

# It Knows What You're Going To Do: Adding Anticipation to a Quakebot

John E. Laird  
University of Michigan  
1101 Beal Ave.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2110  
laird@umich.edu

## ABSTRACT

The complexity of AI characters in computer games is continually improving; however they still fall short of human players. In this paper we describe an AI bot for the game Quake II that tries to incorporate some of the missing capabilities. This bot is distinguished by its ability to build its own map as it explores a level, use a wide variety of tactics based on its internal map, and in some cases, anticipate its opponent's actions. The bot was developed in the Soar architecture and uses dynamical hierarchical task decomposition to organize its knowledge and actions. It also uses internal prediction based on its own tactics to anticipate its opponent's actions. This paper describes the implementation, its strengths and weaknesses, and discusses future research.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

I.2.1 [Artificial Intelligence]: Applications and Expert Systems – *games*.

## General Terms

Algorithms, Performance, Design

## Keywords

Computer Games, Anticipation, Quake, Soar

## 1. INTRODUCTION

AI bots in first-person shooter (FPS) computer games have continually gotten more complex and more intelligent. The original bots in FPSs were completely oblivious to their environment and used fixed scripts to attack the human player. Current bots, such as those found in Quake III [2] or Unreal Tournament, are beginning to approximate the game play of humans. They collect health and other powerups, and they have a variety of tactics such as circle- Strafing and popping in and out of doorways. What, if anything, are they missing? Although they can react to different situations and opponents, as of yet they do not anticipate or adapt to the behavior of other players.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

The following quote from Dennis (Thresh) Fong, the Michael Jordon of Quake, gives some insight into the importance of anticipation (Newsweek, November 1999):

Say my opponent walks into a room. I'm visualizing him walking in, picking up the weapon. On his way out, I'm waiting at the doorway and I fire a rocket two seconds before he even rounds the corner. A lot of people rely strictly on aim, but everybody has their bad aim days. So even if I'm having a bad day, I can still pull out a win. That's why I've never lost a tournament.

A related example is when you see an enemy running down a hallway far away. Because the enemy has only the blaster (an inferior weapon), you realize he is probably looking for the hyperblaster (a much better weapon), which is just around the corner from you. You decide to go get the hyperblaster first and directly confront the enemy, expecting that your better firepower will win the day.

Each of these tactics can be added manually for specific locations in a specific level of a game. We could add tests that if the bot is ever in a specific location on a specific level and hears a specific sound (the sound of the enemy picking up a weapon), then it should set an ambush by a specific door. Unfortunately, this approach requires a tremendous effort to create a large number of tactics that work only for the specific level.

Instead of trying to encode behaviors for each of these specific situations, an alternative is to add a general capability for anticipating an opponent's actions. From an AI perspective, anticipation is a form of planning; a topic that researchers in AI have studied for 40 years. The power of chess and checkers programs comes directly from their ability to anticipate their opponent's responses to their own moves. Anticipation for bots in first-person shooters (FPS) has a few twists that differentiate it from the standard AI techniques such as alpha-beta search. First, a player in a FPS does not have access to the complete game state as does a player in chess or checkers. Second, the choices for action of a player in a FPS unfold continuously as time passes. At any time, the player can move, turn, shoot, jump, or just stay in one place. There is a breadth of possible actions that make search intractable and requires more knowledge about which actions might be useful.

This paper describes the Soar Quakebot and how anticipation was added to it. The original Soar Quakebot [5] was designed to be a human-like expert at playing Quake deathmatches. It did not incorporate any planning, and was designed to be a reactive system that incorporated tactics via hierarchical goals based on the

techniques we used to successfully model the behavior of military pilots [1, 6]. However, as we developed the Quakebot, we found that improving the behavior of the bot required more and more specialized tactics. In addition, when we presented our work to game developers, they invariably asked, "Does it anticipate the human players actions? If it did, that would be really cool." Given that the underlying goal of all of our research is to be "really cool" (which may be hard to believe given that we are nerdy AI researchers), we finally got around to looking at adding anticipation, which is the subject of this paper.

