

10703 Deep Reinforcement Learning and Control

Russ Salakhutdinov

Machine Learning Department
rsalakhu@cs.cmu.edu

Policy Gradient I

Used Materials

- **Disclaimer:** Much of the material and slides for this lecture were borrowed from Rich Sutton's RL class and David Silver's Deep RL tutorial

Policy-Based Reinforcement Learning

- ▶ So far we **approximated** the value or action-value function using parameters θ (e.g. neural networks)

$$V_{\theta}(s) \approx V^{\pi}(s)$$

$$Q_{\theta}(s, a) \approx Q^{\pi}(s, a)$$

- ▶ A policy was generated directly from the **value function** e.g. using ϵ -greedy
- ▶ In this lecture **we will directly parameterize the policy**

$$\pi_{\theta}(s, a) = \mathbb{P}[a \mid s, \theta]$$

- ▶ We will focus again on **model-free reinforcement learning**


Policy-Based Reinforcement Learning

- ▶ So far we **approximated** the value or action-value function using parameters θ (e.g. neural networks)

$$V_{\theta}(s) \approx V^{\pi}(s)$$

$$Q_{\theta}(s, a) \approx Q^{\pi}(s, a)$$

- ▶ A policy greedy Sometimes I will also use the notation: $\pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)$ e.g. using ϵ -


$$\pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)$$

- ▶ In this

$$\pi_{\theta}(s, a) = \mathbb{P}[a \mid s, \theta]$$

- ▶ We will focus again on **model-free reinforcement learning**

Value-Based and Policy-Based RL

- ▶ Value Based


- Learned Value Function
- Implicit policy (e.g. ϵ -greedy)

- ▶ Policy Based

- No Value Function
- Learned Policy

- ▶ Actor-Critic

- Learned Value Function
- Learned Policy



Advantages of Policy-Based RL

► Advantages

- Better convergence properties
- Effective in high-dimensional or continuous action spaces
- Can learn stochastic policies

► Disadvantages


- Typically converge to a local rather than global optimum
- Evaluating a policy is typically inefficient and high variance

Example: Rock-Paper-Scissors



- ▶ Two-player game of rock-paper-scissors
 - Scissors beats paper
 - Rock beats scissors
 - Paper beats rock
- ▶ Consider policies for iterated rock-paper-scissors
 - A **deterministic policy** is easily exploited
 - A **uniform random policy** is optimal (i.e. Nash equilibrium)

Example: Gridworld I



- ▶ The agent **cannot differentiate** the grey states
- ▶ Consider features of the following form (for all N, E, S, W)

$$\phi(s, a) = \mathbf{1}(\text{wall to } N, a = \text{move } E)$$


- ▶ Compare **value-based RL**, using an approximate value function

$$Q_{\theta}(s, a) = f(\phi(s, a), \theta)$$

- ▶ To **policy-based RL**, using a parameterized policy


$$\pi_{\theta}(s, a) = g(\phi(s, a), \theta)$$

Example: Gridworld II



- ▶ Under aliasing, an **optimal deterministic policy** will either
 - move W in both grey states (shown by red arrows)
 - move E in both grey states
- ▶ Either way, it can get stuck and never reach the money
- ▶ Value-based RL learns a **near-deterministic policy**
 - e.g. greedy or ϵ -greedy
- ▶ So it will traverse the corridor for a long time

Example: Gridworld III



- ▶ An **optimal stochastic policy** will randomly move E or W in grey states

$$\pi_{\theta}(\text{wall to N and S, move E}) = 0.5$$

$$\pi_{\theta}(\text{wall to N and S, move W}) = 0.5$$

- ▶ It will reach the goal state in a few steps with **high probability**
- ▶ Policy-based RL can learn the optimal stochastic policy

Policy Objective Functions

- ▶ **Goal:** given policy $\pi_\theta(s,a)$ with parameters θ , find best θ
- ▶ But how do we measure the quality of a policy π_θ ?
- ▶ In **episodic environments** we can use the start value

$$J_1(\theta) = V^{\pi_\theta}(s_1) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [v_1]$$

