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1 Introduction

For a long time, the board game Go was considered a testbed challenging for AI technologies. Its state space is huge (about $3^{361}$) thus traditional searching methods cannot solve it in a reasonable time. AlphaGo (AG) (Silver et al. 2016), a program released by DeepMind (DM), beat the human Go Champion player in 2015, by using deep reinforcement learning (Deep-RL, DRL) (Mnih et al. 2015) and Monte Carlo tree search (MCTS) (Chaslot et al. 2008). AG first used human data to do supervised learning (SL) and then used DRL plus MCTS to do RL training (Sutton and Barto 1998). After 1 year, the successor, AlphaGo Zero (AGZ) (Silver et al. 2017) was published, which can beat AG without human data. Researchers thought Go has been solved and began to shift to other challenging domains.

Meanwhile, from 2010, a video game StarCraft (SC, or called SC1) developed by Blizzard Entertainment (BE) was also used as a testbed for AI (Ontaño et al. 2013). SC has many differences with Go. E.g., it is an imperfect information game, its action and state space are also much larger than Go. Though there had been some RL research on SC, the majority of methods are state machines and heuristic search, e.g., see SAIDA and Locutus. These bots’ APM (actions per minute) is not restricted, meaning the APM can be much larger than humans’. However, there are still no bots that can beat professional players (Cerickly et al. 2019).

The two roads of RL research after Go and AI research for SC converged in 2017. DM and BE jointly published SC2LE (short as SE (Vinyals et al. 2017)), a machine learning platform for StarCraft II (SC2). SC2 is the successor to SC, also developed by BE. The gameplay of SC2 is similar to SC1 except for some differences like some unit types have changed. Such, training difficulties on SC2 should be similar to SC1. However, there have 3 reasons for SE to be a better learning platform: 1. BE provided an official interface for SC2, while the one in SC1, the BWA, is got through reverse engineering by the community; 2. BE also released Linux SC2 to be the simulator for running SC2 on servers. While SC1 can not directly run on Linux, making training inconvenient; 3. BWA can’t close the game rendering screen, leading to slow training. While the Linux SC2 can run without rendering, improving the sampling speed by a margin.

DM also provided supports for SE by a Python interface PySC2 (short as PS1, the subscript is version number). A contribution of PS is that it provides a human interface (HI) for agent learning. E.g., it needs the agent first selects the unit (like humans use a mouse to click), then issues the command. We call it human action (HA). The agent also needs to perceive the visual information directly from the screen. Such challenges make training on PS is hard. The baseline in SE (Mnih et al. 2016) can not even beat the easiest built-in AI. Some researchers use tricks to ease the difficulties, e.g., see (Sun et al. 2018), (Pang et al. 2019), and (Lee et al. 2018). They rely on macro actions built on HA. However, direct RL training is still little.

In Jan 2019, AlphaStar (AS) (Vinyals et al. 2019a) was proposed in a blog (we call it ASB refers to Blog). When fighting against human players (HP), ASB shows powerful performance and firstly wins the professional HP. However, in a Live show, AS was deceived by the strategies of HP, showing its weakness. Also, criticisms argue it uses APM humans can not achieve. After 10 months, the improved AS (Vinyals et al. 2019b) was published (we call it ASN, N refers to Nature). ASN has a restriction of APM and camera. Having these constraints, ASN still achieved the Grand-Master (GM) level in Battle.Net (a match platform hold by BE) and surpassed 99.8% of players. The results are promising and the SC2 problem seems to be solved.

However, in this paper, we present a novel view of AS by delving deeply into its details, codes (by a reproduction (Liu et al. 2021b)), and through experiments, and analysis. We argue that the problem handled by AS is actually a sub-
problem of the one raised in SE. The difficulty between the two is different but is little discussed. We call this “Neglect in AS”. Then through replays, we present the defects of AS and connect the reason to its architecture. Finally, we give future directions for the SC2 problem. This paper’s contribution is as follows:

• We present a critical rethinking of the AS, such as the actual problem they handled and the defects of it.
• We provide a symbolic definition for the SC2 problem and decomposition it by several dimensions for future research.
• For the future research direction on SC AI, we give potentially useful suggestions.

