

ELEC-E8125 Reinforcement Learning Interleaved learning and planning in model-based RL

Joni Pajarinen 1.11.2022

Learning goals

• Understand how learning and planning are used together in model-based reinforcement learning



Anatomy of reinforcement learning Model-based





Adopted from Sergey Levin.

Motivation (partial recap)

- Reinforcement learning has limited sample efficiency
- Learned policies are task(reward-function)-specific, learned policies cannot be directly reused
- Learned dynamics model is reusable and can be used to reason about potential futures
- Sometimes we know the model, e.g. in games!





How to specify the model? Are there other situations where we know the model?

Model definition and types

- Dynamics model $\mathbf{s}_{t+1} = f(\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ or $f(\mathbf{s}_{t+1} | \mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$
- Reward model $r_t = r(\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$ or $r(r_t | \mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$
- Models are usually learned
 - Parametric regression (e.g. neural net) common
- May be also known (e.g. games, simulators)
 - Even physics based models need to be often calibrated
- Also other possibilities (active research area)
 - Latent variable models, graph neural networks, non-parametric regression models such as Gaussian processes, ...



Which model to use?



liqut Ist hidden 2nd hidden Output liquer liquer liquer

$$Y_i=eta_0+eta_1\phi_1(X_{i1})+\dots+eta_p\phi_p(X_{ip})+$$

Gaussian process (GP)

- Data-efficient
- Slow with big datasets
- May be too smooth for non-smooth dynamics

Neural networks (NNs)

- Expressive
- Unpredictable with sparse data (overfit)
 - NN ensembles estimate uncertainty

Linear models

- May be used locally
- Do not overfit

Domain specific parametric models (e.g. physics parameters) can also be used. \rightarrow Traditional control engineering approach of model identification + control.

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering

how to act in current situation (choose action)

Time of planning

On-line (every time step)

- Act on current state
- Act without learning
- Better in unfamiliar situations

learn to act in any situation (learn policy)

Off-line (use single / multiple episodes)

- Fast online computation
- Predictable within familiar situations

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering









We kind of saw this already last week.

Input: base policy π_0

Run base policy to collect data $D \leftarrow \{(s, a, s')_i\}$

Repeat

Fit dynamics model f(s, a) to minimize $\sum_{i} ||f(s_i, a_i) - s_i'||^2$ Use model to plan (e.g. iLQR, CEM) actions Execute first planned action, observe resulting state s'Update dataset $D \leftarrow D \cup \{(s, a, s')\}$



Input: base policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0$

Run base policy to collect data $D \leftarrow \{(s, a, s')_i\}$

Repeat

Fit dynamics model f(s, a) to minimize $\sum_{i} ||f(s_i, a_i) - s_i'||^2$ Use model to plan (e.g. iLQR, CEM) actions Execute first planned action, observe resulting state s'Update dataset $D \leftarrow D \cup \{(s, a, s')\}$

- Sample efficient
- Computationally expensive for two reasons
 - Dynamics fitting costly → model may be fitted only periodically (every n steps)
 - Planning costly for long horizons
- Robust to moderate model errors
- Choice of regression model is an important design parameter

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering This is model-predictive control (MPC) with learned dynamics. MPC horizon length is limited, can we do something?

Input: base policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0$

Run base policy to collect data $D \leftarrow \{(s, a, s')_i\}$

Repeat

Fit dynamics model f(s, a) to minimize $\sum_{i} ||f(s_i, a_i) - s_i'||^2$ Use model to plan (e.g. iLQR, CEM) actions Execute first planned action, observe resulting state s'Update dataset $D \leftarrow D \cup \{(s, a, s')\}$

- Sample efficient.
- Computationally expensive for two reasons
 - <u>Dynamics fitting costly</u> → model may be fitted only periodically (every n steps)
 - Planning costly for long horizons
- Robust to moderate model errors
- Choice of regression model is an important design parameter

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering This is model-predictive control (MPC) with learned dynamics. MPC horizon length is limited, can we do something?





Backprop ~ chain rule of partial derivatives

Combining parametric policy with learned dynamics by backpropagation



 $\frac{\partial r_t}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial r_t}{\partial a_t} \frac{\partial a_t}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial r_t}{\partial s_t} \frac{\partial s_t}{\partial \theta}$ $r_t \frac{\partial s_t}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial s_t}{\partial s_{t-1}} \frac{\partial s_{t-1}}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial s_t}{\partial a_{t-1}} \frac{\partial a_{t-1}}{\partial \theta}$

policy reward dynamics $\nabla_{\theta} \pi(s_t) \quad \nabla_a r(s_t, a_t) \quad \nabla_s f(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$ $\nabla_s r(s_t, a_t) \quad \nabla_a f(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$



Backprop ~ chain rule of partial derivatives

Combining parametric policy with learned dynamics by backpropagation



Run base policy to collect data $D \leftarrow \{(s, a, s')_i\}$ Repeat

Fit dynamics model $f_{\phi}(s, a)$ to minimize $\sum_{i} ||f_{\phi}(s_{i}, a_{i}) - s_{i}'||^{2}$ Calculate policy gradient update by backpropagating through dynamics Execute updated policy (1 or more steps), collect data Update dataset $D \leftarrow D \cup \{(s, a, s')\}$

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering

Tools handle this automatically by automatic differentiation.