- ▶ In continuing environments we can use **the average value**

$$J_{avV}(\theta) = \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) V^{\pi_\theta}(s)$$

- ▶ Or **the average reward per time-step**

$$J_{avR}(\theta) = \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) \sum_a \pi_\theta(s, a) \mathcal{R}_s^a$$

where $d^{\pi_\theta}(s)$ is stationary distribution of Markov chain for π_θ

Policy Objective Functions

- ▶ **Goal:** given policy $\pi_\theta(s,a)$ with parameters θ , find best θ
- ▶ But how do we measure the quality of a policy π_θ ?
- ▶ In continuing environments we can use **the average value**

$$J_{avV}(\theta) = \sum_s d^{\pi_\theta}(s) V^{\pi_\theta}(s)$$

- ▶ In the episodic case, $d^{\pi_\theta}(s)$ is defined to be
 - the **expected number** of time steps t on which $S_t = s$
 - in a randomly generated episode starting in s_0 and
 - following π and the dynamics of the MDP.


Remember: Episode of experience under policy π : $S_1, A_1, R_2, \dots, S_k \sim \pi$

Policy Optimization

- ▶ Policy based reinforcement learning is an **optimization problem**
 - Find θ that maximizes $J(\theta)$
- ▶ Some approaches do not use gradient
 - Hill climbing
 - Genetic algorithms
- ▶ Greater efficiency often possible using **gradient**
 - Gradient descent
 - Conjugate gradient
 - Quasi-Newton
- ▶ We focus on gradient descent, many extensions possible
- ▶ And on methods that exploit sequential structure

Policy Gradient

- ▶ Let $J(\theta)$ be any policy objective function
- ▶ Policy gradient algorithms search for a **local maximum** in $J(\theta)$ by ascending the gradient of the policy, w.r.t. parameters θ



$$\Delta\theta = \alpha \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$$

α is a step-size
parameter (learning
rate)

is the **policy gradient**

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_1} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_n} \end{pmatrix}$$

Computing Gradients By Finite Differences

- ▶ To evaluate policy gradient of $\pi_\theta(s, a)$
- ▶ For each dimension k in $[1, n]$
 - Estimate k^{th} **partial derivative** of objective function w.r.t. θ
 - By perturbing θ by small amount ϵ in k^{th} dimension

$$\frac{\partial J(\theta)}{\partial \theta_k} \approx \frac{J(\theta + \epsilon u_k) - J(\theta)}{\epsilon}$$

where u_k is unit vector with 1 in k^{th} component, 0 elsewhere

- ▶ Uses n evaluations to compute policy gradient in n dimensions
- ▶ Simple, noisy, **inefficient** - but sometimes effective
- ▶ Works for arbitrary policies, even if policy is not differentiable

Policy Gradient: Score Function


- ▶ We now compute the policy gradient analytically
- ▶ Assume
 - policy π_θ is differentiable whenever it is non-zero
 - we know the gradient $\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(s, a)$
- ▶ Likelihood ratios exploit the following identity

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(s, a) &= \pi_\theta(s, a) \frac{\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(s, a)}{\pi_\theta(s, a)} \\ &= \pi_\theta(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a)\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ The score function is $\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a)$

Softmax Policy: Discrete Actions

- ▶ We will use a **softmax policy** as a running example
- ▶ Weight actions using linear combination of features $\phi(s, a)^\top \theta$
- ▶ **Probability of action** is proportional to exponentiated weight

$$\pi_\theta(s, a) \propto e^{\phi(s, a)^\top \theta}$$


Nonlinear extension: replace $\phi(s, a)$ with a deep neural network with trainable weights w


Think a neural network with a softmax output probabilities

- ▶ The score function is

$$\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) = \phi(s, a) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\phi(s, \cdot)]$$