2 Background

2.1 Deep Reinforcement Learning

RL can be represented as a Markov decision process, which is a 6-tuple \((S, A, P, R, \gamma, T)\). For an environment, \(S\) is state space and \(A\) is action space. From time step 0 to \(T\), the agent faces with \(s_t \in S\), and selects \(a_t \in A\) by policy \(\pi (\text{i.e.}, a_t \sim \pi(s_t))\) in each step. Then the agent receives a reward \(r_t \sim R(s_t, a_t)\) and the environment transists to \(s_{t+1} \sim P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t)\). \(\gamma\) is a discount factor and return is \(G_t = \sum_{z=t}^{n-1} \gamma^{z-t} r_z\). An RL algorithm aims to find an optimal policy \(\pi^* = \arg\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_t[G_t]\).

If using function approximation (FA) to represent the policy and the FA is a Deep Neural Network (Deep-NN, or DNN) (LeCun, Bengio, and Hinton 2015), such RL is called DRL. There have types of DNN in RL, e.g., CNN (Convolutional NN) (Lecun and et al 1998), RNN (Recurrent NN or LSTM) (Hochreiter and Sutskever, and Hinton 2012) is useful for image data learning, RNN (Recurrent NN or LSTM) (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber 1997) is capable of processing sequence data, Transformer (Vaswani and et al 2017) is a fully connected NN with a self-attention mechanism which is good at handling structural information. 

2.2 Problem of StarCraft II

In SC2, the player can choose one from 4 race settings (Protoss, Terran, Zerg, and Random) to play. At the start, the 2 players are born in diagonal locations on the game map. Players need to win by collecting resources, building buildings, producing units, and destroying all the opponent’s buildings. An illustration shows in Fig. 1. Several features make SC2 a suitable environment for testing AI such as imperfect information, various types of units, and operation speed requirements (more details in Appendix).

Note, SC2 is a heavy game (heavy here we means that, compared to Go, it needs more resource for running, training, and debugging). Such, we must admit that SC2 is not an ideal research environment. However, due to this, the effective methods on SC2 show more practical value, because SC2 is more similar in complexity as the real-life task. We formulate the problem of SC2 as \(\mathbb{S}\). Later we show how to subdivide it into multiple dimensions.

Figure 1: Left: schematic. Right: screenshot. Top is the screen, the bottom left is the minimap, the bottom middle is the user interface, dashed box in the minimap is the camera. The mouse can be clicked on the screen and minimap.

2.3 AlphaStar Blog

The baseline in SE (we call it AS\(^Z\), Z refers to zero) uses similar DNN architecture and RL algorithm as in AS\(^B\). But why it has a large improvement from AS\(^Z\) to AS\(^B\)? Actually the main reason is \(\mathbb{S}\) faced by AS\(^B\) is not the one in AS\(^Z\).

AS\(^B\) handles \(\mathbb{S}\) by the raw interface (RI). RI provides an entity (the same as unit, note sometime “unit” can refer to both unit and building) list through the game engine which includes units and buildings of ours, enemies, and neutral’s. By that, a select action of one entity is replaced by providing a pointer to it. Previously the game engine uses \(\text{tag}\) (a unique identifier through one game) as the pointer. RI transforms the tag to the index in the entity list. AS\(^B\) turns the entity list into an entity matrix and uses a Transformer to model their relationship (note the index equals to the row number in the matrix). Then, in the action type head, the entity that performs the action is provided by the index. RI transforms the index to the tag. Then the game engine uses the tag to point to the entity and perform the SC2 action. Note, AS doesn’t need to know the real tag value, and learning is easier.

2.4 AlphaStar Nature

We now introduce AS\(^N\). AS\(^N\) uses a big DNN consists of 3 encoders, 1 core, and 6 heads. The encoders correspond to 3 types of information: spatial, statistical, and entity. The spatial corresponds to the minimaps which are divided into layers passed into CNN. Note screen information is not used. The statistical one includes resources and features designed by humans. In AS\(^Z\), the entity’s information is not used. However, it is used by AS\(^B\&N\) (means the two) by RI (based on PS\(^3\), later we will discuss the versions of PS).

The outputs of the encoders are merged and be input to a core LSTM module. Then, the core is connected to an action-type head. Besides outputting action type, this head also outputs an auto-regressive embedding (ARE). ARE is then be input to the next argument module. The process is repeated for 5 argument modules: delay, queued, units, target unit, and location.

For sample efficiency, AS\(^N\) uses an off-policy RL algorithm. Its loss includes V-trace actor-critic loss, UPGO loss, entropy loss, and distillation loss between the SL policy and the RL one. The tactics in SC2 form a cycle relationship. To handle this, AS proposed a league training mechanism, and train a policy that is robust to all tactics. But, in the section “Defects of AS”, we will show AS is still easy to be attacked by novel tactics. Note AS\(^N\) trains one agent for each Race (we use AS\(^N\)_\(R\) to refer to Protoss, and so on).
3 Neglect in AlphaStar

Here we present why the problem handled by AS$^{Hk,N}$ is not the original one proposed in SE.

