



Trust Region Policy Optimization

Presenter: Puyuan (Jason) Peng

Oct 12

Reinforcement Learning AgentState, Reward s_t, r_t

Markov Decision Processes $p_{\theta}(\tau) = p_{\theta}(s_1, a_1, \cdots, s_T, a_T) = p(s_1) \prod_{t=1}^T \pi_{\theta}(a_t \mid s_t) p(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t)$

The goal is to maximize
$$\ J(heta) = \mathbb{E}_{ au \sim p_ heta(au)} \sum_t \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t)$$

Action

 a_t

$$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Modern RL Algorithms} \\ p_{\theta}(\tau) = p_{\theta}(s_1, a_1, \cdots, s_T, a_T) = p(s_1) \prod_{t=1}^T \pi_{\theta}(a_t \mid s_t) p(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t) \\ \\ \textbf{RL Algorithms} \end{array} \\ \textbf{The Goal: maximize} \checkmark \\ J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta}(\tau)} \sum_t \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \\ \\ J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta}(\tau)} \sum_t \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \\ \\ \textbf{RL Algorithms} \end{array}$$



SOTA in Policy Optimization (As of 2014/2015)

- Policy iteration methods --- #parameters linear in #states, impractical for large scale problems
- Policy gradient methods --- enjoys nice sample complexity guarantees,
 it's supervised learning counterparts have been successful in CV, NLP
- Derivative-free optimization methods --- very simple to understand, work (embarrassingly) the best in some classic benchmark problems

Preliminary: Policy Gradient

Objective:
$$J(heta) = \mathbb{E}_{ au \sim p_ heta(au)} \sum_t \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t)$$

Vanilla policy gradient algorithm:

1. initialize policy π_{θ}

2. run policy π_{θ} to generate sample trajectories $\{\tau^i\}_{i=1}^N$ 3. update policy: $\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_{\theta} J(\theta)$. Go to 2.



Problem: data used for estimating gradient come from previous policy



Core idea: Improving expected reward in each policy update

$$\begin{split} J(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta}(\tau)} \sum_{t} \gamma^{t} r(s_{t}, a_{t}) \\ & \text{New policy Old policy} \\ J(\theta') - J(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} r(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} r(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right] \bullet \mathbb{E}_{s_{0} \sim p(s_{0})} \left[V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{0}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} r(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{0}) + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t} V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t}) - \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t} V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t}) \right] \bullet \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{0}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} r(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} (\gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} (r(s_{t}, a_{t}) + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p_{\theta'}(\tau)} \left[\sum_{t} \gamma^{t} A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right] \end{split}$$

Improving expected reward in each policy update

What we have:

$$J(heta') - J(heta) = \mathbb{E}_{ au \sim p_{ heta'}(au)} \left[\sum_t \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight]$$

Problem: Can't sample trajectories from the new policy!



Importance sampling + using previous state dist.

$$egin{aligned} J(heta') - J(heta) &= \mathbb{E}_{ au \sim p_{ heta'}(au)} \left[\sum_t \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ &= \sum_t \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_{ heta'}(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim \pi_{ heta'}} \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ &= \sum_t \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_{ heta'}(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} rac{\pi_{ heta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ & extstyle extstyle extstyle \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_ heta(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} rac{\pi_{ heta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ & extstyle extstyle \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_ heta(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} rac{\pi_{ heta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \end{aligned}$$

How good is the approximation?

$$J(\theta') - J(\theta) \ge \sum_{t} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_{\theta}(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} \frac{\pi_{\theta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t, a_t) \right] - \frac{4\epsilon\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} D_{\text{KL}}^{\max}(\theta, \theta')$$
Maximize it? Too slow

Reformulate it as a constraint optimization problem:

$$\max_{\theta'} \sum_{t} \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_{\theta}(s_{t})} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_{t} \sim q} \frac{\pi_{\theta'}(a_{t} \mid s_{t})}{q(a_{t} \mid s_{t})} \gamma^{t} A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_{t}, a_{t}) \right]$$

s.t.
$$\max_{s \sim p_{\theta}(s)} \left[D_{\mathrm{KL}}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot \mid s) \| \pi_{\theta'}(\cdot \mid s)) \right] \leq \delta$$

