




Reinforcement Learning


Autumn 2024

Abhishek Gupta

TA: Jacob Berg



Class Structure



Lecture outline

Recap: Off-Policy RL



Getting Actor Critic to Work in Practice




A Closer Look at Convergence




Frontiers of Off-Policy RL

What can we do to lower variance?


$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) &= \int p_{\theta}(\tau) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{\theta}(\tau) d\tau \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_t \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t^i | s_t^i) \underbrace{\sum_{t'=t}^T r(s_{t'}^i, a_{t'}^i)}\end{aligned}$$



Idea: bundle this across many (s, a) with a function approximator




Function approximator bundles return estimates across states



Notation: Q functions

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_t \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t^i | s_t^i) \sum_{t'=t}^T r(s_{t'}^i, a_{t'}^i)$$



Expected sum of rewards in the future, starting from (s, a) on first step, then π

$$Q^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t'=t}^T r(s_{t'}', a_{t'}') \mid s_t, a_t \right] \quad \text{Bundles estimates across } (s, a)$$

Use the magic of (deep) function approximation


Attempt 2: Recursive structure in Q functions directly

Q functions have special recursive structure themselves!

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} \left[\sum_{t'=t}^T r(s'_t, a'_t) | s_t, a_t \right] \\
 &= r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{t'=t+1} r(s_{t'}, a_{t'}) | s_{t+1}, a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1}) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Bellman equation

$$Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s_{t+1} \sim p(\cdot | s_t, a_t) \\ a_{t+1} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | s_{t+1})}} [Q^\pi(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})]$$



Can be from different policies

Decompose temporally via dynamic programming


Off-policy!

Why is this not just the gradient of the Bellman Error?

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_{a_{t+1} \sim \pi_{\theta}(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1})} [Q_{\hat{\phi}}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})]) \right)^2$$

Approximate using stochastic optimization

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + Q_{\hat{\phi}}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})) \right)^2 \quad a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1})$$



Often tough empirically with function approximators

Expectation inside the square, hard to be unbiased

Note: this may look like gradient descent on Bellman error, it is not!

Policy Updates – REINFORCE or Reparameterization

Let's look a little deeper into the policy update

$$\max_{\theta} J(\theta) = \max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|s)} [Q^{\pi}(s, a)]$$

Likelihood Ratio/Score Function

Pathwise derivative/Reparameterization

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot|s)} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a|s) Q^{\pi}(s, a)]$$

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z)} [\nabla_a Q^{\pi}(s, a)|_{a=\mu_{\theta}+z\sigma_{\theta}} \nabla_{\theta}(\mu_{\theta} + z\sigma_{\theta})]$$

Easier to Apply to Broad Policy Class


Lower variance (empirically)

Remember Lecture 2 and discussion of when gradients can be moved inside

Actor-Critic: Policy Gradient in terms of Q functions

Critic: learned via the Bellman update (Policy Evaluation)

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})) \right)^2 \quad a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1})$$




Lowers variance and is off-policy!

Actor: updated using learned critic (Policy Improvement)

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s)} [Q^{\pi}(s, a)]$$

Going from Batch Updates to Online Updates


This algorithm can go from full batch mode to fully online updates



Allows for much more immediate updates

Challenges of doing online updates

1 sample



Critic: 1 gradient step on Bellman error


Actor: 1 gradient step on policy gradient

When updates are performed online, two issues persist:

1. Correlated updates since samples are correlated
2. Optimization objective changes constantly, unstable

Decorrelating updates with replay buffers

Updates can be decorrelated by storing and shuffling data in a replay buffer



Instead of doing updates in order,
sample batches from replay buffer

How?

Sampled from replay buffer

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1})}} \left[\left(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + Q_{\hat{\phi}}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})) \right)^2 \right]$$

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s)} [Q^{\pi}(s, a)]$$


1. Sample uniformly
2. Prioritize by TD-error
3. Prioritize by target error
4. ... open area of research!

Slowing moving targets with target networks

Continuous updates can be unstable since there is a churn of projection and backup

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1})}} \left[\left(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + Q_{\hat{\phi}}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})) \right)^2 \right]$$

If we set $\bar{\phi}$ to ϕ every update, the update becomes very unstable




Move $\bar{\phi}$ to ϕ slowly!

$$\bar{\phi} = (1 - \tau)\phi + \tau\bar{\phi}$$

Polyak averaging

A Practical Off-Policy RL Algorithm



Lecture outline

Recap: Off-Policy RL



Getting Actor Critic to Work in Practice



A Closer Look at Convergence



Frontiers of Off-Policy RL

What can we do to make off-policy algorithms work
in practice?

