arXiv:1905.11222v1 [cs.AI] 23 May 2019

SOFT OPTIONS CRITIC

A PREPRINT

***Elita Lobo**
Department of Computer Science
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst 01002
elobo@umass.edu

Scott Jordan
Department of Computer Science
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst 01002
sjordan@cs.umass.edu

May 28, 2019

ABSTRACT

The option-critic paper and several variants have successfully demonstrated the use of the options framework proposed by Barto et al to scale learning and planning in hierarchical tasks. Although most of these frameworks use entropy as a regularizer to improve exploration, they do not maximize entropy along with returns at every time step. In this paper we investigate the effect of maximizing entropy of each options and inter-option policy in options framework. We adopt the architecture of the recently introduced soft-actor critic algorithm to enable learning of robust options in continuous and discrete action spaces in a off-policy manner thus also making it sample efficient. In this paper we derive the soft options improvement theorem and propose a novel soft-options framework to incorporate maximization of entropy of actions and options in a constrained manner. Our experiments show that maximizing entropy of actions and options in a constrained manner with high learning rate does not harm the main objective of maximizing returns and hence outperforms vanilla options-critic framework in most hierarchical tasks. We also observe faster recovery when the environment is subject to perturbations.

1 Introduction

Hierarchical RL methods aims to solve long and complex tasks wherein non linear function approximators used to represent policy and value functions are generally susceptible to catastropic forgetting. They do so by breaking the task into simpler subproblems and learning policies defined as options for each of these tasks so as to maximize the expected discounted returns. The options-critic paper proposes a plausible framework that demonstrates learning of options by using policy gradient technique to maximize expected returns. While this framework and several variants proposed since then uses entropy as a regulariser to encourage exploration, none of them maximize entropy in their objective and hence cannot generate robust multimodal policies. Additionally, these frameworks are highly sample inefficient as the underlying RL algorithms used such as TRPO (Schulman et al., 2015), PPO (Schulman et al) or A3C (Mnih et al., 2016), require new samples to be collected for (nearly) every update to the policy . The recently introduced soft actor critic algorithm solves the problem of sample inefficiency in policy gradient methods by providing an off-policy actor critic algorithm based on entropy maximization framework which generates robust multimodal policies. However, simply maximizing entropy while using a sub-optimal temperature can drastically degrade performance (Haarnoja et al., 2018c). Since policies change over time during training, it is impossible to manually adjust the temperature parameter associated with entropy. The soft actor critic paper (Haarnoja et al., 2018d) provides a way to automatically tune the temperature parameter. Thus it also shows that doing so reduces sensitivity to hyperparameter tuning. In this paper, we extend the options framework to incorporate the architecture of soft actor critic algorithm which optimizes entropy in a constrained manner to enable generation of robust multimodal policies. We analyze the effect of maximizing entropy in a constrained manner on option-policies and inter-option policy and compare the performance with that of vanilla option-critic framework.

1.1 Background

A Markov Decision Process consists of a set of states S, a set of actions A, a transition function $P : S \times A \to (S \to [0, 1])$ and a reward function $r : S \times A \to R$. A (Markovian stationary) policy is a probability distribution over actions conditioned on states, $\pi : S \times A \to [0, 1]$. In discounted problems, the value function of a policy π is defined as the expected return:

$$V_\pi(s) = E_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r^{t+1} \mid s_0 = s]$$

and its action value function as

$$Q_\pi(s, a) = E_\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r^{t+1} \mid s_0, a_0],$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor. A policy π is greedy with respect to a given action-value function Q if $\pi(s, a) > 0 \iff a = \arg\max_{a'} Q(s, a')$.

Options Framework The options framework (Sutton, Precup, and Singh 1999; Precup 2000) introduces the idea of temporally extended actions. A Markovian option $\omega \in \Omega$ is a triple $(I_\omega, \pi_\omega, \beta_\omega)$ in which $I_\omega \subseteq S$ is an initiation set, π_ω is an intra-option policy, and $\beta_\omega : S \to [0, 1]$ is a termination function. Precup 2000) show that an MDP endowed with a set of options becomes a Semi-Markov Decision Process (Puterman 1994, chapter 11), which has a corresponding optimal value function over options $V_\Omega(s)$ and option-value function $Q_\Omega(s, \omega)$. The options-critic architecture paper by Pierre et al successful demonstrates how policy gradient algorithms can be applied to temporally extended action spaces. In their paper, they optimize directly the expected discounted return, starting at a state s_0 and option ω_0. $\rho(\Omega, \theta, \mu, s_0, \omega_0) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{\Omega},\theta,\omega}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r^{t+1} \mid s_0, \omega_0)]$. Taking the gradients of this objective with respect to θ and μ , they derive the policy gradient update for the inter-option and intra-option policy. It is assumed that $\forall\, s \in S, \forall \omega \in \Omega : s \in I_\omega$ (i.e., all options are available everywhere), an assumption made in the majority of option discovery algorithms.

