

Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment for Digital Games using Reinforcement Learning

Adrian Mercieca

Institute of Information and Communication Technology

MCAST

Paola, Malta

adrian.mercieca.f31954@mcast.edu.mt

Mr Ivan Briffa

Institute of Information and Communication Technology

MCAST

Paola, Malta

ivan.briffa@mcast.edu.mt

Abstract—This research gauges the benefits and downsides of including overarching Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment (DDA) procedures in digital games, such that the difficulty adapts automatically to the user's performance. An Artificial Intelligence Model was developed to implement and manage DDA in 'Ravenfield'. Users were asked to try both versions, through which important data was extracted. This data showed that a system which is well implemented is beneficial to players, increasing levels of enjoyment and engagement. Systems which fail to stay anonymous can instead compel the user to feel cheated. This review highlights the need for further research on the subject, as to find an ideal way of implementing a system which is beneficial for users across the board.

Index Terms—Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment, Artificial Intelligence, Digital Games

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past few decades, video games have become a more and more common type of entertainment. The difficulty in developing games that are both entertaining and available to a variety of players, regardless of skill level, is growing as the video game business expands. The use of Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment (DDA) in games, which entails automatically modifying the difficulty level of the game in response to the player's performance, is one remedy for skill level-related inaccessibility. DDA has the ability to increase players' enjoyment of games by giving them a personalized gaming experience that is catered to their skills.

Recently, excellent Language Models that have taken the globe by storm have helped Artificial Intelligence (AI) further establish itself as a potent technology. Real-time player performance analysis using AI algorithms enables the game to dynamically modify the challenge level to the player's proficiency level. DDA is successful in boosting player pleasure and engagement while also making games more accessible to players of all skill levels.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how DDA might be implemented in video games using AI. This study specifically looks at a DDA model that is implemented through reinforcement learning and assesses how the DDA processes affect player engagement, satisfaction, and accessibility.

Overall, the study aims to add to the expanding body of knowledge about the use of AI in video games and to offer

new information about how to set up a DDA system that is both effective and efficient.

A. Research Onion

1) *Research Philosophy*: This research study explored the idea that social phenomena are inherently subjective and context-dependent, and can be understood through interpretation and analysis of meaning. Therefore the first layer chosen was 'Interpretivism' as this promoted understanding the subjective experience and perspective of the players. Qualitative research was used to uncover the complex and nuanced meanings that people attach to their experiences and actions.

2) *Research Approach*: An Inductive approach was chosen as this research's purpose is to uncover themes and patterns from the data collected. Since this topic is still relatively unexplored, this exploratory approach seemed ideal to further the topic's understanding, by arriving at a Hypothesis through the data itself.

3) *Research Strategy*: Data was gathered using an experiment. This experiment compared the normal version of a 'Ravenfield' match with another 'Ravenfield' match which was assisted by DDA, and managed through an AI model. The results of these two scenarios were compiled and compared with one another to produce important insight on the topic at hand. <https://www.overleaf.com/project/64612545dbd7809c9a52f4e1>

4) *Choices*: The data was gathered through the use of Mixed-Methods. Participants were asked to answer several questions, some of which were closed-ended (quantitative) and some of which were open-ended (qualitative) and promoted further discussion. All data gathered was necessary to further understand underlying factors which affect enjoyment and engagement during play.

5) *Time-Horizon*: Data was gathered at a single point in time, therefore the Cross-Sectional method was used. The data was however gathered from different groups of people, with varying levels of skill in the topic that was tested.

6) *Techniques and Procedures*: The data was gathered through post-experiment interviews which gauged the difficulty, enjoyment, and engagement during play sessions, after which a number of questions are asked that directly relate to DDA and its utility and perceived value. The sampling

strategy chosen was stratified sampling. The participants were selected to represent four different sub-groups (Teenage Gamers, Teenager Non-Gamers, Adult Gamers, and Adult Non-Gamers). The researchers then analyzed the data using both content analysis and statistical analysis.