3.1 Human Interface vs. Raw Interface

When SE was first proposed, there was a vision that the SC2 problem faced by RL should be much different from other environments. The SE should provide an environment that would be learned as similar as humans, i.e., using HI to learn the SC2 game. The agent should use human actions (HA) and use human observation (HO), that is, learn to select a unit by the position coordinate of that one and use the image on the screen to infer information. Note HI consists of HA and HO, formulated as HI = HA + HO. At that time, the community focuses on SC2 AI agreed to this consensus. We call this type of SC2 problem “human-level control on SC2”.

However, to the surprise of many people, AS used the RI instead of the HI to build its agent, which casts a cloud over its achievements. Note, RI = RA + RO. RA is the raw action which the game engine uses, RO is the raw observation the game engine sees (RO mostly refers to entity information that humans must infer or do some to see). The RI makes AS’s achievements not as great as its vision. It not only narrows its generality to other domains but also makes the comparison with humans not so fair. If we formulate the problem proposed in SE as $SC^h$ (h refers to human), the problem handled by AS is actually $SC^r$ (r refers to raw).

Due to this reason, here we present a case showing the learning difference between RA and HA. Fig. 2 shows the different action space size. This is a simple prototype problem in SC2, that is, how to use Protoss to get as much economy as possible at the start of the game.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Works on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Aug 2017</td>
<td>AS$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jun 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sep 2019</td>
<td>AS$^{Hk,N}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: PS versions. PS=PySC2. AS=AlphaStar. RO=raw observation. RA=raw action.

The paper of AS$^N$ gives a statement of the RI but neglects the discussions of the differences of it to HI. We argue that these discussions should be careful and comprehensive, otherwise it could make people think the problem proposed in SE is already solved. That is, people would see no future research on SC2 AI is needed, which could be very harmful to the community of the SC AI research.

3.2 Overused Human Knowledge

AG$^2$ uses no human data to train a policy. AG uses human data to learn an initial policy. Different from them, AS uses human data in 3 aspects. The 1st is the same as in the AG, which uses human replays to learn a SL policy. The 2nd is the $z$ reward used in RL training, which is the statistic values of the game, consists of two parts, build order, and unit counts. Note the two statistics are important for SC2, but may not be such important for other domains. This definitely narrows the generality of AS.

Due to this reasons, AS will select a replay from the human replays (maybe the ones used in SL). The criterion for selection is not clear, at now could we know is that the race and map of the replay should be equal to the one in the current game. After deciding the replay, when the agent running in the SC2 environment, the replay also runs for the same steps. In each step, the AS agent will calculate the difference of the $z$ between the agent and the player of the replay, and transform it as a negative reward. Note though this processing makes learning better, it actually enforced the agent to imitate the player, instead of encouraging it to discover new strategies. The results of such a way will be shown later section.

The 3rd aspect of using human data is the distillation loss of which the target is the SL policy. This loss makes the policy not moving far away from the SL one. It has the pros to stable training yet cons of preventing the agent from exploring new strategies. There have some other tricks in AS$^N$ using human data. A most typical one is to use the unit type to decide the range of the action type. Note PS doesn’t provide such information. Thus it must be coded manually which can be seen as another injecting human knowledge in AS.

If we formulate the SC problem of using no human knowledge as $SC_0$. Then the problem handled using human replays can be $SC_1$. The problem AS handles is actually $SC_3$ (meaning it uses human data in 3 ways). The ideal problem we want to solve is $SC_0$. The target problem we would solve is $SC_1$. Actually, there is a gap from $SC_3$ to $SC_1$ and a huge gap from $SC_3$ to $SC_0$ (inferred by AG and AG$^2$).
3.3 Impact of APM and EPM

In the match against two professional players, AS\textsuperscript{B} shows incredible APM. In the AS\textsuperscript{N} version, the APM is restricted. But there is still some unfairness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>EPM\textsuperscript{A}</th>
<th>EPM\textsuperscript{P}</th>
<th>APM\textsuperscript{A}</th>
<th>APM\textsuperscript{P}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>182.10</td>
<td>154.17</td>
<td>200.17</td>
<td>247.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Average APM and EPM for all AS\textsuperscript{N} (30) replays. Superscript A=AS, P=Player. Bold values are larger values.