The remainder of the paper is as follows. First, we present the design of the Soar Quakebot sans anticipation. Next we describe how anticipation was added to the Quakebot and present examples of its behavior. To our surprise, it was straightforward to add anticipation to the Soar Quakebot, and it also provided a general approach to encoding many of the tactics that originally required specialized knowledge. Finally, we describe future work to extend the work on anticipation with the main emphasis on learning opponent-specific models of behavior.

## 2. THE SOAR QUAKEBOT

The Soar Quakebot plays the death match version of Quake II. In a death match, players exist in a "level", which contains hallways and rooms. The players can move through the level, picking up objects, called powerups, and firing weapons. The object of the game is to be the first to kill the other players a specified number of times. Each time a player is shot or is near an explosion, its health decreases. When a player's health reaches zero, the player dies. A dead player is then "spawned" at one of a set of spawning sites within the level. Powerups, which include weapons, health, armor, and ammo, are distributed throughout the level in static locations. When a powerup is picked up, a replacement will automatically regenerate in 30 seconds. Weapons vary according to their range, accuracy, spread of damage, time to reload, type of ammo used, and amount of damage they do. For example, the shotgun does damage in a wide area if used close to an enemy, but does no damage if used from a distance. In contrast, the railgun kills in a single shot at any distance, but requires very precise aim because it has no spread.

The Soar Quakebot controls a single player in the game. We have attempted to make the perceptual information and motor commands that are available to the bot similar to those that a human has playing the game. For example, a bot can see only unobstructed objects in their view cone and they can hear only nearby sounds. One issue is that bots cannot sense the walls in a level as coherent objects because they consist of many polygons that are displayed to the user to give the appearance of solid walls, open doorways, etc. To navigate a level, the Quakebot explores the level and deliberately builds up a map based on range data to walls. The Quakebot uses this internally generated map to know

where walls, rooms, hallways, and doors are when it is running through a level. To simplify the map construction code, we restricted the Soar Quakebot so that it maps only two-dimensional levels that consist of rectangular rooms and hallways. Once a map is built, it can be saved for later use when the Soar Quakebot replays the same level.

As shown in Figure 1, the Soar Quakebot reasoning code currently runs on a separate computer and interacts with the game using the Quake II interface DLL (dynamically linked library). C code, which implements the Soar Quakebot's sensors and motor actions, is embedded in the DLL along with our inter-computer communication code, called Socket I/O. Socket I/O provides a platform independent mechanism for communicating all perception and action information between the Quakebot and the game and has also been used to interface Soar to Descent 3. The Quakebot uses Soar [3] as its underlying AI engine. All the knowledge for playing the game, including constructing and using the internal map, is encoded in Soar rules. The underlying Quake II game engine updates the world and calls the DLL ten times a second (the graphics engine updates more often than the game engine). On each of these cycles, all changes to the bots sensors are updated and any requested motor actions are initiated.

In this configuration, Soar runs asynchronously to Quake II and executes its basic decision cycle anywhere from 30-50 times a second on a 400MHz Pentium II, allowing it to take multiple reasoning steps for each change in its sensors.

Soar is an engine for making and executing decisions - selecting the next thing the system should do and then doing it. In Soar, the basic objects of decision are called *operators*. An operator can consist of primitive actions to be performed in the world (such as move, turn, or shoot), internal actions (remember the last position of the enemy), or more abstract goals to be achieved (such as attack, get-item, go-through-door) that in turn must be dynamically decomposed into simpler operators that ultimately bottom out in operators with primitive actions. These primitive actions are implemented by if-then rules, with multiple rules firing in parallel and sequence to implement a single operator.

The basic operation of Soar is to continually propose, select, and apply operators to the current state via rules that match against the current state. When an abstract operator is selected that cannot be applied immediately, such as get-item, then a substate is generated. For this substate, additional operators are then proposed, selected and applied until the original operator is completed, or the world changes in such a way as to lead to the selection of another operator. Figure 2 shows a typical trace of operators being selected. Indentation indicates that a substate has been created and that operators are then selected to pursue the operator that led to the substate.