B. Researcher Positioning

The researcher has a background in digital games, both in development and in playing during leisure time. The researcher acknowledges and has experienced firsthand the emotions and detachment that can be experienced when faced with difficulty which is not in sync with the player's skill.

C. Purpose of Research

The research aims to study how DDA systems could be implemented in a way that amplifies beneficial emotions for the players without adding non-beneficial emotions such as confusion, frustration, and feeling discredited.

D. Research Questions

- Does the adjustment affect player performance?
- Do players notice when adjustments occur?
- Does adjustment significantly affect the player's enjoyment, frustration, or perception of game difficulty?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Game Adjustment

Game systems are iteratively modified by game creators utilizing playtesting feedback, until the game is balanced. Directed mathematical analysis can reveal deeper structures and relationships within a gaming system, even though this method cannot be automated. With the correct algorithms and methodology, these deeper structures and relationships can be changed as the game is being played [1]. Developers can utilize the "Change Blindness" phenomenon, which is the inability to identify changes when they take place during saccades, blinks, blank screens, movie cuts, and other interruptions, to make these transitions seamless [2].

B. Precautions of DDA

[1] says that it is essential to identify and comprehend the systems that make a game fun and how these can be altered to heighten this enjoyment in order to customize a gaming experience for a certain player without negatively affecting well-balanced systems. The author also emphasizes that changing the difficulty during a game could make the player feel deceived if it interferes with or undermines the basic player experience. Mechanics, Dynamics, and Aesthetics (MDA) will differ between games and genres, but they must be taken into account and taken into account when developing DDA. The various player states and game-related actions are referred to as mechanics. Dynamics is the term used to describe how a game's rewards and levels of difficulty change over time. A game's mechanics and dynamics have a significant impact on its aesthetics. The overall aesthetics of a video game are frequently influenced by user expectations

based on genre standards [1]. The study also emphasized the importance of obtaining accurate measurements, such as taking damage readings during battles rather than throughout the entire playing session in order to obtain a reading that is pertinent to the combat.

C. Implementation 1

[1] developed a system that modifies negative feedback without altering the fundamental FPS genre experience using the MDA architecture as a guide. The created system manages the game's basic exploration and combat dynamics, as well as the key inventory mechanics (health, ammo, shields, and weapons), while also keeping the general cycle of activities, which in turn preserves the game's fast-paced shooter aesthetics. In order to estimate the likelihood of mortality in a specific encounter, [1] used damage sustained, health, the mean and standard deviation of current damage rates, and time. This estimate aids in determining if intervention through difficulty adjustment is necessary. [1] emphasizes how crucial it is for every DDA controller to have Adjustment Goals. The Comfort policy, which attempts to keep the players reasonably safe, is the first of the author's three separate policies that are mentioned. Instead, the Discomfort policy is designed to make players work harder by restricting resources and upping the difficulty when a player reaches a certain level of health. The author goes on to say that the Training policy initially gives the player comfort before progressively making them more uncomfortable during a level or session. The player's probability of dying has a predefined threshold of 40% in [1], and if it is exceeded, difficulty changes are made, adding 15 health points every 100 ticks.

D. Implementation 2

According to [3], DDA can aid in retaining the player's attention for a longer period of time in hypercasual endless games. The study demonstrates that while the majority of these games initially succeed in holding the player's attention, most lose their appeal after seven days of play. [3] contends that this results from boredom or irritation brought on by an imbalance between the difficulty of the game and the player's competence. The game can remain in the "Flow" state, which is when the player encounters the optimal challenge and abilities balance, by using a successful DDA system. The "core loop" is encouraged to be entered by achieving and sustaining the player's flow throughout the tutorial or introduction. The study by [3] makes use of a hypercasual infinite game that employs a Quick Progressive Difficulty (QPD) algorithm and develops an alternative version that uses DDA. Because of the way the QPD is designed, difficulty always increases when a player reaches a plateau, which can lead to dissatisfaction and worry. According to the research, dealing with these strong, unfavorable feelings through DDA may help the player stay in the "flow" and play for extended periods of time. The player starts the game with 5 lives, and after gaining 5 consecutive points without losing a life, the player can advance a level, increasing the challenge. The user is stuck at this