We now introduce EPM, a metric for measuring the player has how many “effective actions per minute”. The “effective” means useful, e.g., a click on a unit has meaning, but click twice or third times has no meaning because latter clicks change no state. For humans, they will perform many useless clicks, which is to warm up their hands to prepare for the later fighting moments. This will make many useless actions. In order to distinguish them, SC2 already provides a metric called EPM to measure them. The EPM only contains useful actions, removing useless ones. People can switch seeing the APM or EPM of the player in a replay.

Now we give an example that showing APM not equals to EPM, and how AS differs from a real human. We select one replay (named “PvP_30") of the final version of AS\textsuperscript{N} (called AS\textsuperscript{N} Final). At the time of 4:06, we can see an impressive case, that is though the player’s APM is nearly twice as AS’s (461:221), its EPM is much smaller than AS’s (48:221). Table 2 shows the average value of the two. Hence, a more fair metric to compare should be EPM, not APM.

We formulate the problem which uses an average EPM smaller than \( x \) as \( \mathbb{S}(E_x) \). The \( x \) should not be a simple average number in one game. On contrary, it should be the average of the past 5 seconds, i.e., the agent can issue a max of up to 15 actions in the last 5 seconds if the problem is \( \mathbb{S}(E_{180}) \). However, we encourage more settings such as \( \mathbb{S}(E_{120}), \mathbb{S}(E_{90}) \). Using less EPM may cause the agent to learn more efficient and effective strategies.

3.4 Virtual Camera

The camera is a window that slides through the map. The area in the camera is called screen. Humans accept two types of visual information, the local one is provided by the screen and the global one is provided by the map (which is the minimap in SC). The screen provides nearly most of the information to the player, because only in it can the player see the health or any other pieces of information of the units. The minimap provides rough information indicating where the enemy comes or where the mineral locates and so on. The player can move the mouse in the minimap and click the mouse to make the camera change to the map position where the mouse points to. We call this way of moving camera “clicking”. Another way to move the camera is to make the mouse go towards the edge of the screen, which making the camera move towards the direction orthogonal to the edge. This is a relatively slow way, called “scrolling”. The two are described in Fig. 3a. The clicking way moves faster but it needs the mouse back and forth between minimap and screen, bearing the overhead of hands moving (see Fig. 3a). Hence, some HP prefer scrolling way more.

For AS\textsuperscript{B}, DM announced it beats two professional HP with an interface having no camera. However, the PS\textsubscript{2} at that time only has HA which must use a camera. We suspect that at that time AS\textsuperscript{B} has already used PS\textsubscript{3}. By using RA of PS\textsubscript{3}, AS\textsuperscript{B} can see the units outside of the camera, and give actions to the units anywhere. So it needs not a camera. But this is quite a huge advantage over humans. DM may realize the unfairness, then provided a modified version AS\textsuperscript{B}\textsuperscript{F} (meaning AS\textsuperscript{B} with a camera used) to fight against the professional player MaNa (in a Live show). Though they state that the AS\textsuperscript{B}\textsuperscript{F} has a similar performance as AS\textsuperscript{B}, the result shows a different truth. AS\textsuperscript{B}\textsuperscript{F} can’t concentrate its attention in the right area of the game. It is deceived by MaNa’s confusing units, and then finally loses the game.

Actually, there is no native support by BE for using RA with a camera. The reason is that if one uses the RA, all units can be controlled through an entity list as we discussed before. Hence the screen is not needed. Under this reasoning, the camera in AS\textsuperscript{B}\textsuperscript{F} is actually built by hands. The creating way is not known until AS\textsuperscript{N} is published.

The camera in AS\textsuperscript{N} is a 32x20 size rectangle (measured by game units, e.g., a small map has a 64x64 size). It is moved by the “move camera” action in RA. The camera is actually virtual. The simulating way is to let the opponent units outside the camera have only restrict information. Note AS can still see and select its own units outside the camera. So this is still different from a true camera in HA. For this reason, we call this camera a “fake camera”. This camera causes a problem which is that the AS can select its own units anywhere and has an advantage. Humans can do this by using groups command, but it is much more complex.

We also found due to having no overhead of moving a mouse AS always uses the clicking way for moving a camera. In contrast, HP more often uses scrolling way. Each scroll will generate an action, make the camera action in the full one has more proportions. Hence, HP’s non-camera action rate is smaller than AS’s. E.g., average of AS\textsuperscript{N} is 0.68, while HP is 0.50. Multiplying this with the EPM we can deduce the non-camera actions of the two, which are AS (124.2) : HP (78.4). To see that AS actually does more than 58% actions than HP hence has more advantage in battle.
control.