Soft Actor Critic

The Soft Actor Critic algorithm is derived from the maximum entropy variant of policy iteration method. It optimizes the following objective.

$$J(\pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t},\mathbf{a_t}\sim\rho_\pi}[\sum_{l=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{l-t} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_l}\sim\mathbf{p},\mathbf{a_l}\sim\pi}[r(s_t, a_t) + \alpha_{\omega_t,\theta_t} H(\pi(. \mid s_t) \mid s_t, a_t)]]$$

This objective corresponds to maximizing the discounted expected reward and entropy for future states originating from every state-action tuple (s_t, a_t) weighted by its probability ρ_π under the current policy.

Soft policy iteration alternates between soft policy evaluation and soft policy improvement in maximum entropy framework. In policy evaluation , soft Q value is computed iteratively, starting from any function Q:S $\times$ A $\to$ R and repeatedly applying Bellman backup operator T^π given by:

$$T^\pi Q(s_t, a_t) \equiv R(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_{t+1}}\sim\mathbf{p}}[V(s_{t+1})] \tag{4}$$

where

$$V(s_t) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a_t}\sim\pi}[Q(s_t, a_t) - \alpha \log \pi(a_t \mid s_t)] \tag{5}$$

In the policy improvement step, the policy is updated towards to exponential of new soft Q function. Hence the policy is updated according to the following objective:

$$\pi_{new} = argmin_{\pi' \in \prod_{\omega,\theta}} D_{KL}\left(\pi'(\cdot \mid s_t, w_t) \middle| \frac{exp(Q^{\pi_{old}}(s_t, w_t, \cdot))}{Z^{\pi_{old}}(s_t, w_t)}\right) \tag{8}$$

The paper also formulates the maximum entropy objective as constrained optimization problem wherein the agent tries to maximize returns while acting as randomly as possible and maintaining the minimum specified entropy.

In this paper, we extend the options critic framework to learn robust maximum entropy options policies and inter-option policy. Our reinforcement learning problem can be defined as inter-option and intra-options policy search in an a Markov

decision process (MDP), defined by a tuple (S, A, p, r). The inter-option policy denoted by $\pi_\Omega \in \prod_\Omega$ represents the probability density of option given state and intra-option policy denoted by $\pi_{\omega,\theta} \in \prod_{\omega,\theta}$ represents the probability density of action given state for option ω.
In the next section, we modify the inter-option value function and intra-option value function to include entropy maximization in their respective objectives. Hence we can represent the inter-option value function as:

$$Q_\Omega(s_t, w_t) = \sum_a \pi_{\omega,\theta}(a_t|s_t)(Q_U(s_t, w_t, a_t) - \log \pi_{\omega_t,\theta}(s_t, a_t))$$

where $Q_U : S \times \Omega \times A \to R$ is the value of executing an action in the context of a state-option pair.

$$Q_U(w_t, s_t, a_t) = R(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} \Pr(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t) U(s_{t+1}, w_t)$$

where

$$V_\Omega(s_{t+1}) = Q_\Omega(s_{t+1}, \omega_{t+1}) - \log \pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}\omega_{t+1})$$

The value of executing an option Ω upon entering a state s' is therefore given by:

$$U(w_t, s_{t+1}) = (1 - \beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1}))Q_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_t) + \beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1})V_\Omega(s_{t+1})$$

In the options framework, state-option pairs can be viewed as an extended state in the usual Markov chain. If option ω_t has been initiated or is executing at time t in state s_t, then the probability of transitioning to (s_{t+1}, ω_{t+1}) in one step is:

$$\begin{aligned} P(s_{t+1}, \omega_{t+1}|s_t, \omega_t) = \sum_a \pi_{\omega_t,\theta}(a \mid s_t) P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a)((1 - \beta_{\omega_t,\mu}(s_{t+1}))\mathbf{1}\omega_t = \omega_{t+1} \\ + \beta_{\omega_t,\mu}(s_{t+1})\pi_\Omega(\omega_{t+1}|s_{t+1})) \end{aligned}$$

2 Soft Option Critic

In this section, we modify the options framework to use soft actor critic architecture. We define the Soft Option Evaluation and Soft Option Improvement and derive Termination Gradient Theorem for the soft-option critic framework.