Gaussian Policy: Continuous Actions

- ▶ In **continuous action spaces**, a Gaussian policy is natural
- ▶ Mean is a linear combination of state features

$$\mu(s) = \phi(s)^\top \theta$$


Nonlinear extensions: replace $\phi(s)$ with a deep neural network with trainable weights w

- ▶ Variance may be fixed σ_2 , or can also **parameterized**
- ▶ Policy is Gaussian $a \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(s), \sigma^2)$
- ▶ The **score function** is

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s, a) = \frac{(a - \mu(s))\phi(s)}{\sigma^2}$$

One-step MDP

- ▶ Consider a simple class of one-step MDPs
 - Starting in state $s \sim d(s)$
 - Terminating after one time-step with reward $r = \mathcal{R}_{s,a}$
- ▶ First, let's look at the **objective**:

$$\begin{aligned} J(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [r] \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(s, a) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} \end{aligned}$$

Intuition: Under MDP:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [r] &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P_\theta(s, a) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(s) \pi_\theta(a|s) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(a|s) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} \end{aligned}$$

One-step MDP

- ▶ Consider a simple class of one-step MDPs
 - Starting in state $s \sim d(s)$
 - Terminating after one time-step with reward $r = \mathcal{R}_{s,a}$
- ▶ Use **likelihood ratios** to compute the policy gradient

$$\begin{aligned} J(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [r] \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(s, a) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta J(\theta) &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d(s) \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_\theta(s, a) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) \mathcal{R}_{s,a} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) r] \end{aligned}$$

Policy Gradient Theorem

- ▶ The policy gradient theorem generalizes the likelihood ratio approach to multi-step MDPs
 - ▶ Replaces instantaneous reward r with long-term value $Q^\pi(s,a)$
 - ▶ Policy gradient theorem applies to start state objective, average reward and average value objective
-

- ▶ For any differentiable policy $\pi_\theta(s, a)$, the policy gradient is

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)]$$

Monte-Carlo Policy Gradient (REINFORCE)

- ▶ Update parameters by **stochastic gradient ascent**
- ▶ Using policy gradient theorem
- ▶ Using return G_t as an unbiased sample of $Q^{\pi_\theta}(s_t, a_t)$

$$\Delta\theta_t = \alpha G_t \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s_t, a_t)$$

REINFORCE, A Monte-Carlo Policy-Gradient Method (episodic)

Input: a differentiable policy parameterization $\pi(a|s, \theta), \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, s \in \mathcal{S}, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$

Initialize policy weights θ

Repeat forever:

 Generate an episode $S_0, A_0, R_1, \dots, S_{T-1}, A_{T-1}, R_T$, following $\pi(\cdot|\cdot, \theta)$

 For each step of the episode $t = 0, \dots, T - 1$:

$G_t \leftarrow$ return from step t

$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \gamma^t G_t \nabla_\theta \log \pi(A_t|S_t, \theta)$

Monte-Carlo Policy Gradient (REINFORCE)

- ▶ Let's analyze the update:

$$\Delta \theta_t = \alpha G_t \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s_t, a_t)$$

- ▶ Let's us rewrite is as follows:

$$\theta_{t+1} \doteq \theta_t + \alpha \gamma^t G_t \frac{\nabla_{\theta} \pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)}{\pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)}$$

- ▶ Update is proportional to:
 - the product of a return G_t and
 - the gradient of the probability of taking the action actually taken,
 - divided by the probability of taking that action.