3.5 Control Precision
Here we discuss the control precision when uses a machine to control actions, especially using RA. Humans may make mistakes while issuing commands, especially at a high speed. Human actions need 3 aspects of control: precision of actions; the precision of selection; and quick movement of the mouse. The first means the action should be right. If humans execute the wrong action, the result of the battle will be different. The second means we should select the right unit. E.g., in a battle, we should select the unit which has the lowest health to go back to a safe place. If we select the wrong one, the injured unit will be destroyed by the enemy. The third means that each action that needs to click on some position needs the mouse to move to that position coordinate in a reasonable time. Some action needs first select a unit, then select a target to release the skill. The mouse should first move from the current position to the position of the selected unit and then move from the unit position to the target position (usually the position of an enemy). Such movements need time for humans, see Fig. 4. But for AS, these have no time overhead.

Fig. 5 shows an extreme case in one replay of AS, showing the cooperation of the 3 aspects of control which is hard for HP to do. This case is not to show that the defensive tactics used by AS are cheating, but to say that many of AS’s decisions are dependent on the advantages brought by its accuracy of control precision. Assuming that AS cannot achieve such a perfect defense, it will not choose some overly aggressive tactics. After observing most of AS’s replays, we found, as long as AS assembles a sufficiently large and mixed team, then it will have almost no disadvantage in the battle. It can accurately select any unit and release the skills in a precise location. HP not only need to choose these units and bear the risk of choosing the wrong unit but also specify the location afterward and bear the time overhead of moving from the unit location to the target location. All these put humans in a disadvantaged position in the duel.

If we define the problem handled by AS as $\mathcal{SC}\{P_{1.00}\}$ in which 1.00 indicates the accuracy of control, then we can use $\mathcal{SC}\{P_{0.95}\}$ to express the problem we want to solve. This 0.05 error rate can be reflected in any position of HA or RA. We can use a lower accuracy value during training. E.g., we train for the problem of $\mathcal{SC}\{P_{0.80}\}$, which would further improve the robustness of the agent.

3.6 Summary
Though AS has made big progress, we argue their achievements should not be overestimated. Their results should be viewed from a more scientific and realistic perspective. E.g., the problem they solve is actually $\mathcal{SC}\{E_{180}, P_{1.00}\}$, not the one raised in SE. The path between the two may be a long way. Our intention is not to show the wrong part of AS, but the neglected part in the presentation. We argue these should be stated clearly. Ignoring them, or explaining in a vague way, will make people overestimate the achievements of AS, which will adversely affect the community.

From Table 3 we can see the problem solved by AS$^N$ is nearly two generations away from the problem raised in SE. The AS$^F$ (F refers to Future) is the fictitious version of our imaginary which is the next generation of AS. AS$^F$ uses less human data, and gives more constraint on EPM instead of APM, and has an error rate on control precision. The last problem, proposed in our paper, is the one we think the final SC2 problem is.

4 Defects of AlphaStar
AS achieves GM level. However, the levels of GMs are quite different. E.g., see the two HP in “007TvZ” and “030TvZ”. AS is still not perfect. We analyze defects here.

4.1 Easy To Be Exploited
We first present that AS is still easy to be defeated by novel strategies of HP. In the replay of “029_PvP”, the HP uses a tactic called “Cannon Rush” (CR). The key success factor of the CR is to secretly build a Pylon near the opponent’s base without being seen and then use Cannon (CN) to advance gradually to the base. Due to the usage of human data, AS has learned to defend against this tactic. But the player changes its strategy by a little. He builds two Pylons in a narrow space and builds one CN inside them. AS uses workers to attack the CN under construction, but it divides its workers, making its attacking fail to destroy the CN (see left of Fig. 6). After the CN is built, AS loses its advantages and finally be defeated.

This case shows a defect of AS. Though if using more RL training days, this problem may be alleviated. But we can see that AS didn’t know the key success factor to defend against CR. There are more cases in the Appendix.

4.2 Lack of Reasoning
Here we present a defect of the AS which is that it lacks reasoning. Fig. 6’s right shows a replay “028_PvZ” where the Protoss (AS) trying to attack the Zerg (HP). The Zerg uses several Lurkers to defend against the AS’s attack. Lurkers are invisible units, meaning they can not be seen or attacked until they is a detector unit to detect them. On the contrary, Lurker can always attack the other units. AS’s troops are counter-attack by the Lurkers, go back and forth. These meaningless actions repeat for several rounds and last for several minutes. All the time AS doesn’t know to build a detector, though the condition for building it is already satisfied. These phenomena raise a question, even after 200 years of playing (DM states the time of AS training is similar to HP playing 200 years), does the agent know that an invisible unit should be detected by a detector unit?