Figure 1. Interface between Quake II and the Soar Quakebot

```


10: O: O11 (collect-powerups)
11: ==>S: S14
12: O: O12 (get-item)
13: ==>S: S16
14: O: O19 (goto-item)
15: ==>S: S17
16: O: O23 (face-item)
17: ==>S: S20
18: ==>S: S21
22: O: O25 (wait)
23: O: O24 (wait)
24: O: O28 (move-to-item)
25: ==>S: S23
26: ==>S: S24
27: O: O29 (wait)
28: O: O30 (wait)
29: O: O31 (wait)

```

**Figure 2. Trace of operator selections**

The trace starts with the selection of the collect-powerups operator (O11). This operator immediately becomes a goal, as it is not possible to apply it immediately. In the resulting substate (S14), many rules can fire (not shown) to propose getting specific items that the bot needs. Additional rules fire (also not shown) that create preferences for the operators based on the worth of the item, its distance, etc. At decision 12, one instance is selected, which in this case is to get the supershotgun in the current room. Get-item is further decomposed into suboperators go-through-door, when the item is not in the current room, and goto-item, when the item is in the current room. The supershotgun is in the room, so goto-item is selected, which is then implemented in a substate by face-item and move-to-item. The proposal for face-item tests that if the bot is not facing the item being picked up, then the bot should turn toward it. Facing an item is not instantaneous, and decisions 17-23 show how the bot just waits until the turning is complete. Once the bot is facing the item, the proposal for move-to-item fires, and move-to-item is selected, which also takes time to complete.

Figure 3 shows the underlying organization of operators that gave rise to the trace in Figure 2. This is just a small part of the overall hierarchy, but includes some of the top-level-operators, such as wander, explore, attack, and those that are used in the substate that can arise to apply the collect-powerups operator.




**Figure 3. Partial operator hierarchy**

Soar does not use any pre-defined ordering to determine which operators to select and apply. As mentioned earlier, the knowledge in Soar to propose, select, and apply operators is encoded as if-then rules. The rules are Soar's long-term procedural knowledge, and they are matched against the states stored in Soar's global declarative *working memory*. Working memory holds all of the bot's information about the current situation, including perception, elaborations of perception, data structures representing the map of the game, etc. All rules that successfully match working memory *fire* in parallel to change working memory by either adding or deleting declarative structures. There is no underlying program counter that inexorably moves execution from one statement to the next, independent of changes to the situation, possibly performing an action that has become obsolete. Instead, each action is selected by rules that continually test the current situation.

Soar's underlying processing cycle that selects and applies operators consists of five phases as shown in Figure 4. The following paragraphs describe the processing cycle to a level of detail that can be skipped for those only interested in anticipation.

1. Sensing: Updating the available perceptual information in the top state. The creation and updating of perceptual information is done automatically by C routines in the



**Figure 4. The Soar Decision Cycle**

Quake DLL that simulate the sensing of a human. For example, the Quakebot can "see" unobstructed objects in a forward facing view cone out to a pre-set range. The Quakebot can "hear" movement, explosions, and other sounds to a pre-set range. The Quakebot can also sense its own state, such as the items it has, its health, its position, orientation, speed, etc.

2. Elaboration, operator proposal, and operator evaluation:
  - a) Elaboration: Based on the contents of working memory, rules may fire to monotonically elaborate the sensory information with task-specific data. For example, rules might test current health level and then create a new structure in working memory that classifies it as critical, low, medium, or high. Additional rules can test for the presence of these structures.
  - b) Operator Proposal: Based on the contents of working memory, rules may fire to propose operators to be selected for the current states (the origin of states besides the top state is described below). The action of these rules is to create special working memory elements that signal Soar that the operator should be considered for selection for a specific state. You can think of these rules as testing the pre-conditions of the operators and proposing the operators when it is legal to apply them to the current situation.
  - c) Operator Evaluation: Additional rules can test which operators have been proposed and create *preferences* for them. There is a fixed set of preferences types that can specify partial orders among operator, that some operators should not be selected, that it doesn't matter which operator is selected, and so on. The rules that create the preferences can test other aspects of the state for which the operator is proposed, making it easy to encode heuristic selection knowledge.