2.1 Soft Option Evaluation

For a fixed option, the Soft Q-value can be computed iteratively, starting from any function $Q : S \times \Omega \times A$ and repeatedly applying a modified Bellman backup operator T^π given by:

$$\begin{aligned} T^\pi Q(s_t, w_t, a_t) \equiv & R(s_t, a_t) \\ & + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} \Pr(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t) U(s_{t+1}, w_t) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q(s_t, w_t) = \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a_t} \sim \pi}[Q(s_t, w_t, a_t) - \log \pi_{\omega,\theta}(a_t \mid s_t, w_t)]$$

2.2 Soft Option Improvement

In the policy improvement step, we update the inter-option policy towards the exponential of the new inter-option Q value function . For each state, we update the maximum entropy inter-option policy and corresponding maximum entropy intra-option policy according to

$$\pi_\omega^{new} = argmin_{\pi'_\Omega \in \prod_\Omega} D_{KL}\left(\pi'_\Omega(\cdot \mid s_t) \middle| \frac{exp(Q^{\pi_\Omega^{old}}(s_t, \cdot))}{Z^{\pi_\Omega^{old}(s_t)}}\right)$$

This is equivalent to maximizing the discounted expected reward and entropy over actions and options for future states originating from every state-option-action tuple (s_t, w_t, a_t) weighted by its probability ρ_π under the current policy.

$$J(\pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t}, \mathbf{w_t}, \mathbf{a_t} \sim \rho_\pi}[\sum_{l=t}^{\infty} \gamma^{l-t} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_l} \sim \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{w_l} \sim \pi_\Omega, \mathbf{a_l} \sim \pi_{\omega_t,\theta}}[r(s_t, a_t) + \alpha_{\omega_t,\theta_t} H(\pi_{\omega_t,\theta}(. \mid s_t) \mid s_t, w_t, a_t) + \alpha_\Omega H(\pi_\Omega(. \mid s_t) \mid s_t, w_t)]]$$

We derive the inter-option policy and intra-option policy gradient from the above objective in the next section.

2.3 Architecture

We have used function approximators to approximate inter-option Q value function $Q(s_t, w_t)$, intra-option Q value function $Q(s_t, w_t, a_t)$,intra-option policy $\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t)$, inter-option policy $\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t)$ and termination function $\beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_t)$. The parameters of these networks are ψ, ϕ, θ, Ω and υ. $\bar{Q}(s_t, w_t)$ represent target inter-option Q value function. We update the inter-option policy to minimize the KL divergence between the inter-option policy and normalized exponential form of the new inter-option Q value function . We have used reparameterisation trick (Gumbel Softmax Reparametrisation for discrete space) to update intra-option policy and inter-option policy respectively in Double Inverted Pendulum domain where we have used non linear function approximator to represent the intra-option policies in continuous state-action space and inter-option policy in discrete space. In pinball and fourrooms, we have used tabular and linear function approximators and biased score function estimators to estimate the gradients for inter-option and intra-option policy updates. We also automatically tune the temperature parameter for each option $\alpha_{\omega,\theta}$ and inter-option policy α_Ω using gradient descent.

2.3.1 Option Evaluation:

Objective 1: The inter-option Q value function is trained to minimize the squared residual error

$$\begin{aligned} J_Q(\psi) = E_{s,w}[\frac{1}{2}(Q_\psi(s_t, w_t) - E_{a_t\sim\theta}[\bar{Q_\phi}(s_t, w_t, a_t) \\ -\alpha_{\omega_t,\theta_t}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t))^2]] \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\psi}J_Q(\psi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\psi}Q_\psi(s, w)(Q_\psi(s, w) \\ -E_{a_t\sim\theta}[\bar{Q_\phi}(s_t, w_t, a_t) - \alpha_{\omega_t,\theta_t}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t)]) \\ \psi = \psi - \nabla J_Q(\psi) \end{aligned}$$

Objective 2: The intra-option Q value function is trained to minimize the soft Bellman residual.