This case raised a thought. For humans, if we know several rules of the game, we can reason and deduce several useful tricks for the game. But for AS which uses induction to learn knowledge, if the knowledge is not shown in human replays, or be explored in the RL, AS would not know it. For humans, intelligence is composed of induction and deduction. Though the RL equipped with DNN has the power to learn many things, the natural characteristic of it lacks the ability of deduction. We argue that for a complex game like
Figure 4: (a) Mouse movement trajectory of using clicking way to move the camera. (b) Zerglings nearly overlap. We would select the one with red rectangle. (c) Air units and ground units overlap. We would select the ground unit with the red rectangle which is under the air units. (d) Distance of movement from select a unit to give a target of the action.

Figure 5: Control precision case. Left: HP’s Zerglings go in and want to destroy AS’s Probes. Middle: Probes defend against the Zerglings. Probes and Zerglings overlap. It is difficult to select, specifically select the Probe with low health. The command for the injured Probe is to move back to the mineral on the left. Such, mouse should move from the right to the left for each Probe. The actions need to be completed within several seconds. Right: Zerglings retreat. AS’s defense succeed. No Probe is destroyed. Red rectangles mean ones having low health. HP=human player. AS=AlphaStar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex Level</th>
<th>Level-1</th>
<th>Level-2</th>
<th>Level-3</th>
<th>Level-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Interface</td>
<td>SC_1</td>
<td>SC_1</td>
<td>SC_1</td>
<td>SC_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Data</td>
<td>SC_3</td>
<td>SC_2</td>
<td>SC_1</td>
<td>SC_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPM Constraint</td>
<td>SC_{E180}</td>
<td>SC_{E150}</td>
<td>SC_{E120}</td>
<td>SC_{E90}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera Usage</td>
<td>SC_{C1}</td>
<td>SC_{C1}</td>
<td>SC_{C0}</td>
<td>SC_{C0}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Precision</td>
<td>SC_{P1.00}</td>
<td>SC_{P0.95}</td>
<td>SC_{P0.90}</td>
<td>SC_{P0.80}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Def.</td>
<td>SC_1{E180, C1, P1.00}</td>
<td>SC_1{E150, C1, P0.95}</td>
<td>SC_1{E120, C0, P0.90}</td>
<td>SC_1{E90, C0, P0.80}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faced by</td>
<td>AS^N</td>
<td>AS^E</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Proposed here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Levels of SC2 problem. AS=AlphaStar. SE=SC2LE. C_1=Virtual camera. C_0=Real camera.

A more interesting case occurs due to the lack of reasoning. If HP uses buildings to block its entrance. AS doesn’t know how to go in. Its troops will go back and forth around the buildings and waste much time. Fig. 7 shows the two cases. Left is Zerglings want to go in the Supply Depots. Right is AS’s Dark Templars (DT) want to attack the Cannon (CN), but the CN is surrounded by HP’s workers. CN can attack DT. While DT is a melee unit and must first eliminate the worker, then can the CN be attacked. But AS doesn’t know that. It continuously orders its DT to attack the CN. Finally, the DT is destroyed by the CN.
4.3 Dull Strategy

We found AS’s tactics single and dull. The strategies for each race are nearly the same, e.g., 93.3% tactics of AS$^N$ are building sub-base, then producing Ravager (more details in Appendix). This is different from HP who would try novel tactics and have a plan to carry out the tactics. The tactics of SC should be rich. However, the AS has nearly one single strategy, making its replays lack novelty. Note one reason for creating AI of SC is that humans want to explore new strategies that HP may not find, which is the interest of the SC AI community and SC players.

We think this behavior (imitation of humans) dues to the z reward in RL which makes AS have a good performance but lost its creativity. Some may say that the strategy in AS is the one it finds most effective, hence it doesn’t change. But even professional HPs would try different strategies, e.g., see GSL 2019 Season 1 final contest Maru vs. Classic. Player Classic uses 6 different tactics in 6 matches.

4.4 No Planning

Another defect of AS is the lack of planning. Some strategies need a full plan. In the games of AS, we find it always has only a plan A, no plan B nor plan C exists. That is the most cases when it is defeated by HP. E.g., when its sub-base is destroyed early in the game by HP, AS tried to build a new base in the third place far away from its main base (when its workers go there, they will be easily attacked by HP). Also, when its air sneak has little effect, it still tried to repeat it one time by one time. There is no planning module now in AS, e.g., MCTS which plays a role in AG and AG$^S$. In the current AS, due to the lack of MCTS, the action of AS$^N$ more considers its current return instead of future.