Simplify -- Can we get rid of a parametric actor?

Critic Update

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_{a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot | s_{t+1})} [Q_{\phi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})]) \right]^2$$

Actor Update

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot | s)} [Q^{\pi}(s, a)]$$

What if we removed this explicit actor completely?




Directly Learning Q*


$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\left[Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + \max_{a_{t+1}} [Q_{\phi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})]) \right]^2 \right]$$

$$\pi(a|s) = \max_a Q(s, a)$$

Directly do max in the Bellman update



How can we maximize w.r.t a?

$$\pi(a|s) = \max_a Q(s, a)$$


Analytic maximization can be very difficult to perform in continuous action spaces
Much easier in discrete spaces! → just do categorical max!

Some ideas to do maximization:


1. Sampling based (QT-opt (Kalashnikov et al))
2. Optimization based (NAF, Gu et al)

Practical Actor-Critic in Action



Trained using QT-Opt

Practical Actor-Critic in Action




Trained using DDPG

What can we do to make them match on-policy algorithms in asymptotic performance?

Where does this fail?

Performance Double Q-Learning vs Q-Learning

10 actions at B



Some issues remain:

- 1. Overestimation bias**
2. Insufficient exploration

Let's try and understand these!


Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic

Optimized Q's are often overly optimistic

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\left[Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - \left(r(s_t, a_t) + \max_{a_{t+1}} [Q_{\phi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})] \right) \right]^2 \right]$$

Q is meant to be an expectation

→ actually a random variable because of limited data/stochasticity




(a) Hopper-v1

(b) Walker2d-v1

$E(\max) > \max(E)$, so values are optimistic

Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic



Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
-1	1	-0.1
0.9	-0.5	-0.2

-0.25

0.5


-0.15

Max = 0.5

Chooses left, even though **average** is worse

Also true for actor-critic methods!

Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic




Q-learning can overestimate when values are imperfect (even when unbiased)

Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic

Steps	X1	μ_1		X2	μ_2	Max(μ)
1	3	3.00		-8	-8.00	3.00
2	-2	0.50		-5	-6.50	0.50
3	4	1.67		-8	-7.00	1.67
4	-1	1.00		-10	-7.75	1.00
5	-5	-0.20		5	-5.20	-0.20
6	2	0.17		-7	-5.50	0.17
7	-6	-0.71		-3	-5.14	-0.71
8	-3	-1.00		3	-4.13	-1.00
9	8	0.00		8	-2.78	0.00
10	-6	-0.60		9	-1.60	-0.60
11	-9	-1.36		2	-1.27	-1.27
12	9	-0.50		-1	-1.25	-0.50
13	1	-0.38		2	-1.00	-0.38
14	-1	-0.43		8	-0.36	-0.36
E(X)	-0.43			-0.36	E(Max(μ))	0.09
Max E(X)	-0.36					

Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic – Ensemble Q

Learn two (or N) independent measures of Q, take the minimum
→ pessimistic on random variable



Independent updates

Critic

$$y_j = r(s, a) + \gamma \min_{i=1, \dots, N} Q_{\phi_i}(s', \pi_{\theta}(s'))$$

$$\min_{\phi_j} \mathbb{E}_{(s, a, s') \sim \mathcal{D}} [(Q_{\phi_j}(s, a) - y_j)^2]$$

Actor


$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{\theta}} [\min(Q_{\phi_1}(s, a), Q_{\phi_2}(s, a), \dots, Q_{\phi_N}(s, a))]$$

Significantly improves overestimation and in turn sample efficiency!


Overestimation Bias in Actor-Critic

Significantly improves overestimation and in turn sample efficiency!

■ TD3 ■ DDPG ■ our DDPG ■ PPO ■ TRPO ■ ACKTR ■ SAC



(c) Walker2d-v1



(d) Ant-v1


Double Actor Critic in Action



Double Actor Critic in Action



Where does this fail?