All three types of rules fire in parallel - there is no separate phase for elaboration or proposal or evaluation - the ordering of rule firing is completely data driven. Because of data dependencies, elaboration rule firings will usually lead to proposal and then evaluation rule firings. In addition, these rules retract their actions when their conditions no longer match working memory so that only elaborations, proposals, and evaluations relevant to the current situation are maintained in working memory. Soar stays in this phase until quiescence is reached and no more rules fire or retract. This usually happens in two to three waves of parallel rule firing.

3. Operator Selection: Based on the created preferences, a fixed decision procedure picks the best operator for each state. Once an operator is selected, it is installed as the current operator for the current state in working memory. In many cases, the result of the decision procedure will be to maintain the current operator, especially when it takes time for an operator to apply. If the preferences are inconsistent (one operator is better than another and the second is also better than the first), incomplete (the preferences do not distinguish between the available operators or there are no operators proposed), or do not lead to the selection of a new operator, then an *impasse* is reached, signifying that more knowledge is required. Whatever the cause of the impasse, Soar automatically creates a new *substate* in which the goal of the problem solving is to resolve the impasse. As problem solving progresses, an impasse may arise in the substate, leading to a stack of states. Soar continually fires rules and attempts to select operators for every state in the stack during each loop through the decision cycle. When a different

operator selection can be made for an impassive state (through the creation of results in the substate or through changes in perception that in turn lead to changes in which operators are proposed), then the impasse is resolved, the substate (and all of its substates) is removed from working memory and problem solving continues.

4. Operator Application: Once an operator is selected, rules that match it can fire, changing working memory, possibly creating commands to the motor system. These commands are queued until the Output phase. Because the actions are implemented as rules, Soar directly supports conditional operators as well as operators whose actions unfold over multiple decisions involving feedback from the perceptual system. Rules that apply operators do not retract their actions when they no longer match, but create persistent data structures in working memory that must be explicitly removed by another operator application rule. The operator application phase continues until no additional rules fire.
5. Output: All queued output commands, such as turn, move, or shoot, are sent to the motor system.

The Soar Quakebot is designed based on the principles developed for controlling robots using Soar [4] and then extended in our work on simulating military pilots in training simulations [1].

Below is a list of the main tactics the Quakebot uses. These are implemented across the top-level operators. Excluding the anticipation capability, the current Soar Quakebot has 100 operators, of which 20 have substates, and 715 rules.

- Collect-powerups
  - Pick up items based on their spawn locations
  - Pick up weapons based on their quality
  - Abandon collecting items that are missing
  - Remember when missing items will respawn
  - Use shortest paths to get objects
  - Get health and armor if low on them
  - Pickup up other good weapons/ammo if close by
- Attack
  - Move sideways while continually aiming and shooting at the enemy (circle-strafting)
  - Move to best distance for current weapon
- Retreat
  - Run away if low on health
- Chase
  - Go after enemy based on sound of running
  - Go where enemy was last seen
- Ambush
  - Wait in a hidden corner when entering the room
- Hunt
  - Go to nearest spawn room after killing enemy
  - Go to rooms enemy is often seen in

Finally, the Soar Quakebot has many numeric parameters that determine the details of behavior, such as how long it hides for an ambush, how close it will attempt to get to use a certain weapon. We have grouped some of these parameters together to create different styles of Quakebots that vary in the tactics in terms of aggressiveness, reaction time, aiming skill, and overall intelligence (where certain tactics are disabled or enabled).

### 3. ANTICIPATION

Our approach to anticipation is to have the Quakebot create an internal representation that mimics what it thinks the enemy's internal state is, based on its own observation of the enemy. It then predicts the enemy's behavior by using its own knowledge of tactics to select what it would do if it were the enemy. Using simple rules to internally simulate external actions in the environment, the bot forward projects until it gets a prediction that is useful or reaches a situation where there is uncertainty as to what the enemy would do next. The prediction is used to set an ambush or deny the enemy a weapon or health item.

A general capability like anticipation should really be general. It should be independent of the level that the bot is in. Moreover it should be as independent as possible of the specific tactics the bot already has. That does not mean it can't make use of them when doing anticipation, but it does mean that we should be able to add anticipation with minimal changes to the bot. If only a few changes must be made, it gives us some confidence that the anticipation capability can be used for other bots that play other games. Therefore, in the following sections, we will report on the number and character of the rules that were added, modified, or deleted, and whether these rules were Quake-dependent.

