"The wide world is all about you: you can fence yourselves in, but you cannot forever fence it out."

J. R. R. Tolkien, The Fellowship of the Ring

# CMPUT 655 RL 1 Class 11/12

Image from THE ONE RING™ Roleplaying Game, Second Edition.

Marlos C. Machado

# Reminders I

- We'll have Rich Sutton as guest lecturer today at 15:30.
- The final Project Report is due on December 15th.
  - The link on eClass is already open.
  - I cannot accept late submissions.
- The final grades (best 9) for the Coursera activities are *almost* available on eClass.
- The Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT) Survey is now available.

# Please, interrupt me at any time!



## Last Class (Recorded)

# Chapter 13

# **Policy Gradient Methods**

4

Deep Reinforcement Learning

# Chapter 16 Applications and Case Studies -ish

## Many High-profile Stories in RL are due to Deep RL



Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning

Marlos C. Machado

Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu <sup>⊠</sup>, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare,

## Many High-profile Stories in RL are due to Deep RL



## Many High-profile Stories in RL are due to Deep RL

#### \*[Tesauro, 1994]



[Mnih et al., 2015]



[Degrave et al., 2022]





[Vinyals et al., 2019]



[Bellemare et al., 2020]

## Deep Reinforcement Learning

- Deep RL is more than neural networks + RL.
   It is actually designing algorithms to use deep learning.
- Similar to RL, deep RL is simultaneously a problem, a class of solution methods, and the field that studies this problem and its solution methods.
  - Deep RL studies control (and prediction) problems in which a computational agent learns to make decisions. It focuses on problems with high-dimensional observations.
  - The solution methods in deep RL consist of using (at least) a neural network for either value function or policy approximation. Ideally, these solution methods are general in sense of being applicable to a wide range of problems.
  - Given how general reinforcement learning is, it can definitely be seen as a specific subset of RL.
    - We still need to deal with the same problems, generalization, credit assignment, and exploration.



# Some history

## RL + Neural Networks: TD Gammon [Tesauro, 1992, 1994, 1995]

- A straightforward combination of the  $TD(\lambda)$  algorithm and nonlinear function approximation using a multilayer artificial neural network to play backgammon.

$$\mathbf{w}_{t+1} \doteq \mathbf{w}_t + \alpha \Big[ R_{t+1} + \gamma \hat{v}(S_{t+1}, \mathbf{w}_t) - \hat{v}(S_t, \mathbf{w}_t) \Big] \mathbf{z}_t \qquad \mathbf{z}_t \doteq \gamma \lambda \mathbf{z}_{t-1} + \nabla \hat{v}(S_t, \mathbf{w}_t)$$

- Backgammon has too many positions and an effective branch. factor of about 400.
- Self-play for data generation.
- It had many versions:
  - v0: straightforward input with little domain knowledge.



black pieces

nove clockwise

A backgammon position

- v1: added specialized backgammon features.
- $_{\circ}$  v2 / v2.1: bigger network (40 and then 80) and selective two-ply search.
- v3 / v3.1: bigger network (160) and selective three-ply search.



Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research 47 (2013) 253-279

Submitted 02/13; published 06/13

#### The Arcade Learning Environment: An Evaluation Platform for General Agents

Marc G. Bellemare University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Yavar Naddaf Empirical Results Inc., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Joel Veness Michael Bowling University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada YAVAR@EMPIRICALRESULTS.CA

MG17@CS.UALBERTA.CA

VENESS@CS.UALBERTA.CA BOWLING@CS.UALBERTA.CA

#### Abstract

In this article we introduce the Arcade Learning Environment (ALE): both a challenge problem and a platform and methodology for evaluating the development of general, domain-independent AI technology. ALE provides an interface to hundreds of Atari 2600 game environments, each one different, interesting, and designed to be a challenge for human players. ALE presents significant research challenges for reinforcement learning, model learning, model-based planning, imitation learning, transfer learning, and intrinsic motivation. Most importantly, it provides a rigorous testbed for evaluating and comparing approaches to these problems. We illustrate the promise of ALE by developing and benchmarking domain-independent agents designed using well-established AI techniques for both reinforcement learning and planning. In doing so, we also propose an evaluation