Trust Region

The optimization problem

$$egin{aligned} &\max_{ heta'} \sum_t \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_ heta(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} rac{\pi_{ heta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_ heta}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ & ext{s.t.} \ &\max_{s \sim p_ heta(s)} [D_{ ext{KL}}(\pi_ heta(\cdot \mid s) \| \pi_{ heta'}(\cdot \mid s))] \leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the optimization objective:

$$egin{aligned} &\max_{ heta'} \sum_t \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_{ heta}(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} rac{\pi_{ heta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_{ heta}}(s_t, a_t)
ight] \ & ext{s.t.} \ \mathbb{E}_{s \sim p_{ heta}(s)} \left[D_{ ext{KL}}(\pi_{ heta}(\cdot \mid s) \| \pi_{ heta'}(\cdot \mid s))
ight] \leq \delta \end{aligned}$$



The practical algorithm

How do we approximate objective using samples

$$\bar{A}(\theta') := \sum_{t} \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim p_{\theta}(s_t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a_t \sim q} \frac{\pi_{\theta'}(a_t \mid s_t)}{q(a_t \mid s_t)} \gamma^t A^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t, a_t) \right]$$
single path
trajectories
Sn an
all state-action
points used in
objective
Po
rollout set

Experimental Setup

Domains

- Simulated Robotic Locomotion: swimmer, hopper and walker on MuJoCo
- Atari gams: raw image as input

Questions to study?

- What are the performance characteristics of the single path and vine sampling procedures?
- How does TRPO compare to related prior works (e.g. natural policy gradient)?
- How does TRPO compare with other methods when applied to large-scale problems, with regard to final performance, computation time, and sample complexity?

Experimental Setup

Policy network

Locomotion



Atari games

Simulated Robotic Locomotion



Atari games

	B. Rider	Breakout	Enduro	Pong	Q*bert	Seaquest	S. Invaders
Random Human (Mnih et al., 2013)	354 7456	1.2 31.0	0 368	$\begin{array}{c} -20.4 \\ -3.0 \end{array}$	157 18900	110 28010	179 3690
Deep Q Learning (Mnih et al., 2013)	4092	168.0	470	20.0	1952	1705	581
UCC-I (Guo et al., 2014)	5702	380	741	21	20025	2995	692
TRPO - single path TRPO - vine	1425.2 859.5	10.8 34.2	534.6 430.8	20.9 20.9	1973.5 7732.5	1908.6 788.4	568.4 450.2



CS391R: Robot Learning (Fall 2021)

Summary of the experiments

Locomotion: Single path and vine TRPO solved all four locomotion problems, while natural gradient method, derivative-free methods only work on two of the easier problem (i.e. Cartpole and swimmer).

Atari games: TRPO consistently achieves reasonable result across different games and outperforms prior methods in some of them.

Discussion

Pros

- Theory side: provably monotonic policy improvement
- Empirical side:

1. First work that learns controllers from scratch for all four locomotion tasks; the algorithm is very general and doesn't require on any hand-architected policy classes.

2. the same algorithm also works well on image-based Atari game playing, which again shows the generality of TRPO.

Cons

- Second order optimization, therefore it is relatively complicated and not very compatible with modern automatic differentiation packages
- Not very compatible with modern distributed training paradigm.

Subsequent work

♣ J. Schulman, et al. "Proximal policy optimization algorithms.", 2017.

Proximal policy optimization, or PPO, improves upon TRPO. PPO attains the data efficiency and reliable performance of TRPO, but much simpler and only use first order gradient

Other related work

R. Williams. "Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning.", 1992.

- S. Kakade. "A Natural Policy Gradient.", 2001.
- S. Kakade and J. Langford. "Approximately optimal approximate reinforcement learning", 2002.
- ✤ J. Schulman, et al. "High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation.", 2015
- * T.P. Lillicrap, et al. "Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning.", 2015.
- ✤ T. Haarnoja, et al. "Soft actor-critic algorithms and applications.", 2018.