$$\begin{aligned} J_Q(\phi) = \mathbf{E_{s_t,w_t,a_t}}[\frac{1}{2}(Q_\phi(s_t, w_t, a_t) - (R(s_t, a_t)+ \\ \gamma\mathbf{E_{s_{t+1}}}[\sum_{w_{t+1}}(1-\beta_{w,v}(s_{t+1}))I_{w_t=w_{t+1}}\bar{Q_\psi}(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1})+ \\ \beta_{w,v}(s_{t+1})(\pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1})\bar{Q_\psi}(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1}) - \alpha_\Omega\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t))])^2] \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating with respect to ϕ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}J_Q(\phi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}Q_\phi(s_t, w_t, a_t)(Q_\phi(s_t, w_t, a_t) - (R(s_t, a_t) \\ +\gamma\mathbf{E_{s_{t+1}}}[\sum_{w_{t+1}}((1-\beta_{w,v}(s))I_{w_t=w_{t+1}}\bar{Q}_\psi(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1}) \\ +\beta_{w,v}(s_{t+1})(\pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1})(\bar{Q}_\psi(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1}) \\ -\alpha_\Omega\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t))))]])) \\ \phi = \phi - \nabla J_Q(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

2.3.2 Option Improvement:

Objective 3: In the policy improvement step, we minimize the KL divergence between inter-option policy and corresponding exponential of the inter-option Q value function. From equation 9 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} J_\pi(\Omega) = \mathbf{E_{s_t\epsilon\sim N(0,1)}}[\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) - Q(s_t, w_t)] \\ w_t = f_\Omega(\epsilon; s_t) \;\;\&\;\; \epsilon\sim N(0,1) \\ J_\pi(\Omega) = \mathbf{E_{s_t\epsilon\sim N(0,1)}}[\alpha_\Omega\log\pi(s_t, f_\Omega(\epsilon; s_t)) - Q_\psi(s_t, f_\Omega(\epsilon; s_t))] \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\Omega}J_\pi(\Omega) = \alpha_\Omega\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) + \left(\alpha_\Omega\frac{\partial}{\partial w_t}\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial w_t}Q_\psi(s_t, w_t)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}f_\theta(\epsilon; s) \end{aligned}$$

We can derive the intra-option gradient from the above objective by differentiating $J(\Omega)$ with respect to θ.

$$a_t = f'_{\omega,\theta}(\epsilon; s_t)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} J_\pi(\Omega) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t}\epsilon\sim\mathbf{N(0,1)}}[\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) - (Q(s_t, w_t, a_t) - \alpha_{\omega,\theta}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t))])$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} J(\omega,\theta) = \alpha_{\omega,\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, w_t, a_t) + \left(\alpha_{\omega,\theta}\frac{\partial}{\partial a_t}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial a_t}Q_\phi(s_t, w_t, a_t)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}f'_{\omega,\theta}(\epsilon; s)$$

The gradient update of the inter-option policy and intra-option policies can be evaluated either using reparametrisation trick as shown which has lower variance than Reinforce gradient estimates. The reinforce gradient estimate of the intra-option policy is given by:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} J(\omega,\theta) = -\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t},\mathbf{w_t},\mathbf{a_t}}[(Q_U(w_t, s_t, a_t) - \alpha_{\omega_t,\theta}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) + 1)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(\log(\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t)))]$$

Proof in Apendix
We can similarly derive the the reinforce gradient estimate of the inter-option policy:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\Omega} J(\Omega) = -\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t},\mathbf{w_t},\mathbf{a_t}}[(Q_\Omega(s_t, w_t) - \alpha_\Omega\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) + 1)\frac{\partial}{\partial\Omega}(\log(\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t)))]$$

2.3.3 Termination function update:

The option critic termination gradient theorem states that the goodness of the termination function can only be evaluated upon entering the next state. We hence derive the termination function update from the KL divergence objective defined for inter-option policy as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\upsilon}(J_\pi(\Omega)) = \gamma\sum_{w_{t+k},s_{t+k}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}P^{(k)}(s_{t+k}, w_{t+k} \mid s_t, w_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\upsilon}\beta_{w_t,\upsilon}(s_{t+1})A(s_{t+k}, w_{t+k})$$

2.4 Automatic Temperature parameter tuning

We automatically tuning the temperature parameter associated with inter-option policy and intra-option policies to maximize returns while maintaining a minimum target entropy H .

