Assistant Professor, Department of Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin





**Personal Autonomous Robotics Lab** 

# EXPLORATION IN RL

# Scott Niekum

$$
\mu_n(x) := \mu(x\,;\, x_{1:n}) := \frac{N_n(x)}{n}.
$$

$$
\rho_n'(x) = \Pr_{\rho}(X_{n+2} = x \,|\, X_1 \ldots X_n = x_{1:n}, X_{n+1} = x).
$$

$$
\rho_n(x)=\frac{\hat{N}_n(x)}{\hat{n}}
$$

 $\sim 100$  km s  $^{-1}$ 

$$
\hat{N}_n(x) = \frac{\rho_n(x)(1 - \rho'_n(x))}{\rho'_n(x) - \rho_n(x)} = \hat{n}\rho_n(x).
$$

Count-based exploration (Bellemare et al. 2016)

$$
\rho_n(x) = \frac{\hat{N}_n(x)}{\hat{n}}
$$
\n $\rho'_n(x) = \frac{\hat{N}_n(x) + 1}{\hat{n} + 1}.$ 

# Count-based exploration (Bellemare et al. 2016)



Figure 1: Pseudo-counts obtained from a CTS density model applied to FREEWAY, along with a frame representative of the salient event (crossing the road). Shaded areas depict periods during which the agent observes the salient event, dotted lines interpolate across periods during which the salient event is not observed. The reported values are 10,000-frame averages.

## Count-based exploration (Bellemare et al. 2016)

A particular choice of pseudo count-based exploration bonus is at least as exploratory as computing a (usually intractable) information gain bonus!

Info gain: KL divergence between prior and posterior (in this case, of the density model) when observing new data

 $D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P \parallel Q) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x) \ln \left( \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \right)$ 

*Intuitively: how much does the data change your beliefs?*



# Go-Explore (Ecoffet et al. 2019)

1. Intrinsic reward (green) is distributed throughout the environment



3. By chance, it may explore another equally profitable area



2. An IM algorithm might start by exploring (purple) a nearby area with intrinsic reward



4. Exploration fails to rediscover promising areas it has detached from



## Go-Explore (Ecoffet et al. 2019)



Figure 2: A high-level overview of the Go-Explore algorithm.

## Where do rewards come from? (Singh et al.)



Figure 1: Agent-Environment Interaction in RL. A: The usual view. B: An elaboration.



Fig. 1. Hungry-Thirsty domain. Thick lines are walls, striped squares denote possible food or water sites.



**Hungry and Not Thirsty** 

Fig. 3. Evolved reward function from the Hungry-Thirsty domain.

FLOAT .- 0.5 FLOAT .+

**Hungry and Thirsty** 

### STATE2 4.5 FLOAT.% STATE2 FLOAT.% FLOAT.DUP STATE1 STATE2 FLOAT.% FLOAT.+ FLOAT.\* STATE1



Fig. 2. Agent fitness (left) and evolutionary progress (right) over a distribution of environments.



Fig. 4. Agent fitness on nonstationary (left) and short lifetime (right) problems.

## Potential-based shaping rewards (Ng 1999)

 $\Phi$ 

# $F(s, a, s') = \gamma \Phi(s') - \Phi(s)$



States

Alternate idea: is it possible to explore by generating and testing causal hypotheses about the world?

- Objects: spatially localized, permanence, temporal coherence, static appearances and properties
- Quasi-static assumption: Objects have properties such as position or velocity that do not change unless acted upon
- Proximity assumption: Objects cannot interact unless they make contact

# **Simplifying assumptions:**



Given a hypothesized interaction between two objects, verify if a relation exists by learning to control that interaction

# Core idea:

# Control Hypothesis

# Visual Hypothesis



# **Hypothesis Verification**

 $\Delta \mathbf{r}$ 



# **Visual Hypothesis**

Discover convolutional filters that behave like objects

Detect changepoints in dynamics **Control Hypothesis** 

# **Hypothesis Verification**



Learn options with goal of creating particular changepoints













# Breakout Training Curves

## **Training Sample Efficiency**



### **Comparison of Rainbow and HyPE**