Anticipation requires knowledge about when to anticipate the enemy, how to anticipate, and what to do following anticipation. In the Quakebot, these map onto the following:

1. Proposal and selection for the predict-enemy operator.
2. Application for the predict-enemy operator.
3. Proposal for selecting ambush operators.

#### 3.1 Proposal and Selection

When should the Soar Quakebot attempt to predict the enemy's behavior? It should not be doing it continually, because of the computational overhead and the interference with other activities. It shouldn't do it when it has absolutely no idea what the state of the other bot is and it also shouldn't do it when any prediction will be ignored because the bot already knows what to do. The Soar Quakebot attempts to anticipate an enemy when it senses the enemy (so it knows some things about the enemy's state) and the enemy is not facing the bot and is far away (otherwise the bot should be attacking). Figure 5 shows an example situation where the Quakebot (lower left) sees its enemy (upper center) heading north, on its way to get a desirable object (the heart). The Quakebot proposes and selects the predict-enemy operator.




Figure 5. The predict-enemy operator is selected.

During the prediction process, changes to the world that make prediction undesirable, such as if the enemy turns toward the Quakebot, cause predict-enemy to be retracted and another operator selected so that the Quakebot is not be caught napping.

The proposal and selection rules are not specific to a given level, nor are they specific to the game of Quake. However, they do restrict anticipation so that it is only used in limited cases. Later we will discuss the possibility of an even more general approach that extends the use of anticipation. Overall, there are 4 rules used to propose and select the predict-enemy operator.

#### 3.2 Application

Our approach to predicting the enemy's behavior is straightforward. The Quakebot creates an internal representation of the enemy's state based on its perception of the enemy and then uses its own knowledge of what it would do in the enemy's state to predict the enemy's actions. Thus, we assume that the enemy's goals and tactics are essentially the same as the Quakebot's. This is the same approach that is taken in AI programs that play most games, such as chess or checkers.

The first step is to create the internal representation of the enemy's situation so that the Quakebot's tactics can apply to them. This is easy to do in Soar because Soar already organizes all of its information about the current situation in its state structure in working memory. When the predict-enemy operator is selected and a substate is created, that state is transformed into a state that looks like the top-level state of the enemy. This is done using an operator (create-enemy-state) that creates structures on the substate that corresponds to what the Quakebot thinks the enemy is sensing and has in its working memory, such as the map. The internal representation of the enemy's state is only approximate because the Quakebot can sense only some of it and must hypothesize what the enemy would be sensing. Surprisingly, just knowing the enemy's position, health, armor level, and current weapon are sufficient to make a plausible prediction of high-level behavior of players such as the Soar Quakebot. Sixteen rules are involved in creating the enemy state, nine that are specific to the Quakebot data structures and seven that are general. Three existing rules had to be modified to inhibit them from firing during the initialization of the prediction, so that the internal representation for the enemy's state did not include sensory information from the Quakebot itself.






Figure 6. The Quakebot creates an internal representation of enemy's situation.

The second step involves using the Quakebot's tactics on its representation of the enemy's state. In the current example, rules propose collect-powerups to get the heart powerup. The Quakebot knows that the powerup is in the room to the north from prior explorations and attributes that knowledge to the enemy. Once collect-powerups is selected, a substate will be created, and then get-item, which in turn will have a substate, followed by go-through-door. Further decompositions would arise if the bot were attempting to get the powerup in its world. However, for internal simulations, the Quakebot can skip the decompositions if we add a rule that simulates the abstract actions of the operator. The rule directly changes the internal representation so that the Quakebot (thinking it is the enemy) thinks it has moved into the hall. Similar rules are added to short-circuit other operator decompositions. Additional rules (frame axioms) update data structures that would change via perception such as health improving if a health item were picked up. One rule is added to keep track of how far the enemy would travel during these actions. This information will be used to decide when to terminate the prediction. Altogether, nine rules are added to simulate the effects of abstract operators. These rules are specific to the operators used in Quake, but independent of the details of the specific level. Figure 7 shows the updated internal representation of the Quakebot.



