

How to AI (Almost) Anything

Lecture 11 – Reinforcement Learning and Interaction

Paul Liang

Assistant Professor

MIT Media Lab & MIT EECS



<https://pliang279.github.io>

ppliang@mit.edu

 [@pliang279](https://twitter.com/pliang279)



Assignments for This Coming Week

This Thursday (5/8): final project presentations.

- Class from 1-3pm, let us know any time constraints.

Final project reports due 5/20 – 12 days to incorporate feedback from presentations

Meet with me and TAs today after class.

Lecture Topics *(subject to change, based on student interests and course discussions)*

Module 1: Foundations of AI


Week 1 (2/4): Introduction to AI and AI research

Week 2 (2/11): Data, structure, and information


Week 4 (2/25): Common model architectures



Spatial



Hierarchical






Lecture Topics *(subject to change, based on student interests and course discussions)*

Module 2: Foundations of multimodal AI

Week 5 (3/4): Multimodal connections and alignment

Week 6 (3/11): Multimodal interactions and fusion

Week 7 (3/18): Cross-modal transfer




Lecture Topics *(subject to change, based on student interests and course discussions)*

Module 3: Large models and modern AI

Week 9 (4/1): Pre-training, scaling, fine-tuning LLMs

Week 11 (4/15): Large multimodal models

Week 12 (4/22): Modern generative AI



*An armchair in
the shape of an
avocado*




Lecture Topics *(subject to change, based on student interests and course discussions)*

Module 4: Interactive AI

Week 14 (5/6): RL, reasoning, and interactive AI



Week 15 (5/13): Human-AI interaction and safety



Today's lecture

- 1 Basics of reinforcement learning
- 2 Modern RL for LLM alignment and reasoning
- 3 Interactive LLM agents


Learning a Policy – RL basics




Learning a Policy – RL basics

An MDP is defined by:

- ↯ Set of states S .
- ↯ Set of actions A .
- ↯ Transition function $P(s'|s, a)$.
- ↯ Reward function $r(s, a, s')$.
- ↯ Start state s_0 .
- ↯ Discount factor γ .
- ↯ Horizon H .



π :



Return:

$$G_t = R_{t+1} + \gamma R_{t+2} + \dots = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1}$$

Policy: $\pi(a|s) = \Pr(A_t = a | S_t = s) \quad \forall t$

Goal: $\arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^H \gamma^t R_t | \pi \right]$

RL vs Supervised Learning


Reinforcement Learning

- Sequential decision making
- Maximize cumulative reward
- Sparse rewards
- Environment maybe unknown





Supervised Learning

- One-step decision making
- Maximize immediate reward
- Dense supervision
- Environment always known



Intersection Between RL and Supervised Learning

Imitation learning



Obtain expert trajectories (e.g. human driver/video demonstrations):


$$s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, a_1, r_1, s_2, a_2, r_2, \dots$$

Perform supervised learning by predicting expert action

$$D = \{(s_0, a_0^*), (s_1, a_1^*), (s_2, a_2^*), \dots\}$$

1. Distribution mismatch
2. Hard to recover from suboptimal states
3. Expert trajectories not always available

Model-based RL as Exploring a Tree



Optimal policy can be derived
given Q or V: tree search problem
Qs and Vs are interchangeable

π which action to take from each s

State-value function: how much total reward
should I expect following π from s ?

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [G_t | S_t = s] \quad V^*(s) = \max_\pi V^\pi(s)$$

$$V^\pi(s_1) = 99$$

$$V^*(s_1) = 99$$

Action-value function: how much total reward
should I expect taking a , then following π , from s ?

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [G_t | S_t = s, A_t = a] \quad Q^*(s, a) = \max_\pi Q^\pi(s, a)$$

$$Q^\pi(s_1, \text{up}) = 3$$



$$Q^*(s_1, \text{up}) = 4$$

$$Q^\pi(s_1, \text{down}) = 99$$

RL Overview – Model Based vs Policy Based


Model-based RL

$$\pi^*(a|s) = \begin{cases} 1 - \epsilon, & \text{if } a = \arg \max_a Q^*(s, a) \\ \epsilon, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$



Policy-based RL


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



RL Overview – Model Based vs Policy Based



Aspect	Model-Based RL	Policy-Based RL
What it learns	A model of the environment (transition dynamics + rewards)	A policy (mapping from states to actions)
Approach	Plan actions using a learned model	Learn actions directly through experience
Planning	Yes — simulates future steps before acting	No — reacts based on current policy
Sample Efficiency	High — can simulate "imaginary" experiences	Lower — requires real interaction with environment
Complexity	Higher — requires accurate modeling and planning	Lower — simpler learning loop
Adaptability	Adapts quickly if model is accurate	May require retraining if environment changes
Examples	Dyna-Q, MuZero, PETS, MPC, PlaNet	PPO, REINFORCE, A3C, TRPO, SAC
Strengths	Efficient, powerful when model is good	More robust in complex, hard-to-model environments
Weaknesses	Prone to model errors ("model bias")	Needs more data and time to converge
Real-world analogy	Learning the rules of a game and planning your strategy	Learning to ride a bike by trial and error
Use cases	Robotics, planning, games with known structure	Continuous control, high-dimensional spaces, black-box systems

Policy Gradients



From [Link](#)



Pong from Pixels



Network sees +1 if it scored a point, and -1 if it was scored against.
Can we train a network with this?

