Systematic Analysis of Scalable RL for Dots and Boxes

Project Overview

Title: "Systematic Analysis of Scalable Reinforcement Learning for Dots and Boxes: From 3x3 to Large Boards" **Research Gap**: Existing work on larger boards is fragmented, lacks systematic comparison, and ignores computational efficiency **Your Contribution**: First comprehensive, systematic study of RL scalability with CPU-efficiency focus

Research Questions

Primary Research Questions:

- 1. **Scalability**: How do different RL algorithms perform as board size increases from 3x3 to 6x6+?
- 2. **Efficiency**: Which RL methods are most computationally efficient for larger boards on CPU-only systems?
- 3. **Comparative Analysis**: What are the relative strengths/weaknesses of different RL approaches across board sizes?

Secondary Research Questions:

- 1. Breaking Points: At what board size does each algorithm start failing?
- 2. **State Representation**: How does state encoding affect scalability?
- 3. Training Efficiency: Which methods require least training time for acceptable performance?
- 4. **Human-Level Performance**: Can we achieve human-level play on larger boards efficiently?

Literature Foundation & Baselines

Existing Work to Build On:

- 3x3 Baselines: Pandey (2022), da Costa (2022), BoxesZero (2025)
- Larger Board Attempts: Miller et al. (6x6), Deakos (5x5), ChantalMP (12x12)
- Implementations: Multiple GitHub projects with varying approaches

Your Systematic Approach:

- Reproduce key results from existing 3x3 work
- Systematically extend to 4x4, 5x5, 6x6 boards
- Compare methods that others tested individually
- Add CPU-efficiency analysis (novel contribution)

Methodology Framework

Board Sizes for Testing:

- **3x3**: Baseline comparison with existing work
- 4x4: First scaling step
- **5x5**: Medium complexity (matches Deakos)
- **6x6**: High complexity (matches Miller et al.)

• Larger if feasible: Push boundaries of CPU capabilities

RL Algorithms to Compare:

1. Classical Methods:

- Q-Learning (tabular for small boards)
- Deep Q-Network (DQN)
- Policy Gradient (PPO/A2C)

2. Advanced Methods:

- AlphaZero-style (MCTS + NN)
- Actor-Critic variants
- N-Tuple networks (from MarkusThill)

3. Hybrid/Novel Approaches:

- Rule-based + RL combinations
- Transfer learning across board sizes
- CPU-optimized variants

State Representations to Test:

- Binary grids: Simple edge representation
- Structured features: Chains, boxes, strategic features
- Convolutional: 2D spatial representation
- Graph-based: Explicit game structure

Evaluation Metrics:

- **Performance**: Win rate vs. baselines (random, heuristic, human)
- Efficiency: Training time, memory usage, inference speed
- Scalability: How metrics degrade with board size
- **Robustness**: Performance across different opponents

Experimental Design

Phase 1: Foundation & Reproduction

Goal: Establish solid baselines and reproduce key existing results

Tasks:

- Implement/adapt existing 3x3 algorithms
- Reproduce key results from literature
- Establish evaluation protocols
- Create systematic testing framework

Deliverables:

Working implementations of 3-4 RL algorithms

- Validated results on 3x3 boards
- Standardized evaluation pipeline

Phase 2: Systematic Scaling Analysis

Goal: Comprehensive comparison across board sizes

Experimental Matrix:

Algorithm × Board Size × State Representation × Evaluation Metric

Key Experiments:

- Algorithm Comparison: Same setup, different algorithms
- Scaling Analysis: Same algorithm, different board sizes
- Representation Impact: Same algorithm, different state encodings
- Efficiency Analysis: Training time vs. performance trade-offs

Statistical Rigor:

- Multiple random seeds for each experiment
- Proper significance testing
- Confidence intervals for all results
- Reproducibility documentation

Phase 3: CPU-Efficiency Focus

Goal: Novel contribution focused on computational constraints

Efficiency Experiments:

- Training Efficiency: Time to reach acceptable performance
- Memory Usage: RAM requirements across board sizes
- Inference Speed: Decision time during play
- Scalability Limits: Maximum feasible board size per method

CPU-Optimized Variants:

- Simplified neural network architectures
- Efficient state representations
- Approximate methods for large boards
- Hybrid approaches combining fast heuristics with RL

Phase 4: Advanced Analysis & Novel Contributions

Goal: Push beyond existing work with new insights

Advanced Experiments:

• Transfer Learning: Train on small boards, test on large

- Curriculum Learning: Progressive board size training
- Multi-Agent Analysis: Self-play vs. diverse opponents
- Theoretical Analysis: Complexity bounds, convergence analysis

Novel Algorithmic Contributions:

- CPU-efficient variants of existing methods
- Hybrid rule-based + RL approaches
- Board-size adaptive algorithms
- Computational budget allocation strategies

Expected Contributions

Primary Contributions:

- 1. Systematic Scalability Analysis: First comprehensive study of RL scaling in Dots and Boxes
- 2. **CPU-Efficiency Focus**: Novel analysis of computational constraints in game RL
- 3. Comparative Methodology: Standardized evaluation framework for future research
- 4. Practical Insights: Clear guidance on which methods work best for different scenarios

Secondary Contributions:

- 1. Algorithmic Improvements: CPU-optimized variants of existing methods
- 2. Theoretical Insights: Understanding of why certain methods scale better
- 3. Reproducible Research: Open-source implementations and datasets
- 4. **Benchmark Establishment**: Standard evaluation protocols for larger boards

Target Conferences & Positioning

Primary Targets:

- AAMAS: Multi-agent systems, game theory focus
- IJCAI: Al applications, systematic studies
- **CoG**: Conference on Games (specialized venue)

Secondary Targets:

- **AAAI**: General AI, practical applications
- AIIDE: Interactive entertainment, games
- Various workshops: At NeurIPS, ICML, etc.

Paper Positioning:

- Systematic study (not just novel algorithm)
- **Practical focus** (CPU efficiency, scalability)
- Reproducible research (open source, clear methodology)
- **Bridging theory and practice** (academic rigor + practical constraints)

Technical Implementation Plan

Development Environment:

- Python 3.8+ with standard ML libraries
- **PyTorch** for deep learning (CPU optimized)
- OpenAl Gym interface for environments
- Weights & Biases for experiment tracking
- Git + GitHub for version control

Code Structure:

```
dots_boxes_rl/

— environments/  # Game implementations

— agents/  # RL algorithm implementations

— experiments/  # Systematic experiment scripts

— analysis/  # Result analysis and visualization

— baselines/  # Existing work reproduction

— utils/  # Shared utilities
```

Reproducibility Requirements:

- Fixed random seeds for all experiments
- **Detailed logging** of hyperparameters and results
- **Docker containers** for consistent environments
- Comprehensive documentation of all procedures
- Open-source release of all code

Success Metrics

Technical Success:

- **Reproduction**: Successfully reproduce 3+ existing results
- **Scaling**: Demonstrate systematic scaling analysis up to 6x6
- **Efficiency**: Show clear computational efficiency comparisons
- Novel Insights: Identify at least 2 new algorithmic improvements

Publication Success:

- Paper Acceptance: Target tier 2-3 conference acceptance
- Reproducibility: All results independently verifiable
- Impact: Citations from follow-up work
- Open Source: Community adoption of code/benchmarks

Personal Success:

- Deep RL Understanding: Master multiple RL algorithms
- Research Skills: Develop systematic experimental methodology
- Technical Skills: Advanced Python/PyTorch proficiency
- Academic Writing: Produce publication-quality paper

Risk Mitigation

Technical Risks:

- Computational Limits: Focus on CPU-efficient methods, smaller boards if needed
- Implementation Bugs: Extensive testing, reproduce known results first
- Experimental Complexity: Start simple, add complexity gradually

Research Risks:

- Limited Novelty: CPU-efficiency angle provides clear differentiation
- Negative Results: Systematic failure analysis is still valuable
- Scope Creep: Well-defined research questions with clear boundaries

Timeline Risks:

- Reproduction Takes Too Long: Use existing implementations where possible
- Experiments Don't Converge: Have backup simpler algorithms
- Writing Delays: Start writing early, parallel to experiments

Resources & Tools

Computational Resources:

- Your CPU: AMD 5600G (sufficient for this project)
- Cloud Computing: Consider Google Colab/Kaggle for large experiments
- Storage: Local + cloud backup for all experimental data

Software Tools:

- **Development**: VS Code, Jupyter notebooks
- Experiment Tracking: Weights & Biases, TensorBoard
- Visualization: Matplotlib, Seaborn, Plotly
- Writing: LaTeX, Overleaf
- Reference Management: Zotero, Mendeley

Learning Resources:

- RL Textbooks: Sutton & Barto, Bertsekas
- Online Courses: Spinning Up, CS234 Stanford
- Paper Repositories: ArXiv, Google Scholar alerts
- **Code Examples**: GitHub repositories, research reproductions

Expected Outcomes

Academic Impact:

- Systematic Understanding: Clear picture of RL scalability in Dots and Boxes
- Methodological Contribution: Framework for systematic game RL evaluation
- Practical Insights: Guidance for practitioners with limited computational resources

• Future Research: Foundation for more advanced work in this area

Technical Outcomes:

- Open Source Framework: Reusable code for Dots and Boxes RL research
- Benchmark Suite: Standard evaluation protocols and baselines
- Algorithmic Improvements: CPU-efficient variants of existing methods
- Empirical Database: Comprehensive results across methods and board sizes

Personal Development:

- Research Expertise: Deep understanding of RL and systematic experimentation
- Technical Skills: Advanced ML engineering and experimental design
- Academic Writing: Publication-quality research communication
- Domain Knowledge: Expertise in game AI and computational efficiency

This research plan positions you to make meaningful contributions to an active research area while building on existing work systematically. The CPU-efficiency focus provides a clear novel angle that distinguishes your work from existing fragmented efforts.