$$\max_{\pi 0:T}\mathbf{E}_{\rho_\pi}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}r(s_t, a_t)]$$
$$\text{s.t } \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t},\mathbf{a_t}\sim\rho_\pi}[-\log(\pi_{\omega,\theta}(a_t \mid s_t))] >= H\,\forall t$$
$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_t},\mathbf{w_t}\sim\rho_\pi}[-\log(\pi_\Omega(a_t \mid s_t))] >= H\,\forall t$$

Thus we compute gradients with α_Ω and $\alpha_{\theta,\omega}$ following the objectives:

$$J(\alpha_\Omega) = \mathbf{E}_{w_t\sim\pi_\Omega}[-\alpha_\Omega\log\pi_\Omega(s_t, w_t) - \alpha_\Omega H]$$

$$J(\alpha_{\theta,\omega}) = \mathbf{E}_{w_t\sim\pi_{\omega,\theta}}[-\alpha_{\theta,\omega}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) - \alpha_{\theta,\omega}H]$$


2.5 Soft Option Critic Algorithm

Input: $\Omega, \phi_1, \phi_2, \psi, \theta, T, \beta$
$n \leftarrow n$
$D \leftarrow []$
$\bar{\phi_1} \leftarrow \phi_1, \bar{\phi_2} \leftarrow \phi_2$
$\alpha_{\omega_i} \leftarrow T$
$\alpha_\Omega \leftarrow T$
for each iteration do **do**
  $s \leftarrow s_0$
  Choose ω according to inter-option policy π_Ω
  for each environment step do **do**
    $a_t \sim \pi_{w_t,\theta}(a_t \mid s_t)$
    Take action a_t and observe state s_{t+1}
    $D \leftarrow D \bigcup \{s_t, w_t, a_t, r(s_t, a_t), s_{t+1}\}$
    if $beta_{\omega_t,\upsilon}$ terminates in s_{t+1} **then**
      choose new ω according to inter-option policy π_Ω
    end if
  end for
  for each gradient step do **do**
    $\theta \leftarrow \lambda_\theta \nabla_\theta J_\pi(\theta, \omega)$
    $\phi_i \leftarrow \lambda_\phi \nabla_\phi J(\phi_i)$
    $\psi \leftarrow \lambda_\psi \nabla_\psi J(\psi)$
    $\alpha_i \leftarrow \lambda_{\alpha_i} \nabla_{\alpha_i} J(\alpha_i)$
    $\alpha_\Omega \leftarrow \lambda_\Omega \nabla_\Omega J_\pi(\Omega)$
    $\bar{\phi_i} \leftarrow \tau\phi_i \ + (1-\tau)\bar{\phi_i} \forall i \in \{1, 2\}$ Update target network weights.
  end for
end for

Algorithm 1: Soft Option Critic

Experiments and Results

The goal of our experimental evaluation is to understand how the effect of constrained entropy maximization in options critic framework. We compare the performance of our method with the options-critic method in the following domains.



(a) Figure A (b) Figure B

Figure 1: Performance in pinball and fourrooms environment

2.6 Fourrrooms:

We consider a navigation task in the four-rooms domain (Sutton, Precup, and Singh 1999). Our goal is to evaluate the ability of a set of options learned fully autonomously to recover from a sudden change in the environment. (Sutton, Precup, and Singh 1999) presented a similar experiment for a set of pre-specified options; the options in our results

have not been specified a priori. Initially the goal is located in the east doorway and the initial state is drawn uniformly from all the other cells. After 1000 episodes, the goal moves to a random location in the lower right room. Primitive movements can fail with probability 1/3, in which case the agent transitions randomly to one of the empty adjacent cells. The discount factor was 0.99, and the reward was +1 at the goal and 0 otherwise. We chose to parametrize the intra-option policies with Boltzmann distributions and the terminations with sigmoid functions. For all Boltzmann policies, we set the temperature parameter to 0.001. All the weights were initialized to zero.

As can be seen in the figure, when the goal suddenly changes, the soft option-critic agent recovers faster than vanilla option critic as the policies generated have high entropy and are multimodal which makes it easier to adapt to any perturbations in the environment. Hence policies generated by soft option critic are more robust than those generated by vanilla options critic.