difficulty after this level up, or harder if he or she can again accumulate 5 consecutive points without losing a life. The DDA-implemented modified version maintains the player's ability to level up in the same way but adds a requirement that allows the player to level down in order to lessen the frustration brought on by the extremely challenging gameplay. If a player loses a life following an increase in difficulty, this may mean that the difficulty may be out of whack with their current abilities, which results in a decrease in difficulty.

E. Implementation 3

[4] implemented DDA to a beloved classic called Pac-Man. The DDA is based on the use of the Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS), which is an improved version of the Monte Carlo Simulation algorithm. The Ghosts, which are controlled by MCTS, engage in battles against a computer-simulated Pac-Man that follows a predetermined strategy. At each decision point in the maze, the MCTS simulation constructs a search tree encompassing all the permissible moves for the Ghosts. The available legal moves include Right, Left, Up, and Down, while any moves that would result in the Ghosts or Pac-Man hitting a wall or colliding with each other are eliminated. [4] expected this system to outperform other DDA implementations in three fronts. Firstly, this adjustment is centred around the intelligence level of opponents, ensuring that players engage with adversaries possessing similar capabilities, thereby promoting fairness. Also, it provides a means of ongoing and adaptable adjustment of the game's challenge. This is achieved by modifying the simulation time of the MCTS algorithm, which is employed to generate opponent artificial intelligence. Lastly, DDA based on MCTS is implemented through extensive computation, thereby minimizing the need for domain-specific knowledge and human involvement.

F. Implementation 4

[5] explored and analyzed mDDA (multiplayer Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment) which is a gameplay element found in competitive multiplayer video games. Its purpose is to diminish the gap in challenge experienced by all players by modifying the performance of specific individuals. A notable example of this can be observed in the racing game Mario Kart 7. In this game, when players ranked lower in the race collect a weapon box, their likelihood of receiving a more effective weapon is heightened. This adjustment grants lower-performing players an increased opportunity to enhance their ranking. A total of 180 games were chosen for review using Metacritic [9], which assigns normalized scores to games based on approved game review publications and websites. The selection of games for formal review was based on their Metacritic scores, ensuring a variety of game quality levels. The initial step involved examining game genres on Metacritic, and the three genres with the highest proportion of competitive multiplayer gameplay modes were identified as First-Person Shooters (FPS), Racing, and Fighting. Subsequently, 60 games with competitive multiplayer modes were selected from each of these three genres. To encompass a diverse range of games,

we opted for 30 games in each genre that had a Metacritic rating higher than 75, as well as 30 games with ratings ranging from 50 to 74 within each genre. Games with ratings below 50 were excluded due to limited information available from other sources, making them challenging to investigate effectively.

G. Implementation 5

In [6], a series of experiments is detailed, wherein Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) are trained offline. These ANNs serve as embedded game agents within a shooting game, controlling the behavior of non-player characters (NPCs). The training datasets for the ANNs are constructed based on the gameplay of three distinct player skill levels: expert, medium, and beginner. Each skill level's training dataset is then used to train a corresponding ANN. To determine the optimal number of neurons in the hidden layer and the appropriate duration for training, a three-fold cross-validation method is employed. Additionally, the study includes a comparison between the ANN approach and two traditional game AI techniques: finite state machine (FSM) and computer random controlled methods.