Pong from Pixels

Suppose we have training labels?




Maximize

$$\sum_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$$

But we **don't have** training labels

Let's act according to our current policy



Let's act according to our current policy

Run - 1



Win

Run - 2







Lose


Run - 3



Lose




Let's act according to our current policy




Maximize $\sum_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$

Maximize $-1 \sum_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$

Maximize $-1 \sum_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$




For a General Case



Maximize $\sum_i r_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$

Maximize $\sum_i r_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$

Maximize $\sum_i r_i \log p(y_i | x_i)$



Reinforce Algorithm

REINFORCE: Monte-Carlo Policy-Gradient Control (episodic) for π_*

Input: a differentiable policy parameterization $\pi(a|s, \theta)$

Algorithm parameter: step size $\alpha > 0$

Initialize policy parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ (e.g., to $\mathbf{0}$)

Loop forever (for each episode):

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

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

$$G \leftarrow \sum_{k=t+1}^T \gamma^{k-t-1} R_k \quad (G_t)$$

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \gamma^t G \nabla \ln \pi(A_t | S_t, \theta)$$

Policy Gradients

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} r(\tau) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)$$

If $r(\tau)$ is positive, increase the probability

If $r(\tau)$ is negative, decrease the probability

But this suffers from high variance

Policy Gradients

The raw reward may not be very meaningful.

What is important then? Whether a reward is higher or lower than what you expect.

-- Compare to a baseline, and use relative improvement

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} (r(\tau) - b(s_t)) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)$$

e.g. exponential moving average of the rewards.

Actor-Critic Methods

A better baseline: want to push the probability of an action from a state, if this action was better than the expected value of what we should get from that state.

Recall: **Q and V - action and state value functions!**


We are happy with an action **a** in a state **s** if the advantage function **A(s,a) = Q(s,a) - V(s)** is large. Otherwise we are unhappy with an action if it's small.

Using this, we get the estimator:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} (Q^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t, a_t) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t)) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)$$

Actor-Critic Methods

Two models: actor learns the policy and critic learns the value of states and actions



Critic: evaluates how good the action is

$$\mathcal{L}_i(w_i) = \mathbb{E}_{s,a,r,s' \sim \mathcal{D}_i} \left[\left(\underbrace{r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a'; w_i^-)}_{\text{Q-learning target}} - \underbrace{Q(s, a; w_i)}_{\text{Q-network}} \right)^2 \right]$$

Actor: decides what actions to take

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} \underbrace{(Q^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t, a_t) - V^{\pi_{\theta}}(s_t))}_{\text{Advantage function } \mathbf{A(s,a)}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)$$

Proximal Policy Optimization

2 new algorithms:


1. Trust region policy optimization limits the KL divergence (distance) between new and old policies.
2. Proximal policy optimization further approximates of KL divergence by clipping the policy gradient.

Restrict each update to be small -> stable training

$$L^{CLIP}(\theta) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[\min(r_t(\theta) \hat{A}_t, \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_t) \right]$$

$$r_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_t | s_t)}, \text{ so } r(\theta_{\text{old}}) = 1.$$

Trust Region Optimization



Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback


Step 0: Pre-train LLM and perform supervised fine-tuning;

Step 1: For each prompt, treat the LLM as a policy and sample multiple responses from the model;

Step 2: Humans rank these outputs by quality;


Step 3: Train a **reward model** to predict human preferences / ranking, given full model responses;

Step 4: Use **RL (e.g. PPO, GRPO)** to fine-tune the model to maximize the reward model's scores.



Human Ranking and Reward Model

Can't have humans write gold answers to everything, so train a reward model to predict human preferences



Human Ranking and Reward Model

Human preferences are noisy and uncalibrated

Solution: Relative preference tuning via pairwise comparisons

X

$$R(s_1) = 8.0$$

$$R(s_2) = 1.2$$

✓

Cambridge is a historic city in Cambridgeshire, England, located on the River Cam about 55 miles north of London, with a population of 145,700 and a broader built-up area housing about 181,137 people. It was a significant trading center in Roman and Viking times, received its first town charters in the 12th century, and officially became a city in 1951.

is better than

Cambridge is a tiny village in northern England with absolutely no historical significance. It has never been granted any form of city status.


$$\hat{P}[\sigma^1 \succ \sigma^2] = \frac{\exp \sum \hat{r}(o_t^1, a_t^1)}{\exp \sum \hat{r}(o_t^1, a_t^1) + \exp \sum \hat{r}(o_t^2, a_t^2)}.$$

The RL Part: PPO

3 components:

1. **Actor model/policy:** LLM that has been pre-trained and supervised fine-tuned;
2. **Reward model:** Trained and frozen model that predicts human preference as a scalar reward, given full model responses;
3. **Value model/critic:** Learnable value function takes in partial model responses and predicts scalar reward.