5 Future Ways

We now present future directions for the SC2 problem.

5.1 Using Human Action Space

As we analyzed before, the AS$^S$ and AS$^N$ all use RA instead of HA, which is not consistent with the raised problems in SE. We think based on the success of AS, we should look forward to train in the challenging HA. The hardest part of HA is how to accurately select a unit we wanted on the screen by its coordinate. We think computer vision methods like object detection (Szegedy and et al 2013) or segmentation (Goel, Weng, and Poupart 2018) can be a candidate solution. Another untrivial part of HA is how to treat the moving camera problem. If the camera is exploring randomly at the beginning of the training, the training of the other part like selection or action may not be practical. We argue that we may use some heuristic ways to control the moving of the camera at the start, after the training of the other part is mature, we can concentrate on the training of the camera.

5.2 More Fair Comparison with Humans

Here we discuss the fair comparison problem with HP. A fair comparison is hard due to the play of SC consists of two parts, the mechanical part, and the intellectual part. AI has advantages in the mechanical part. Yet what we want to test is the intellectual part. One way is to keep the mechanical part as similar as HP, and then test the intellectual part as the AS$^N$ does. However, as we analyzed, the current setting has still a long distance from a fair comparison. Some settings may not be adjusted as appropriately as we want. Thus we argue a strict condition, which is that the mechanical part of AI should be weaker than humans, should be used. This is aimed at making AI using cleverer tactics, not depending on superior micro-operations.

5.3 Fewer Resources

AS uses about 4,200 CPU cores and 256 TPU cores for training one agent which is a huge cost. AS also has a training day of 44. We think in the future we should explore training a similar agent which has comparative performance with much fewer computing resources and time. Some works (Liu et al. 2021a) have tried these, but their performance is only tested with the built-in AI. Training a computer that has a similar level as a master-level player on one single commercial server in one day may be a potential direction for future research.

5.4 Open Source

We argue that an important direction for AI on SC2 should be open-sourced. As we analyzed in the SC2 problems section, due to the setting of imperfect information and larger state and action space, the SC2 problem shows more similarities as the real-life problem and thus has more practical value. Also because the SC is the simulation of a battle or war, the learning abilities of the agent may also facilitate the research on the wargame or controlling the real combat unit in the real world, thus the research by closed-source may exacerbate the military imbalance in the world. The research by open-sourced should be the way to maintain this balance.
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A Appendix

A.1 SC2 Problem (Full Introduction)
Here we give a detailed analysis of the features of the SC2 problem.

Imperfect information Unlike Go, players in SC cannot see the opponent’s information. Except for all the visible areas of our units, the rest of the game map is shrouded in a layer of fog called fog-of-war. There are two layers of this fog. The first layer means the areas that have never been explored, which we call black fog. Under this black fog, none of the information can be seen. When our units have explored this area once, this layer would be replaced by a second layer of fog called gray fog. Under the gray fog, players can only see information such as the terrain and the last buildings the player saw. The existence of the fog of war requires players to carry out appropriate reconnaissance and exploration. The fog of war has also greatly increased the requirements for game-theoretic tricks.

Various types of units In Go, each stone has the same meaning. On the contrary, in SC, each unit type has unique characteristics and is quite different from others. This is very similar to a real war. E.g., Terran has the Marine, Tank, Battleship, and so on. Although the Protoss is a fantasy race, its arms also have historical shadows. For example, the Zealot corresponds to swordsmen in history, and the Templar can correspond to wizards. There are counter relationships between these unit types and form a “Rock-Paper-Scissors” cycle, so there is no absolutely invincible unit type.

Operation and response speed Unlike Go, SC2 also requires players to have a fast reaction and operation speed. Because of this difference, some think SC2 is a difficult than Go due to the speed requirements places high requirements on the processing speed of AI. Others believe that AI gains advantages by the response speed. Because the micro-operations in SC have a large influence on the battle situation, some bots that rely on powerful micro-operations have gained advantages, e.g., see some famous script AI in SC. Although AS claims that it did not rely on these micro-operations to gain advantages, we found that the victory of many games of AS is established by the accumulation of these small micro-operation advantages, not the overall strategic view. E.g., AS can beat some HP on the frontal battlefield but be defeated by some other HP’s novel tactics.

A.2 AS versions
Here we show the characteristics and differences of each version of AS, please refer to Table 4.

A.3 Neglect in AlphaStar (More Cases)
Here we show more cases of neglect in AlphaStar.