**Figure 7. The Quakebot projects that the enemy will move into hallway in pursuit of powerup.**

The internal simulation continues until the Quakebot thinks that the enemy would pick up the powerup. At that point, the enemy is predicted to change top-level operators and choose wander. Because there is only one exit, wander leads to selecting an operator to go to the hallway and finally back into the room where the enemy started (and where the Quakebot is).



**Figure 8. The Quakebot projects that enemy will return to the current room.**

### 3.3 Predicting

Throughout this process, the Quakebot is predicting the behavior of the enemy. That prediction is only useful if the Quakebot can get into a tactical position that takes advantage of the prediction. Up until the enemy returns to the room, the prediction does not help the Quakebot. However, if the Quakebot hides by the hallway, it can get off a shot into the back or side of the enemy as it comes into the room. Thus, following the prediction, the Quakebot can set an ambush.

What are the general conditions for using the prediction: that is, what advantage might you get from knowing what the enemy is going to do? For Quake II, we've concentrated on the case where the bot can predict that it can get to a room before the enemy, and either set an ambush or deny the enemy some important powerup. This is done by continually comparing the distance that the enemy would take to get to its predicted location to the distance it would take for the Quakebot to get to the same location. For the current system, the number of rooms entered is used as a rough distance measure. In the example above, the Quakebot predicts that it will take the enemy four moves to get back to the current room, and it knows it is already in that room. Why doesn't the Quakebot stop predicting when the enemy would be coming down the hallway, which is three moves for it vs. one for the bot? The reason is that the Quakebot knows that it cannot set an ambush in a hallway, and thus waits until the predicted location is a room.


A prediction can also terminate when the Quakebot (thinking as the enemy) comes across a situation in which there are multiple possible actions for which it does not have a strong preference. This would have arisen in the previous example if there had been three doors in the northern-most room - with only two doors, the prediction would have gone forward because of the preference to avoid going back where you came from. When this type of uncertainty arises, the Quakebot abandons the prediction. A total of five rules are used to detect that a relevant prediction has been created. These are specific to the approaches of using distance or uncertainty to decide when to terminate the prediction.

One possible extension to our approach is to have the bot maintain explicit estimates or probabilities of the different alternatives and search forward, predicting all possible outcomes and their probabilities. There are two reasons this is not done. First, the Quakebot does not need the probability estimates in order to make its own decision. Second, the added time to do such an extensive prediction could make the prediction meaningless as the enemy will have already moved through the environment by the time the prediction completes.

### 3.4 Using the Prediction

In the Soar Quakebot, three operators make use of the predictions created by predict-enemy: hunt, ambush, and deny-powerups. When a prediction is created that the enemy will be in another room that the Quakebot can get to sooner, hunt is proposed and it sends the bot to the correct room. Once in the same room that the enemy is predicted to be in, ambush takes over and moves the bot to an open location next to the door that the enemy is predicted to come through. In general, the bot will try to shoot the enemy in the back or side as it enters the room (shown below in the figure). But if the bot has the rocket launcher, it will take a pre-emptive shot when it hears the enemy getting close (a la Dennis Fong). Both of these ambush strategies have time limits associated with them so that the bot waits only a bit more time than it thinks the

enemy will take to get to the room in which the bot has set the ambush. Deny-powerups is selected when the enemy is predicted to attempt to pick up a powerup that the bot can get first.



**Figure 9. The Quakebot executes an ambush based on the results of its prediction.**

### 3.5 Learning predictions

Inherent to Soar is a learning mechanism, called chunking, that automatically creates rules that summarize the processing within impasses as rules. Chunking creates rules that test the aspects of the situation that were relevant during the generation of a result. The action of the chunk creates the result. Chunking can speed up problem solving by compiling complex reasoning into a single rule that bypasses the problem solving in the future. Chunking is not used with the standard Quakebot because there is little internal reasoning to compile out; however, with anticipation, there can be a long chain of internal reasoning that takes significant time (a few seconds) for the Quakebot to generate. In that case chunking is perfect for learning rules that eliminate the need for the Quakebot to regenerate the same prediction. The learned rules are specific to the exact rooms, but that is appropriate because the predictions are only valid under special circumstances.