Some issues remain:



1. Overestimation bias

2. Insufficient exploration

Let's try and understand these!

Collapse of Exploration in Off-Policy RL

Deep RL policies will often converge prematurely or explore insufficiently




Very unstable learning

Addressing Policy Collapse in Off-Policy RL

Adding entropy to the RL objective can help significantly

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$



$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t (r(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \mathcal{H}(\pi(\cdot|s_t))) \right]$$

Simple change in on-policy RL

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \left[\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t|s_t) \sum_{t'=t}^T \gamma^{t'-t} (r(s_{t'}, a_{t'}) + \alpha \mathcal{H}(\pi(\cdot|s_{t'}))) \right] + \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{H}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot|s_t)) \right] \quad (\text{via chain rule})$$

Max-Ent Off-Policy RL

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t (r(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \mathcal{H}(\pi(\cdot|s_t))) \right]$$

Work through the recursion, same as with the regular Bellman

Critic – Policy Evaluation

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ a_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot|s_{t+1})}} \left[(Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + Q_{\hat{\phi}}^{\pi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}))) - \alpha \log \pi(a_{t+1}|s_{t+1}))^2 \right]$$

Actor – Policy Improvement

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} \left[Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s, a) - \alpha \log \pi(a|s) \right] \right]$$

Soft Bellman Equation from Max-Ent RL

Optimize a "soft" Bellman equation

$$Q(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow r_t + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim p_s} [V(s_{t+1})]$$

$$Q_{\text{soft}}(s_t, a_t) \leftarrow r_t + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim p_s} [V_{\text{soft}}(s_{t+1})]$$

$$V(s_t) \leftarrow \max_a Q(s_t, a)$$

$$V_{\text{soft}}(s_t) \leftarrow \alpha \log \int_{\mathcal{A}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} Q_{\text{soft}}(s_t, a')\right) da'$$






$$\pi(a|s_t) \leftarrow \arg \max_a Q(s_t, a)$$

$$\pi_{\text{soft}}(a|s_t) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} (Q_{\text{soft}}(s_t, a) - V_{\text{soft}}(s_t))\right)$$

Go from max to "softmax" (imagine if α goes to 0, it becomes a max)

Prevents premature collapse of exploration while smoothing out optimization landscape!

Maximum Entropy Actor-Critic Algorithms in Action



(f) Humanoid (rllab)

Lecture outline

Recap: Off-Policy RL



Getting Actor Critic to Work in Practice



A Closer Look at Convergence



Frontiers of Off-Policy RL

Ok, so are off-policy algorithms perfect?

What makes off-policy RL hard?

Deadly triad:

1. Function Approximation
2. Bootstrapping
3. Off-policy learning

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s,a,s') \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\left[Q_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - (r(s_t, a_t) + \max_{a_{t+1}} [Q_{\phi}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})]) \right]^2 \right]$$


These in combination lead to many of the difficulties in stabilizing off-policy RL with function approximation

Zooming out – what makes off-policy RL hard?

Deadly triad:



1. Function Approximation
2. Bootstrapping
3. Off-policy learning

61% of runs show divergence of Q-values



Diverges even with linear function approximation, when off-policy + bootstrapping

Zooming out – what makes off-policy RL hard?




(b) $v(s) = w\phi(s)$ diverges.

Let's go to the whiteboard!


A Closer Look at the Value Bellman Equation

Bellman Update

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_i, a_i, s_i') \sim \pi} [(V_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_i) - y_i)^2]$$
$$y_i = r(s_i, a_i) + V(s_i')$$


Fixed-point iteration algorithm

$$x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$$



Bellman equation

$$V^{\pi}(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} \left[r(s_t, a_t) + V^{\pi}(s_{t+1}) \right]$$

Holds at convergence

$$x^* = f(x^*)$$

Fixed-point

Q: Does this update converge to the true value as a fixed point?

Does this converge?

Q: Does this update converge to the true value as a fixed point?

$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_i, a_i, s_i') \sim \pi} [(V_{\phi}^{\pi}(s_i) - y_i)^2]$$
$$y_i = r(s_i, a_i) + V(s_i')$$

Banachs fixed point theorem

Let (M, d) be a **complete metric space**.