Virtual Camera Here we show the difference in the proportion of camera actions caused by the difference in the way that AS and HP use the camera, please see Table 5.
A.4 Defects of AlphaStar (More Cases)

Here we show more cases of defects of AlphaStar.

Easy To Be Exploited  Here we show how AS was defeated by HP's new tactics, which is shown in Fig. 9. The figure on the left shows that AS initially had an advantage. However, HP used Battlecruiser and continuously harassed AS through Tactical Jump. The economy of AS was destroyed. And HP has more and more Battlecruisers. The original advantages of AS are disappearing. In the end, AS is already not very good at playing games. It even made its Overlords go directly to the battleship (this is undoubtedly a suicidal behavior because Overlord has no offensive ability and is a non-combat unit). It can be seen from this game that AS is not good at adapting to new tactics. The figure on the right shows that AS was being Crawler Rushed by HP. HP is also Zerg. We found that AS rarely used its own workers for reconnaissance when playing games. Therefore, once it is targeted by the opponent using new tactics, it is easy to lose. When AS is playing, it rarely scouts. In the ZvZ game, one of the Zerg players can choose Crawler Rush. Due to AS does not scout, it was unable to deal with such tactics.

Dull Strategy  The strategies of the AS of each Race at the beginning are nearly the same. Please see Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8. The Strategy Order column shows the Strategy of AS. E.g., the start strategies of $\text{AS}_N$ are all building a Reaper then transfer to Hellions. It then uses Banshees to conduct aerial harassment. The start strategies of $\text{AS}_Z$ are all building the sub-base quickly (a risky strategy), then start to use Roach. $\text{AS}_N$ will build two Adepts to destroy the enemy’s workers and then use one or more Oracles to conduct aerial harassment, repeated in all the matches, even against all the races.

By the league training, AS learns a policy that is the best response to an un-uniform mixture of policies. That is the reason why AS seems to have one single strategy. However, such behavior is far apart from HP. HP will try different strategies and have a plan to carry out the strategies over time. The strategies of SC (include SC1 and SC2) should be rich, e.g., Rush, Timing, Economy, Proxy, Fast Technology, and so on. However, the AS has nearly one single strategy, making its replays boring and lack novelty.

Lack of Reasoning  Fig. 12 shows that at the beginning of the game, HP laid a Creep on the second base of AS. Human buildings cannot be built on the Creep. But obviously, AS does not have such a concept of knowledge. From the 10 minutes of the game, it has always wanted to build buildings on the Creep. But the game engine keeps returning to it the hint information that cannot be built. Such actions make AS waste some time and economy.

A.5 Analysis of All AS Replays

We give the analysis of all replays of AS Final here, see Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8. The Description of Game Process shows a brief description of the game process.
AS uses a mixed troops containing Disruptor and Warp Prism to gain a huge advantage.

GM performs not well in resisting Adepts and Oracles, and its economy is destroyed.

GM's 20 workers are killed by AS's suicide attacks. FB: AS defenses by 3 Shield Battery.

AS uses 2 Adepts to harass at first, and then uses 2 Oracles to harass to gain an advantage.

GM is killed more than 10 workers by AS in the first 3 minutes and then quits directly.

GM uses Cannon Rush. AS defended with Immortal, but was defeated by GM's Oracles.

AS uses mixed troops, and unbelievable micro-operations which humans hard to do.

GM resists harassment well. GM uses Nydus Worm to sneak, but can't gains advantages.

M wants to build a base on the Creep at 10:49. (2) AS wants to build a Missile Turret on the Creep at 11:50. (3) AS wants to build a Missile Turret on the Creep at 12:07. (4) AS wants to build a base on the Creep at 14:30.

Table 6: AS\textsubscript{M}\textsuperscript{P} replays. Res.=AS's result. OL=opponent level. GM=Grand-Master player. M=Master player. UN=Unranked player. FB=Final Battle. E\textsuperscript{A}=EPM for AS. E\textsuperscript{P}=EPM for player. A\textsuperscript{A}=APM for AS. A\textsuperscript{P}=APM for player.
Table 7: AS\(^2\) replays. Res. = AS’s result. OL = opponent level. GM = Grand-Master player. M = Master player. UN = Unranked player. \(E_A = EPM\) for AS. \(E_P = EPM\) for player. \(A_A = APM\) for AS. \(A_P = APM\) for player.

Table 8: AS\(^2\) replays. Res. = AS’s result. OL = opponent level. GM = Grand-Master player. M = Master player. UN = Unranked player. \(E_A = EPM\) for AS. \(E_P = EPM\) for player. \(A_A = APM\) for AS. \(A_P = APM\) for player.