2.7 Pinball:

In the Pinball domain (Konidaris and Barto 2009), a ball must be guided through a maze of arbitrarily shaped polygons to a designated target location. The state space is continuous over the position and velocity of the ball in the xy plane. At every step, the agent must choose among five discrete primitive actions: move the ball faster or slower, in the vertical or horizontal direction, or take the null action. Collisions with obstacles are elastic and can be used to the advantage of the agent. In this domain, a drag coefficient of 0.995 effectively stops ball movements after a finite number of steps when the null action is chosen repeatedly. Each thrust action incurs a penalty of -5 while taking no action costs -1. The episode terminates with +10000 reward when the agent reaches the target. We interrupted any episode taking more than 10000 steps and set the discount factor to 0.99. We used Boltzmann policies for the intra-option policies and linear-sigmoid functions for the termination functions. The learning rates were set to 0.01 for the critic and 0.001 for both the intra and termination gradients. We used an epsilon greedy policy over options with = 0.01. This environment requires the agent to select actions with high precision in order to maximize its returns and recover from any deviations from the intended trajectory. We observe that soft-options critic framework can consistently achieve higher rewards in this environment as compared to the vanilla options critic.

Conclusion

We have introduced a framework which integrates constrained entropy maximization introduced by soft actor critic in options framework thus enabling sample efficient learning of robust maximum entropy policies in continuous and well as discrete action space. We have also derived maximum entropy policy gradient estimates for inter-option and intra-option policy as an alternative to reparameterisation trick but we note that these gradients would have high variance. Our experiments demonstrate that maximizing entropy in a constrained manner helps in generating robust policies and does not degrade performance in a hierarchical framework. Our future goal is to understand how to leverage this framework to generate diverse options which specialize in distinct parts of the state space to further reduce the exploration time during training and also generate visually distinguishable options.

3 Appendix

3.1 Intra-option policy gradient estimate using Reinforce

We estimate the intra-option policy gradient using REINFORCE Differentiating the inter-option policy objective with respect to θ gives us the intra-option policy gradient as

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}J(\Omega) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(Q_\Omega(s_t,w_t) - \log\pi_\Omega(s_t,w_t)) \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(\sum_{a_t}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)(Q_U(w_t,s_t,a_t) - \log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t))) \\
&\sum_{a_{t+1}}(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t))Q_U(w_t,s_t,a_t) + \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_U(w_t,s_t,a_t) \\
&+\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t) + \log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)) \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_U(w_t,s_t,a_t) = \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)&\sum_{s_{t+1}}\Pr(s_{t+1}\mid s_t,a_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}U(s_{t+1},\omega_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}U(s_{t+1},\omega_t) \\
&= (1-\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1}))(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_t)) \\
&+\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1})\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}V_\Omega(s_{t+1}) \\
&= (1-\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1}))(\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_t)) \\
&+\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1})\sum_{w_{t+1}}\pi_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1})\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1}) \\
&= \sum_{\omega_{t+1}}((1-\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1}))\mathbf{1}_{\omega_{t+1}=\omega_t} \\
&+\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1})\pi_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1}))\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1}) \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_t,w_t) &= \sum_{a_t}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)Q_U(w_t,s_t,a_t) \\
&+\sum_{a_t}\log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t) \\
&+\sum_{a_t}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t) \\
&+\sum_{a_{t+1}}\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_t,a_t)\gamma\sum_{t+1}\Pr(s_{t+1}\mid s_t,a_t) \\
&\sum_{\omega_{t+1}}((1-\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1}))\mathbf{1}_{\omega_{t+1}=\omega_t} \\
&+\beta_{\omega,v}(s_{t+1})\pi_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1}))\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}Q_\Omega(s_{t+1},w_{t+1}) \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}J(\Omega) = -\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}&\sum_{s_{t+1},\omega_{t+1}} Pr(s_{t+k},w_{t+k}\mid s_{t+k},w_{t+k}) \\
&\sum_{a_{t+k}}\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}(\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+k},a_{t+k})) \\
&(Q_U(w_{t+k},s_{t+k},a_{t+k}) + \log\pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+k},a_{t+k}) + 1)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof of Termination Gradient Theorem for Soft Options Critic