Let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be a **contraction**.

That is, there exists $q \in [0 . . 1)$ such that for all $x, y \in M$:

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq q d(x, y)$$

Then there exists a unique **fixed point** of f .

Let's consider a simple version of this algorithm

$$V_{i+1}^{\pi}(s) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim p(\cdot | s, a) \\ a \sim \pi(\cdot | s')}} [r(s, a) + V_i^{\pi}(s')]$$

$$V_{i+1} \leftarrow B_p^{\pi} V_i^{\pi}$$



Prove this is a contraction

Does this converge?

$$V_{i+1}^\pi(s) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim p(\cdot|s,a) \\ a \sim \pi(\cdot|s')}} [r(s, a) + V_i^\pi(s')]$$

$$V_{i+1} \leftarrow B_p^\pi V_i^\pi$$

Bellman operator




To prove:

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq \gamma d(x, y)$$



inf-norm

Value functions



$$V_{i+1} \leftarrow B_p^\pi V_i^\pi \quad U_{i+1} \leftarrow B_p^\pi U_i^\pi$$

$$|V_{i+1} - U_{i+1}|_\infty \leq \gamma |V_i - U_i|_\infty$$

$$|V_{i+1} - U_{i+1}|_\infty = \max_s |V_{i+1}(s) - U_{i+1}(s)|$$

$$= \max_s \left| \left(\int \pi(a|s) \left(\int p(s'|s, a) (r(s, a) + \gamma U_i(s')) ds \right) da \right) - \left(\int \pi(a|s) \left(\int p(s'|s, a) (r(s, a) + \gamma V_i(s')) ds \right) da \right) \right|$$

$$= \gamma \max_s \left| \left(\int \pi(a|s) \left(\int p(s'|s, a) (U_i(s') - V_i(s')) ds \right) da \right) \right|$$

$$\leq \gamma \max_s \left| \left(\int \pi(a|s) \left(\int p(s'|s, a) \max_x (U_i(x) - V_i(x)) ds \right) da \right) \right|$$

$$= \gamma \max_s \left| \left(\int \pi(a|s) \max_x (U_i(x) - V_i(x)) da \right) \right|$$

$$= \gamma \max_x |U_i(x) - V_i(x)| = \gamma |U_i - V_i|_\infty \quad \text{Contraction, hence converges to a fixed point}$$


Does this converge for arbitrary function approximation?

For arbitrary function approximation, it is not just a Bellman backup

$$V_{i+1}^\pi(s) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim p(\cdot|s,a) \\ a \sim \pi(\cdot|s')}} [r(s, a) + V_i^\pi(s')] \quad V_{i+1} \leftarrow B_p^\pi V_i^\pi$$

We perform a Bellman backup + a projection

Projection – find closest element of function class to approximate tabular values



$$\min_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{(s_i, a_i, s_i') \sim \pi} [(V_{\phi}^\pi(s_i) - y_i)^2]$$
$$y_i = r(s_i, a_i) + V(s_i')$$

Backup may be a contraction, but backup
+ projection may not be

Lecture outline

Recap: Off-Policy RL



Getting Actor Critic to Work in Practice



A Closer Look at Convergence



Frontiers of Off-Policy RL

What should I work on?


Where does the frontier of off-policy RL lie?

Off-policy is an extremely promising tool, but not quite plug and play like PG methods


- Low variance, off-policy, avoids reconstruction, performs dynamic programming
- Has the potential to be **performant** and **sample efficient**

But in practice is often unstable, inefficient with high dimensional observations

Sampling



Theory



Exploration





Image-based RL






Partial Observability




Prioritizing Experience


Performing uniform buffer TD updates can be catastrophically bad



(a) Sub-optimal convergence for on-policy distributions: return (dashed) and value error (solid). Note that value error decreases rapidly at the start and finally converges to a nonzero value, leading to sub-optimal return.



(b) Instability for replay buffer distributions: return (dashed) and value error (solid) over training iterations. Note the rapid increase in value error at multiple points, which co-occurs with instabilities in returns.



(c) Error (left) and returns (right) for sparse reward MDP with replay buffer distributions. Note the inability to learn, low return, and highly unstable value error \mathcal{E}_k , often increasing sharply, destabilizing the learning process.