# Arcade Learning Environment

**Over 50 Domains in 8 Minutes 23 Seconds** 

Marlos C. Machado











18





Exploration

## Transfer Learning



## Intrinsic Motivation



### Deep Q-Network (and Deep RL) [Mnih et al., 2013, 2015]

 Playing Atari with Deep Reinforcement Learning

 Volodymyr Mnih
 Koray Kavukcuoglu
 David Silver
 Alex Graves
 Ioannis Antonoglou

 Daan Wierstra
 Martin Riedmiller

 DeepMind Technologies
 {vlad, koray, david, alex.graves, ioannis, daan, martin.riedmiller} @ deepmind.com

Abstract



2013

Dec



### Deep Q-Network (and Deep RL) [Mnih et al., 2013, 2015]







$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t + \alpha \Big[ R_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q(S_{t+1}, a'; \boldsymbol{\theta}^-) - Q(S_t, A_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \Big] \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t} Q(S_t, A_t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$$

**RMSProp** 

Game	Random Play	Best Linear Learner	Contingency (SARSA)	Human	DQN (± std)	Normalized DQN (% Human)
Alien	227.8	939.2	103.2	6875	3069 (±1093)	42.7%
Amidar	5.8	103.4	183.6	1676	739.5 (±3024)	43.9%
Assault	222.4	628	537	1496	3359(±775)	246.2%
Asterix	210	987.3	1332	8503	6012 (±1744)	70.0%
Asteroids	719.1	907.3	89	13157	1629 (±542)	7.3%
Atlantis	12850	62687	852.9	29028	85641(±17600)	449.9%
Bank Heist	14.2	190.8	67.4	734.4	429.7 (±650)	57.7%
Battle Zone	2360	15820	16.2	37800	26300 (±7725)	67.6%
Beam Rider	363.9	929.4	1743	5775	6846 (±1619)	119.8%
Bowling	23.1	43.9	36.4	154.8	42.4 (±88)	14.7%



Game	Random Play	Best Linear Learner	Contingency (SARSA)	Human	DQN (± std)	Normalized DQN (% Human)
Alien	227.8	939.2	103.2	6875	3069 (±1093)	42.7%
Amidar	5.8	103.4	183.6	1676	739.5 (±3024)	43.9%
Assault	222.4	628	537	1496	3359(±775)	246.2%
Asterix	210	987.3	1332	8503	6012 (±1744)	70.0%
Asteroids	719.1	907.3	89	13157	1629 (±542)	7.3%
Atlantis	12850	62687	852.9	29028	85641(±17600)	449.9%
Bank Heist	14.2	190.8	67.4	734.4	429.7 (±650)	57.7%
Battle Zone	2360	15820	16.2	37800	26300 (±7725)	67.6%
Beam Rider	363.9	929.4	1743	5775	6846 (±1619)	119.8%
Bowling	23.1	43.9	36.4	154.8	42.4 (±88)	14.7%

### Tables can be misleading [Machado et al., 2018]

• Tables imply an apples-to-apples comparison, even when they are not:

- DQN saw much more data than the baselines.
- DQN measured its performance differently than the baselines.
- DQN used domain knowledge other baselines didn't:
  - Lives signal
  - Action set

# This can be a big deal [Liang et al., 2016]

### State of the Art Control of Atari Games Using Shallow Reinforcement Learning

Yitao Liang<sup>†</sup>, Marlos C. Machado<sup>‡</sup>, Erik Talvitie<sup>†</sup>, and Michael Bowling<sup>‡</sup> <sup>†</sup>Franklin & Marshall College Lancaster, PA, USA {yliang, erik.talvitie}@fandm.edu {machado, mbowling}@ualberta.ca



It is not that we should be using linear function approxim. <sup>[Liang et al., 2016; Machado et al. 2018]</sup> but we should understand

> and be careful with our claims 80 0 DQN  $\bigcirc$  Sarsa( $\lambda$ ) + LFA 60 % games it is better And the second second 40 20 0 10M 50M 100M 200M

> > Total number of frames

Marlos C. Machado





$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t + \alpha \Big[ R_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q(S_{t+1}, a'; \boldsymbol{\theta}^-) - Q(S_t, A_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \Big] \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_t} Q(S_t, A_t; \boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$$

**RMSProp** 