Input: base policy $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0$

Run base policy to collect data $D \leftarrow \{(s, a, s')_i\}$

Repeat

Fit dynamics model f(s, a) to minimize $\sum_{i} ||f(s_i, a_i) - s_i'||^2$ Use model to plan (e.g. iLQR, CEM) actions Execute first planned action, observe resulting state s'Update dataset $D \leftarrow D \cup \{(s, a, s')\}$

- Sample efficient
- Computationally expensive for two reasons
 - Dynamics fitting costly → model may be fitted only periodically (every n steps)
 - Planning costly for long horizons
- Robust to moderate model errors
- Choice of regression model is an important design parameter



Example PILCO (Deisenroth&Rasmussen, 2011)

- Dynamics learning: Use Gaussian process models to include model uncertainty. Known quadratic reward
- Simulation: Simulate trajectory with learned ______
 model, including uncertainty ______
- Policy: Radial basis function
- Policy update: Calculate analytically policy gradient using learned dynamics and optimize with quasi-Newton optimizer (BFGS)
- GP → Very sample efficient. Cannot handle a large dataset





Reward function can also be learned using GP, e.g. BlackDROPS (2017).





Simulate environment to generate additional data: DYNA



Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering

Simulate environment to generate additional data: latent dynamics motivation

- Dynamics $f(\mathbf{s}_{t+1}|\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$
- Reward model $r(r_t|s_t, a_t)$
- Do we need to find an exact dynamics model that is valid for every possible state and action?
- What about learning only a model that allows us to perform the task?
- Some states may share identical optimal policies.
 Can we take advantage of this somehow?



Simulate environment to generate additional data: latent dynamics

- Real dynamics $f(\mathbf{s}_{t+1}|\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t)$
- Real reward model $r(r_t|s_t, a_t)$
- Latent state q_t
- Latent dynamics model $f(\boldsymbol{q}_t | \boldsymbol{q}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{o}_{t-1})$ and $f(\boldsymbol{q}_t | \boldsymbol{q}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{t-1})$
- Latent reward model $r(r_t|q_t)$
- Policy $\pi(\boldsymbol{a}_t|\boldsymbol{q}_t)$
- Value function $v(q_t)$

Observation of the state



Model from Dreamer [Hafner et al., ICLR 2019]

Dreamer: learn latent dynamics

- For real world data tuples (*o_t*, *a_t*, *r_t*) update latent state using f(*q_t*|*q_{t-1}*, *a_{t-1}*, *o_{t-1}*)
- and to match real world data update latent models:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\boldsymbol{q}_{t} | \boldsymbol{q}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{o}_{t-1}) \\ f(\boldsymbol{q}_{t} | \boldsymbol{q}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{t-1}) \\ r(r_{t} | \boldsymbol{q}_{t}) \end{aligned}$$



Picture adapted from Dream to Control: Learning Behaviors by Latent Imagination [Hafner et al., ICLR 2019]



Dreamer: learn behavior by policy backprop

- Simulate dynamics using $f(\boldsymbol{q}_t | \boldsymbol{q}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{a}_{t-1})$
- Estimate value $v(q_t)$ and rewards
- Update policy π(*a_t*|*q_t*) to maximize value using policy backprop through dynamics (discussed on slide 14)



Picture adapted from Dream to Control: Learning Behaviors by Latent Imagination [Hafner et al., ICLR 2019]



Dreamer: act in the real world

To collect real world data sample actions from policy π(*a*_t|*q*_t) and update latent state using f(*q*_t|*q*_{t-1}, *a*_{t-1}, *o*_{t-1})



Picture adapted from Dream to Control: Learning Behaviors by Latent Imagination [Hafner et al., ICLR 2019]





Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering

The ideas can also be combined!

Summary

- Model-based RL requires typically less data than valuebased or policy gradient approaches
- Sometimes learned dynamics can be transferred across tasks
- Potentially suboptimal: policy optimization with approximate models may lead to suboptimal solutions and approximate methods to local minima
- Sometimes models are harder to learn than policy
- Often explicit choices required (e.g. time horizon)



Next: exploration / exploitation

- Next week: how to choose actions to find optimal policy?
 - Choose always the best action?
 - But we do not know the best action before we try actions out!
 - How to balance exploration (trying out) with exploitation (choosing what seems the best at the moment)?
 - Monte Carlo tree search (MCTS): balancing exploration vs. exploitation in model-based planning