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon}(J(\Omega)) = -\sum_{a_t} \pi_{\omega,\theta}(a_t \mid s_t) \sum_{s_{t+1}} \gamma \Pr(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} U(s_{t+1}, w_t)$$

$$U(w_t, s_{t+1}) = (1 - \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1}))(Q_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_t) + \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1}) V_\Omega(s_{t+1}))$$

$$= (1 - \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1})) \sum_a \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})(r(s_{t+1} a_{t+1})$$

$$-\alpha_{w_t, s_{t+1}} \log \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_t) - \sum_{s_{t+2}} \gamma \Pr(s_{t+2} \mid s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) U(w, s_{t+2}))$$

$$+\beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1}) \sum_{\omega_{t+1}} \pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1})(\sum_{a_{t+1}} \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})(r(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) - \alpha_{w_t, s_{t+1}} \log \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_t)$$

$$+\gamma \sum_{s_{t+2}} \Pr(s_{t+2} \mid s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) U(s_{t+2}, w_t))) - \alpha_\Omega \log \pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} U(w_t, s_{t+1}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1})(V_\Omega(s_{t+1}) - Q_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_t))$$

$$+\gamma(1 - \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1})) \sum_{a_{t+1}} \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})$$

$$\sum_{s_{t+2}} \Pr(s_{t+2} \mid s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} U(w_{t+1}, s_{t+2})$$

$$+\gamma \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1}) \sum_{w_{t+1}} \pi_\Omega(s_{t+1}, w_{t+1}) \sum_{a_{t+1}} \pi_{\omega,\theta}(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})$$

$$\sum_{s_{t+2}} \Pr(s_{t+2} \mid s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} U(\omega_t, s_{t+2})$$

$$= -\frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+1}) A_\Omega(s_{t+1}, \omega)$$

$$+ \sum_{\omega_{t+1}} \sum_{s_{t+2}} Pr(s_{t+2}, w_{t+1} \mid s_{t+1}, w_t) \frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} U(s_{t+2}, \omega_{t+1})$$

$$= -\sum_{w_{t+k}, s_{t+k}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Pr(s_{t+k}, w_{t+k} \mid s_t, w_t)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \upsilon} \beta_{\omega,\upsilon}(s_{t+k}) A_\Omega(s_{t+k}, w_{t+k})$$

Lemma 1
Consider the Bellman backup operator T in Equation 6 and a mapping $Q^0 : S \times \Omega \times A \to R$ with $|A| < \infty$ and define $Q^{k+1} = TQ^k$. Then the sequence Q^k will converge to the soft Q-value of π as $k \to \infty$.
Proof:
We define the entropy augmented reward as

$$r_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) = r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_{t+1}} \sim \mathbf{p}}[H(\pi_{\omega,\theta}(\cdot \mid s_{t+1}))]$$

and rewrite the update rule as:

$$Q_U(w_t, s_t, a_t) = r_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_{t+1}} \sim \mathbf{p}}[U(s_{t+1}, w_t)]$$

In the proof of intra-option q learning in Sutton et al 1998, it was proved that expected value of the update operator $r + \gamma U(s', w)$ yields a contraction ie-

$$[\mathbf{E}[r(s, a) + \gamma U(s', \omega)] - Q^*(s, w)] \leq \gamma \max_{s'', w''} \mid Q(s'', w'') - Q^*(s'', w'') \mid$$

Hence, we can define an evaluation operator TQ over intra-option Q value function space $S \times \Omega \times A$, with similar metric as that used for $Q(s, \omega)$:

$$T(Q_U(w_t, s_t, a_t)) = r_{\omega,\theta}(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{s_{t+1}} \sim \mathbf{p}}[U(s_{t+1}, w_t)]$$

Following analysis similar to that for $Q(s, \omega)$, we can show that the contraction holds.

References

[1] Tuomas Haarnoja and Aurick Zhou and Kristian Hartikainen and George Tucker and Sehoon Ha and Jie Tan and Vikash Kumar and Henry Zhu and Abhishek Gupta and Pieter Abbeel and Sergey Levine Soft Actor-Critic Algorithms and Applications. In *CoRR 2018*

[2] Tuomas Haarnoja and Aurick Zhou and Pieter Abbeel and Sergey Levine Soft Actor-Critic: Off-Policy Maximum Entropy Deep Reinforcement Learning with a Stochastic Actor In ICML 2018.

[3] Pierre-Luc Bacon and Jean Harb and Doina Precup The Option-Critic Architecture In AAAI 2016.

[4] Sutton, Richard and Precup, Doina and Singh, Satinder Between MDPs and Semi-MDPs: A Framework for Temporal Abstraction in Reinforcement Learning In Artificial Intelligence Journal 10.1016/S0004-3702(99)00052-1