H. Experiments

[1] initiated the experiment by giving subjects a description of the game and its controls, followed by at least 15 minutes of playtime. Performance data was stored for later revision and subjects were then requested to fill out an evaluation form. The experiment was single-blind, with half of the games adjusted and the other half control [1]. Adversely, [3] had participants first try one version of the game, and then try the other. This allowed the research to distinguish between the results obtained from each participant for both versions. Scores and frustration evaluations were gathered from each participant after each play session. [4] gathered data in relation to using different simulation times. For each simulation time, 250 gameplays were conducted, and from these an average win rate was calculated. [5] recorded three key elements from each of the games reviewed: the activation trigger, the affected game rules and the scope of the effects. These were generalized and split further into specific components. A framework was developed to classify and recognize instances of mDDA by identifying the shared components and potential attributes associated with each component.

I. Results

[1] initiated the experiment by giving subjects a description of the game and its controls, followed by at least 15 minutes of playtime. Performance data was stored for later revision and subjects were then requested to fill out an evaluation form. The experiment was single-blind, with half of the games adjusted and the other half control [1]. Adversely, [3] had participants first try one version of the game, and then try the other. This allowed the research to distinguish between the results obtained from each participant for both versions. Scores and frustration evaluations were gathered from each participant after each play session. [4] gathered data in relation

to using different simulation times. For each simulation time, 250 gameplays were conducted, and from these an average win rate was calculated. [5] recorded three key elements from each of the games reviewed: the activation trigger, the affected game rules and the scope of the effects. These were generalized and split further into specific components. A framework was developed to classify and recognize instances of mDDA by identifying the shared components and potential attributes associated with each component. In [6], the implementation and analysis of game AI agents using ANN were described. The training data, recorded from players of different skill levels (expert, medium, and beginner) playing against computer random-controlled NPCs, were utilized to identify valuable feature vectors as inputs for the neural network. Through three-fold cross-validation, the optimal number of neurons in the hidden layer and the appropriate training duration were determined. Subsequently, the trained neural network was integrated into the game as the artificial intelligence for the NPCs. Finally, the fuzzy control theory was employed to facilitate dynamic difficulty adjustment in the game. In contrast to the traditional game AI implemented using FSM, the utilization of neural networks for decision-making in [6] brought it closer to human thinking patterns and enhanced the level of intelligent reasoning. To enhance the game's AI and introduce a wider range of behavior patterns, a trained neural network was integrated into a real-time game. This integration aimed to enhance the overall gameplay experience and increase the enjoyment factor by offering more diverse and engaging gameplay options.




Fig. 1. Literature Map

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Game and Equipment Used

The video game "Ravenfield" was modified for this study to add DDA. Changes in opponent accuracy, dependent on the team's remaining unit lives and the balance of flag control, caused this revision. If there was a balance, the level of difficulty was perfect. A change was required to rebalance the teams' remaining unit lives (tickets) and/or flag balance when there was an imbalance on either side. An ASUS ROG

STRIX G15 with the following specifications was used during the entire research project:

- Central Processing Unit: Intel I7-11850H
- Memory / RAM: 16GB
- Graphical Processing Unit: Nvidia RTX 2060 (Laptop)

B. Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment Models

The "stablebaselines3" Python package was used to build the AI Model. This package makes it easier to create AI models with different settings. It was found that a Multi Input Policy setting would be perfect for this investigation to handle the inevitably complicated observations. Data that the model identifies with an action during training is referred to as an observation. The initial observation listed the number of tickets left on the blue team's and red team's teams, the balance of the flags, and the level of difficulty of the current set. After initializing a class that handles logging and saving during training, the model was configured to store its best version after every 1000 steps. This made it possible to compare the effectiveness and pace of improvement of several models in great detail. The models were now be loaded and tested by playing a loaded model and returning the total rewards, which could then be compared to the output of other models. The initial model underwent five days of nonstop training and 265000 steps.

C. Reward System

This study featured a number of requirements that, when met, gave incentives to the AI Model. The first requirement relates to the difference in team tickets (unit balance), wherein the Model was given a reward with a value of 1 if the difference was 5 tickets or fewer. When the Model met another requirement—having the flag balances of the two teams within 10% of one another—another prize of the same value was obtained concurrently. When the first two requirements were met at the same time, the Model received another reward with a value of 1.

