19 template. For Word see https://gecco-2019.sigevo.org/index.html/dl1241; for Latex, see https://gecco-2019.

³ You are free to choose the concept of 'best'. For instance, instead of choosing the solution with the highest Gain, you could choose the solution with the highest number of defeated enemies.

⁴ These 5 repetitions are important because the environment is not exactly the same every time you play, and thus, sometimes your algorithm finds solutions that sometimes win and sometimes loose. Although it was not feasible to perform such repetitions during the evolutionary runs, in the final test we can afford it.

⁵ There are R packages that plot multiple boxplots and automatically test them.

sigevo.org/index.html/d1895. Reports exceeding the maximum number of pages will automatically FAIL the group on the given Task.

You need to include the following info at the BEGINNING of the assignment (it is allowed to use an extra page for that): Name of the course; Number and name of the Task (e.g., Task 1: specialist agent); Number (and possibly name) of the team (e.g., Team 12, Team Jacob); Name and student ID nr. of the team members; Date. It is allowed to use an extra page for that, but this cover page should not contain anything beyond this identification info. It is also allowed to add one more extra page containing only references.

The pages describing the actual content should be as follows:

- Introduction (make sure to define a clear research question or goal, cf. Reporting Research document).
- Methods: explain how your algorithms work and its motivation, parameter settings, experimental setup, fitness function, budget, etc. Make sure everything is reproducible with the information presented!
- Results and discussion: discuss the differences between the results of your EAs; do they outperform each other? Comment on a possible explanation for that; Discuss the differences between your results and the results of the baseline paper; are they better/equal/worse? Comment on a possible explanation for that.
- Conclusions
- Literature list / bibliography: cite all works you are using in your project.

8 Tips

- Note that for this assignment, the performance will be of importance. For this reason, tuning is of importance. You should think about how to tune the parameters of your EA algorithm. Also you should discuss this in your report!
- Note that the demos are not part of the framework, but only a demonstration of how one specific user could use the framework. The cleanest example, and from which you should start is dummy_demo.py. We emphasize that all you need to know to start your own experiments is in the manual (evoman1.0-doc.pdf), and it does not depend on the demos.

- Add legends with large letters to the plots, so that you can reduce the plot size while still making it readable, saving a lot a space.
- Test your algorithm(s) at first using a small population for few generations. This also applies for tuning.
- Remember to count the time of some of your experiments and take this into consideration to plan carefully your budget.
- Be organized concerning the output files of your experiments.
- It might be interesting to normalize the inputs for the controller (as done in the default controller).
- Do a literature review using the references of the baseline papers. One key author to have in mind is Julian Togelius.
- Try to make a group with people of diverse scientific background, e.g. an AI student, a CS student, and a biology student.
- Apples and oranges: Evoman is a game playing framework, and not an EA framework (like for instance, DEAP).

9 Grading

Each Task is worth a maximum of 10 points, and the final assignment final grade is calculated as: 50% (Task I) + 50% (Task II). Task I is described in another document.