Monte-Carlo Policy Gradient (REINFORCE)

- ▶ Let's analyze the update:

$$\Delta\theta_t = \alpha G_t \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s_t, a_t)$$

- ▶ Let's us rewrite is as follows:



move most in the directions that favor
actions that yield the highest return


$$\theta_{t+1} \doteq \theta_t + \alpha \gamma^t G_t \frac{\nabla_{\theta} \pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)}{\pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)}$$

Update is inversely proportional to the action probability --
actions that are selected frequently are at an advantage (the
updates will be more often in their direction)

Puck World Example

- ▶ Continuous actions exert small force on puck
- ▶ Puck is rewarded for getting close to the target
- ▶ Target location is reset every 30 seconds
- ▶ Policy is trained using REINFORCE



Value-Based and Policy-Based RL

- ▶ Value Based


- Learned Value Function
- Implicit policy (e.g. ϵ -greedy)

- ▶ Policy Based

- No Value Function
- Learned Policy

- ▶ Actor-Critic

- Learned Value Function
- Learned Policy



Actor-Critic

- ▶ Monte-Carlo policy gradient still has **high variance**
- ▶ We can use a **critic** to estimate the action-value function:

$$Q_w(s, a) \approx Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)$$

- ▶ **Actor-critic algorithms** maintain two sets of parameters
 - **Critic Updates** action-value function parameters w
 - **Actor Updates** policy parameters θ , in direction suggested by critic
- ▶ Actor-critic algorithms follow an approximate policy gradient

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q_w(s, a)]$$

$$\Delta\theta = \alpha \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q_w(s, a)$$

Actor-Critic

- ▶ Monte-Carlo policy gradient still has **high variance**
- ▶ We can use a **critic** to estimate the action-value function:

$$Q_w(s, a) \approx Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)$$

- ▶ Actor-critic algorithms follow an approximate policy gradient

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q_w(s, a)]$$

$$\Delta\theta = \alpha \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q_w(s, a)$$

- ▶ Remember:

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q^{\pi_\theta}(s, a)]$$

Estimating the Action-Value Function

- ▶ The critic is solving a familiar problem: **policy evaluation**
- ▶ How good is policy π_θ for current parameters θ ?
- ▶ This problem was explored in previous lectures, e.g.
 - **Monte-Carlo** (MC) policy evaluation
 - **Temporal-Difference** (TD) learning
- ▶ Could also use e.g. least-squares policy evaluation

Action-Value Actor-Critic

- ▶ Simple actor-critic algorithm based on **action-value critic**
- ▶ Let us first use linear value function approx: $\phi(s, a)^\top w$
 - **Critic Updates** w by linear TD(0)
 - **Actor Updates** θ by policy gradient

function QAC

 Initialise s, θ

 Sample $a \sim \pi_\theta$

for each step **do**

 Sample reward $r = \mathcal{R}_s^a$; sample transition $s' \sim \mathcal{P}_{s'}^a$.

 Sample action $a' \sim \pi_\theta(s', a')$

$\delta = r + \gamma Q_w(s', a') - Q_w(s, a)$

$\theta = \theta + \alpha \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s, a) Q_w(s, a)$

$w \leftarrow w + \beta \delta \phi(s, a)$


$a \leftarrow a', s \leftarrow s'$

end for

end function

Reducing Variance Using a Baseline

- ▶ We can subtract a **baseline function** $B(s)$ from the policy gradient
- ▶ This can reduce variance, **without changing expectation!**

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s, a) B(s)] &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d^{\pi_{\theta}}(s) \sum_a \nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(s, a) B(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d^{\pi_{\theta}} B(s) \nabla_{\theta} \underbrace{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_{\theta}(s, a)}_{\text{equals 1}} \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$


Function of state s , but
tno action a

- ▶ A good baseline is the state value function $B(s) = V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s)$

Reducing Variance Using a Baseline

- ▶ We can subtract a **baseline function** $B(s)$ from the policy gradient
- ▶ This can reduce variance, **without changing expectation!**

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s, a) B(s)] = 0$$

- ▶ A good baseline is the state value function $B(s) = V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s)$
- ▶ So we can rewrite the policy gradient using **the advantage function**:

$$A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a) = Q^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s)$$

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s, a) A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a)]$$

- ▶ Note that it is the exact same policy gradient:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s, a) Q^{\pi_{\theta}}(s, a)]$$