D. Gauging User Feedback

A four-phase experiment that was developed and carried out yielded useful information. To collect as much supporting information as feasible within the constraints of time, a number of questions were created for each phase. Twenty individuals were asked to participate in the experiment and accepted. The participants were split into two groups, as was done by [8], with the only difference being the sequence in which the steps were completed. Phases 2 and 3 were completed by the first group before phase 2, whereas phase 3 was completed by the second group before phase 2. This was done to reduce bias from phase 4's questions, where a person's responses would have been strongly influenced by the most recent phase they had successfully completed. There were several questions written for each stage. Primary data that was gathered came mostly from these questions.

E. The Experiment's Process

1) Phase 1:

- How often do you play digital games? (1-5)
- How would you rate your own skill in playing First Person Shooter Games? (1-5)
- How would you rate your adaptability to new game experiences? (1-5)
- Which of these do prefer the game to be: Easy, Challenging, or Extremely Challenging?
- Have you ever played 'Ravenfield'? If yes, give an estimation of total play-time.

Each participant received a personalized explanation of the game's rules. In particular, the loadout choice, the manual reloading, and the rag dolling effect. The controls were then briefly explained to the participants. Then it was stated that after answering several pre-play questions, players would be required to play a single match before receiving additional instructions. The Phase 1 questions, which prompted self-assessment on experiment-related skills and assessed the participants' expectations for the result of their future play session, were then given to the participants to complete.

2) Phase 2:

- How challenging was the match? (1-5)
- How engaged were you during play? (1-5)
- How much would you say you enjoyed it? (1-5)
- How well-balanced was the game's difficulty? (1-5)
- Did you notice anything strange during the match?

The game 'Ravenfield' in its original form must be used to play a match, according to the instructions given to the participants. They were free to employ any loadout they pleased, and they were told to play until the match was over, whether they won or lost. Participants were required to respond to questions on the current Phase after the gaming session. These inquiries measured the participant's perceptions of the questions' enjoyment, engagement, and difficulty.

3) Phase 3:

- How challenging was the match? (1-5)
- How engaged were you during play? (1-5)
- How much would you say you enjoyed it? (1-5)
- How well-balanced was the game's difficulty? (1-5)
- Did you notice anything strange during the match?

With one significant difference, this Phase functioned exactly like Phase 2. In this stage, the players engaged in a match using Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment with an altered version of the game "Ravenfield." Evaluation was completed following the conclusion of the game, just as it did in Phase 2.

4) Phase 4:

- Could you guess which of the matches played had Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment?
- Do you feel that the adjustments were suitably balancing the game?
- Do you feel that the adjustments affected your performance?
- Did the adjustment affect your enjoyment, frustration, or perception of the game?

The research and the notion of dynamic difficulty adjustment were ultimately explained to the subject before the final Phase began. They were questioned about their ability to recognize which of the games they played used dynamic difficulty adjustment now that the context was evident. Finally, they were asked additional questions on how they perceived the use of dynamic difficulty adjustment in video games.

IV. TEMPLATE

- Use either SI (MKS) or CGS as primary units. (SI units are encouraged.) English units may be used as secondary units (in parentheses). An exception would be the use of English units as identifiers in trade, such as "3.5-inch disk drive".
- Avoid combining SI and CGS units, such as current in amperes and magnetic field in oersteds. This often leads to confusion because equations do not balance dimensionally. If you must use mixed units, clearly state the units for each quantity that you use in an equation.
- Do not mix complete spellings and abbreviations of units: "Wb/m²" or "webers per square meter", not "webers/m²". Spell out units when they appear in text: ". . . a few henries", not ". . . a few H".
- Use a zero before decimal points: "0.25", not ".25". Use "cm³", not "cc".)