Below is an English version of a rule learned by the Quakebot.

```
If predict-enemy is the current operator and
  there is an enemy with health 100,
  using the blaster, in room #11 and
  I am distance 2 from room #3
then
  predict that the enemy will go to room #3
  through door #7.
```

Compiled into the prediction is that the bot can get to room #3 before the enemy.

Once this rule is learned, the bot no longer needs to go through any internal modeling and will immediately predict the enemy's behavior when it sees the enemy under the tested situations. The impact is that as the bot plays the game, it will build up a set of prediction rules, and it will make fast predictions in more situations. In fact, it might turn out that originally when it does prediction, the time to do the prediction sometimes gets in the way of setting an ambush or denying a powerup, but with experience that time cost will be eliminated. One possibility to create more challenging opponents is to pre-train Quakebots so that they already have an extensive set of prediction rules.

## 4. LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS

In this section we discuss various limitations and possible extensions to the anticipation capabilities of the Soar Quakebot.

### 4.1 Generality of Anticipation Capability

Our goal was to create a general anticipation capability that could be used by a Quakebot for different game levels. In that we've succeeded. None of the knowledge that was added to support anticipation must be customized for a specific level. The power comes from reusing the bot's tactics and knowledge of a level (which it gains by mapping the level on its own).

A more general goal is for the anticipation capability to be useful by other bots in completely different games. Many parts of the capability are completely independent of Quake. However, some are not. Below is a recap of the different parts of the anticipation capability and the types of game-specific or game-independent knowledge they require.

- Deciding when to predict an enemy's behavior.
  - General across games but restricted to a set of situations.
- Predicting the enemy's behavior.
  - Creating the internal representation of the enemy's state.
    - Specific to the structure of the perceptual data and important internal state features.
  - Proposing and selecting operators for the enemy.
    - General: uses existing bot knowledge.
  - Simulating the execution of operators.
    - Specific to the operators, but part of the planning knowledge that would be available if bot planned some of its own actions.
  - Deciding that a prediction is useful.
    - Specific to the situations that the bot expects to be useful: places the bot can get to first.
- Using the prediction to select other tactics/operators.
  - Specific to those tactics.

The minor weaknesses are in terms of adding knowledge about the perceptual data and the abstract execution of operators. They are usually easy to add and in no way restrict the use of anticipation.

The more troubling issue arises from the need for knowledge that determines when the enemy's behavior should be predicted and how will the predictions be useful. This restricts anticipation to being used only under situations that the designer has deemed worthwhile. This is important because anticipation could be used as the generator for many of the tactics that would otherwise be coded by hand. For example, during a fight the bot could predict that an injured enemy would attempt to pick up a nearby health. The bot could use this to either get the health first, or direct its weapon toward the health, making it more likely that the enemy will be hit. Another example is where the bot uses its knowledge about the expected path of the enemy to avoid the enemy when the bot is low on health or has inferior weapons. Similarly, when the bot kills an enemy, it could predict that the enemy will be recreated at a spawn location with only a mediocre weapon. It could use that prediction to move toward the closest spawn point in hope of engaging the enemy before it gets a better weapon. This tactic is currently hard coded in the Soar Quakebot, but could arise from the appropriate use of anticipation.

The obvious approach would be to always predict the enemy's action and then plan actions that the bot could perform that would get it to a preferred state (such as the enemy being dead, or having full health and a good weapon). This has the potential of simplifying the bot by replacing tactics with a general planning mechanism. However, there is the cost of planning and the fact that the planning would interfere with the bot's ability to react quickly to its environment. Unfortunately, forward planning in these environments is intractable because of the huge space of possible moves the bot can take at each moment, with the most obvious culprit being which direction it should face. The more subtle cost is that of developing the planning knowledge that is used to generate the tactics, which in practice can be very difficult.