Need to prioritize updates to propagate good values

Theory/Convergence with Function Approximation

Significant body of work on learning dynamics with function approximation

Delusional Bias




Figure 1: A simple MDP that illustrates delusional bias (see text for details).

Implicit regularization

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{exp}}(\theta) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} \phi(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{a}_i)^\top \phi(\mathbf{s}'_i, \mathbf{a}'_i).$$


Bilinear classes

Framework	B-Rank	B-Complete	W-Rank	Bilinear Class (this work)
B-Rank	✓	✗	✓	✓
B-Complete	✗	✓	✗	✓
W-Rank	✗	✗	✓	✓
Bilinear Class (this work)	✗	✗	✗	✓


Exploration in Off-Policy RL

Better exploration methods


Uncertainty based methods



Count-based methods



Information gain methods




Often critical for getting algorithms to work!


Image-based Off-Policy RL

Learning from high dimensional observations is unstable – images/point clouds


Data augmentations



Pre-trained representations





Student-teacher



Still very unstable, lot of open research problems!

Partial Observability in Off-Policy RL

Off-policy methods critically depend on the Markov assumption





Learning history conditioned/recurrent Q-functions is an open area!

How has off-policy RL manifested in robotics?

Small changes – larger number of ensembles, more minibatch steps allow for training in < 20 mins




How has off-policy RL manifested in robotics?




How has off-policy RL manifested in robotics?

Uses MPO – a variant of actor critic with a supervised learning style actor update




How has off-policy RL manifested in robotics?


Bootstrapped with a few demonstrations



How has off-policy RL manifested in robotics?




untrained




12 min later



30 min later



1 hour later



2 hours later

Pros/Cons of Off-Policy Methods in Robotics

Pros:

1. Sample-efficient enough for real world
2. Can learn from images with suitable design choices
3. Off-policy, can incorporate prior data

Cons

1. Often unstable
2. Can achieve lower asymptotic performance
3. Requires significant storage

Fin.



Lecture outline

The Anatomy of Model-Based Reinforcement Learning



Model based RL v0 → random shooting + MPC



Model based RL v1 → MPPI + MPC



Model based RL v2 → uncertainty based models




Model based RL v3 → policy optimization with models



Model based RL v4 → latent space models with images

Landscape of Reinforcement Learning Algorithms




$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$

Gradient Ascent

Dynamic Programming

Model-Based Optimization

What if we just learned how the world worked?



$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$

1. Learn a surrogate model of the transition dynamics from arbitrary off-policy data
2. Do reward maximization against this model

Intuitive: learn how the world works first and then plan in that model


Why do model-based RL?

Why would we do this?


Transfer/Adaptive



Efficiency




Simplicity



Naturally off-policy!


Why do model-based RL?



Just 2 hours of real robot training

Connections to Cognitive Science

Significant evidence for mechanisms for prediction of outcomes in neuro/cognitive science




Reinforcement learning in the brain

Yael Niv

Psychology Department & Princeton Neuroscience Institute, Princeton University


Model Based RL – Problem Statement

Model Learning



$$\hat{p}_\theta \leftarrow \arg \min_{\hat{p}_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \hat{p}_\theta)$$

Planning



$$\arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}, \pi} \left[\sum_t r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$

Can also just be a single trajectory

How should we instantiate these?

What will we not cover today?


iLQR/iLQG

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T} \sum_{t=1}^T c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x}_t = f(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \mathbf{u}_{t-1})$$


$$f(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) = \mathbf{F}_t \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{f}_t$$

$$c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{C}_t \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{c}_t$$

MBRL with GPs/Non-Parametrics




Non-linear TrajOpt



Byron's lectures do a wonderful job, do go watch them!



What will we cover today?

Use neural networks as our model!




$$\hat{p}_\theta \leftarrow \arg \min_{\hat{p}_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}, \hat{p}_\theta)$$

$$\arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}, \pi} \left[\sum_t r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$



Model Based RL – Assumptions



$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_{\theta}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T r(s_t, a_t) \right]$$

Assumptions:

1. Can only **sample** from dynamics
2. Can **reset** the environment
3. Reward function is **known**

We will get into this in a later lecture!

Model Based RL – A template