A. Equations

Number equations consecutively. To make your equations more compact, you may use the solidus (/), the exp function, or appropriate exponents. Italicize Roman symbols for quantities and variables, but not Greek symbols. Use a long dash rather than a hyphen for a minus sign. Punctuate equations with commas or periods when they are part of a sentence, as in:

$$a + b = \gamma \tag{1}$$

Be sure that the symbols in your equation have been defined before or immediately following the equation. Use "(1)", not "Eq. (1)" or "equation (1)", except at the beginning of a sentence: "Equation (1) is . . ."

B. L^AT_EX-Specific Advice

Please use "soft" (e.g., `\eqref{Eq}`) cross references instead of "hard" references (e.g., (1)). That will make it possible to combine sections, add equations, or change the order of figures or citations without having to go through the file line by line.

Please don't use the `{eqnarray}` equation environment. Use `{align}` or `{IEEEeqnarray}` instead. The `{eqnarray}` environment leaves unsightly spaces around relation symbols.

Please note that the `{subequations}` environment in L^AT_EX will increment the main equation counter even when there are no equation numbers displayed. If you forget that, you might write an article in which the equation numbers skip from (17) to (20), causing the copy editors to wonder if you've discovered a new method of counting.

BIBTEX does not work by magic. It doesn't get the bibliographic data from thin air but from .bib files. If you use BIBTEX to produce a bibliography you must send the .bib files.

LATEX can't read your mind. If you assign the same label to a subsection and a table, you might find that Table I has been cross referenced as Table IV-B3.

LATEX does not have precognitive abilities. If you put a `\label` command before the command that updates the counter it's supposed to be using, the label will pick up the last counter to be cross referenced instead. In particular, a `\label` command should not go before the caption of a figure or a table.

Do not use `\nonumber` inside the `{array}` environment. It will not stop equation numbers inside `{array}` (there won't be any anyway) and it might stop a wanted equation number in the surrounding equation.

C. Some Common Mistakes

- The word "data" is plural, not singular.
- The subscript for the permeability of vacuum μ_0 , and other common scientific constants, is zero with subscript formatting, not a lowercase letter "o".
- In American English, commas, semicolons, periods, question and exclamation marks are located within quotation marks only when a complete thought or name is cited, such as a title or full quotation. When quotation marks are used, instead of a bold or italic typeface, to highlight a word or phrase, punctuation should appear outside of the quotation marks. A parenthetical phrase or statement at the end of a sentence is punctuated outside of the closing parenthesis (like this). (A parenthetical sentence is punctuated within the parentheses.)
- A graph within a graph is an "inset", not an "insert". The word alternatively is preferred to the word "alternately" (unless you really mean something that alternates).
- Do not use the word "essentially" to mean "approximately" or "effectively".
- In your paper title, if the words "that uses" can accurately replace the word "using", capitalize the "u"; if not, keep using lower-cased.
- Be aware of the different meanings of the homophones "affect" and "effect", "complement" and "compliment", "discreet" and "discrete", "principal" and "principle".
- Do not confuse "imply" and "infer".
- The prefix "non" is not a word; it should be joined to the word it modifies, usually without a hyphen.
- There is no period after the "et" in the Latin abbreviation "et al."
- The abbreviation "i.e." means "that is", and the abbreviation "e.g." means "for example".

An excellent style manual for science writers is [7].

D. Authors and Affiliations

The class file is designed for, but not limited to, six authors. A minimum of one author is required for all conference articles. Author names should be listed starting from left

to right and then moving down to the next line. This is the author sequence that will be used in future citations and by indexing services. Names should not be listed in columns nor group by affiliation. Please keep your affiliations as succinct as possible (for example, do not differentiate among departments of the same organization).

E. Identify the Headings

Headings, or heads, are organizational devices that guide the reader through your paper. There are two types: component heads and text heads.

Component heads identify the different components of your paper and are not topically subordinate to each other. Examples include Acknowledgments and References and, for these, the correct style to use is "Heading 5". Use "figure caption" for your Figure captions, and "table head" for your table title. Run-in heads, such as "Abstract", will require you to apply a style (in this case, italic) in addition to the style provided by the drop down menu to differentiate the head from the text.