## 4.2 Recursive Anticipation

The Quakebot anticipates what the enemy does next. An obvious extension is for the Quakebot to anticipate the enemy anticipating its own actions. This recursion can go on to arbitrary depths, but the usefulness of it is probably limited to only a few levels. Recursive anticipation could lead the Quakebot to actions that are deceptive and confusing to the enemy. Although this might be useful in principle and for non-real-time computer games, such as real-time strategy games where there is more global sensing and a less frantic pace, it might be of only limited use for the Quakebot. The reason is that the bot must sense the enemy in order to have some idea of what the enemy's state is, and the enemy must sense the bot in order to have some idea of what the bot's state is. In Quake, there are only rare cases where the bot and the enemy can sense each other and one will not start attacking the other. However, we plan to do some limited investigation of recursive anticipation to find out how useful it is.

## 4.3 Enemy-Specific Anticipation

The current anticipation scheme assumes that the enemy uses exactly the same tactics as the Quakebot. However, there may be cases where you know beforehand that an opponent has different tactics, such as preferring different weapons. By incorporating more accurate models of an enemies weapon preferences, the Quakebot can decide to ambush an enemy in completely different (and more appropriate) rooms. This is easily handled by adding enemy-specific rules that encode the given tactics.

Unfortunately, an enemy's tactics and preference are rarely known beforehand. We have extended the Quake bot so that it gathers weapon preference data for its enemies. This approach is simple to implement, has low computational overhead, but has limitations in that the bot can only learn about specific enemy preferences. Although this limitation is of concern to us as researchers, it may be completely sufficient for computer games. Similar approaches have already been successfully used in football games to track and adjust to the play-calling behavior of human players [8].

A more general, but more difficult approach is to have the bot modify its knowledge each time the enemy does something unpredictable. The bot would continually try to build up its knowledge so that it can successfully predict the enemy. One final complexity is that the enemy will not be static, but will be adapting to the bot's tactics, and even to the bot's use of anticipation and its adaptation to the enemy. For example, after the first time an enemy is ambushed after getting the powerup from a

dead-end room, it will probably anticipate the ambush and modify its own behavior.

## 5. SUMMARY AND PERSPECTIVE

The goal of our research is to create synthetic characters for computer games with human-level intelligence. Incorporating anticipation is a critical part of human-level intelligence and we have demonstrated how it can be added to an existing bot.

From our perspective, this has been a success because it was added with only minimal changes to our existing bot, it added significantly new capabilities and behavior, and it points the way to many additional research issues. Most important, it makes the Quakebot more interesting to play against – you never know what might be around the next corner. From an AI perspective, our work is a bit of a rehash of research on opponent modeling and tracking [7], planning, and reactive planning. Its contribution to AI is that it pursues these topics within the context of a complex, dynamic, and competitive environment, where planning and execution efficiency are of utmost importance as well as ease of implementation. From a computer games perspective, our work points the way for where commercial bots could be in a few years, not just "thinking" on their own, but predicting what you are thinking.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Jones, R.M., Laird, J.E., Nielsen, P.E., Coulter, K.J., Kenny, P.G., and Koss, F.V. (1999) Automated Intelligent Pilots for Combat Flight Simulation, *AI Magazine*, 20(1), 27-42.
- [2] Keighley, G. (1999) The Final Hours of Quake III Arena: Behind Closed Doors at id Software, GameSpot, <http://www.gamespot.com/features/btg-q3/index.html>.
- [3] Laird, J. E., Newell, A., and Rosenbloom, P. S. (1987), Soar: An architecture for general intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, 33(3), 1-64.
- [4] Laird, J. E. and Rosenbloom, P. S. (1990) Integrating Execution, Planning, and Learning in Soar for External Environments. In *Proceedings of National Conference of Artificial Intelligence*, Boston, MA, 1022-1029.
- [5] Laird, J. E. and van Lent, M. (1999) Developing an Artificial Intelligence Engine. In *Proceedings of the Game Developers' Conference*, San Jose, CA, 577-588.
- [6] Tambe, M., Johnson, W. L., Jones, R. M., Koss, F., Laird, J. E., Rosenbloom, P. S., and Schwamb, K. (1995), Intelligent Agents for Interactive Simulation Environments, *AI Magazine*, 16 (1), 15-39.
- [7] Tambe, M. and Rosenbloom, P. S. (1995) RESC: An approach for real-time, dynamic agent tracking. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [8] Whatley, D. (1999) Designing Around Pitfalls of Game AI. In *Proceedings of the Game Developers' Conference*, San Jose, CA, 991-999.