Text heads organize the topics on a relational, hierarchical basis. For example, the paper title is the primary text head because all subsequent material relates and elaborates on this one topic. If there are two or more sub-topics, the next level head (uppercase Roman numerals) should be used and, conversely, if there are not at least two sub-topics, then no subheads should be introduced.

F. Figures and Tables

a) *Positioning Figures and Tables:* Place figures and tables at the top and bottom of columns. Avoid placing them in the middle of columns. Large figures and tables may span across both columns. Figure captions should be below the figures; table heads should appear above the tables. Insert figures and tables after they are cited in the text. Use the abbreviation "Fig. 2", even at the beginning of a sentence.

TABLE I
TABLE TYPE STYLES

Table Head	Table Column Head		
	Table column subhead	Subhead	Subhead
copy	More table copy ^a		

^aSample of a Table footnote.



Fig. 2. Example of a figure caption.

Figure Labels: Use 8 point Times New Roman for Figure labels. Use words rather than symbols or abbreviations when writing Figure axis labels to avoid confusing the reader. As an

example, write the quantity “Magnetization”, or “Magnetization, M”, not just “M”. If including units in the label, present them within parentheses. Do not label axes only with units. In the example, write “Magnetization (A/m)” or “Magnetization {A[m(1)]}”, not just “A/m”. Do not label axes with a ratio of quantities and units. For example, write “Temperature (K)”, not “Temperature/K”.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The preferred spelling of the word “acknowledgment” in America is without an “e” after the “g”. Avoid the stilted expression “one of us (R. B. G.) thanks ...”. Instead, try “R. B. G. thanks...”. Put sponsor acknowledgments in the unnumbered footnote on the first page.

REFERENCES

Please number citations consecutively within brackets [1]. The sentence punctuation follows the bracket [2]. Refer simply to the reference number, as in [3]—do not use “Ref. [3]” or “reference [3]” except at the beginning of a sentence: “Reference [3] was the first ...”

Number footnotes separately in superscripts. Place the actual footnote at the bottom of the column in which it was cited. Do not put footnotes in the abstract or reference list. Use letters for table footnotes.

Unless there are six authors or more give all authors’ names; do not use “et al.”. Papers that have not been published, even if they have been submitted for publication, should be cited as “unpublished” [4]. Papers that have been accepted for publication should be cited as “in press” [5]. Capitalize only the first word in a paper title, except for proper nouns and element symbols.

For papers published in translation journals, please give the English citation first, followed by the original foreign-language citation [6].

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Geoff and W. Toby, “Artificial Intelligence and Deep Learning in Video Games A Brief Review,” vol. 4, pp. 404–408, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ICCCS46626.2019.
- [2] S. Chris, M. Brian, H. Ting, and Y. Gary, “The History of Artificial Intelligence .”
- [3] C. Fairclough, M. Fagan, P. Cunningham, and B. Mac Namee, “Research Directions for AI in Computer Games.” Trinity College Dublin, Department of Computer Science, Oct. 01, 2001
- [4] J. Togelius, “AI researchers, Video Games are your friends!,” 2015, vol. 1, p. 5.
- [5] J. Schaeffer, “A Gamut of Games,” vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 29–46, Sep. 2001
- [6] R. Hunnicke, “The Case for Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment in Games,” pp. 429–433, Jun. 2005, doi: 10.1145/1178477.1178573.
- [7] D. J. Simons, “Current Approaches to Change Blindness,” vol. 7, no. 1–3, pp. 1–15, 2000, doi: 10.1080/135062800394658.
- [8] Z. Yang and B. Sun, “Hyper-Casual Endless Game Based Dynamic Difficulty Adjustment System For Players Replay Ability,” 2020, pp. 860–866.

text from your paper may result in your paper not being published.

IEEE conference templates contain guidance text for composing and formatting conference papers. Please ensure that all template text is removed from your conference paper prior to submission to the conference. Failure to remove the template