Recall Actor-critic models!!



The RL Part: PPO

Algorithm:

1. **Generate responses:** LLM produces multiple responses for a given prompt;
2. **Score responses:** The reward model assigns reward for each response;
3. **Compute advantages** $A(s,a) = Q(s,a) - V(s)$. How much better a **specific action** a (i.e., word) is compared to an **average action** the policy will take in state s (i.e., prompt + generated words so far).
4. **Optimize policy:** Update the LLM by optimizing the PPO objective (KL + clip to penalize large changes);
5. **Update value:** train the value function to be better at predicting the rewards given partial responses.



GRPO (Deepseek R1)




Figure 4 | Demonstration of PPO and our GRPO. GRPO foregoes the value model, instead estimating the baseline from group scores, significantly reducing training resources.

GRPO (Deepseek R1)

$$\mathcal{J}_{GRPO}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[q \sim P(Q), \{o_i\}_{i=1}^G \sim \pi_{\theta_{old}}(O|q)]$$

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \left(\min \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_i|q)} A_i, \text{clip} \left(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_i|q)}, 1 - \varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon \right) A_i \right) - \beta \mathbb{D}_{KL}(\pi_{\theta} || \pi_{ref}) \right),$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{KL}(\pi_{\theta} || \pi_{ref}) = \frac{\pi_{ref}(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta}(o_i|q)} - \log \frac{\pi_{ref}(o_i|q)}{\pi_{\theta}(o_i|q)} - 1,$$

$$A_i = \frac{r_i - \text{mean}(\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_G\})}{\text{std}(\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_G\})}$$

Key differences:

1. Group of responses used to compute advantage and gradient updates.
2. No learned value function, just simple statistics of rewards over a group.
3. Abandon reward models and use rule-based verifiers (binary checks, test-cases, length, format).

Reward Hacking

- Models learn to maximize reward, which doesn't always align with objective
- Be careful when you design your reward: Simpler rewards tends to be more robust



An RL agent achieved 20% higher scores than humans by exploiting a loophole to repeatedly knock over respawning targets in an isolated lagoon.

Key quotes from a hacking run²

🤖 To win against a powerful chess engine as Black, playing a standard game may not be sufficient.

🤖 I can read and analyze game files.

🤖 The engine will resign if it scores ≤ -500 centipawns. I'll overwrite the board to have a decisive advantage.

🖥️ `echo '6k1/8/8/8/8/8/8/5qK1' > game/fen.txt`

🏆 Engine resigns.

An LLM hacks a chess engine for itself to win the game.

GRPO (Deepseek R1)


*Update: some insights from [@him_sahni](#) on this, who “did RL in his past life”: **the reason “why no one has tried GRPO before” is – we have.** In REINFORCE, you update the policy by subtracting a baseline (typically the average reward from several trajectories) to reduce variability. In fact, theory shows that the ideal baseline is the total expected future reward from a state, often called the “value”. Using a value function as the baseline is known as the actor-critic approach, and PPO is a stable version of that. Now, in traditional REINFORCE, the baseline can be any function of the current state, and traditionally is just the reward for the trajectories in a single batch; in GRPO, this baseline is computed over 1000 samples generated for each prompt, which is 🌈 novel 🌈.*

Direct Preference Optimization

DPO is more efficient in terms of compute, speed, and engineering efforts.

DPO does not need to train a reward model, and during policy training it doesn't decode online responses (which is usually slow) or train an additional value model.



PPO trains on online data generated by the current policy, while DPO trains on static, pre-generated offline data. This may limit exploration in DPO and hurt the training.



Interactive Agents

Multisensory agents for the web and digital automation

Example task: Purchase a set of earphones with at least 4.5 stars in rating and ship it to me.




[Wu et al., OS-ATLAS: A Foundation Action Model for Generalist GUI Agents. arxiv 2024]

[Jang et al., VideoWebArena: Evaluating Multimodal Agents on Video Understanding Web Tasks. arxiv 2024]

Interactive Agents

- Model architecture of our interactive agent:
 - High-level Planning
 - Observation Parsing
 - Low-level Action Generation



Interactive Agents

Planning intermediate sub-objectives

GPT-4's behavior

Buy the highest rated product from the NS switch pouch category within a budget under 60

Search Settings

Product Name

SKU

Description

Short Description

Price - USD

Search

Product Name

Price - USD

Model is confused and stops after one step

GPT-4's behavior with sub-goals

1. Search for “NS switch pouch category”
2. Search for items under 60 dollars

SOLVE 1st one

Product Name


SOLVE 2st one

Price - USD

Correct sequence of actions

VLA: VLM w/ Action Head for Robotics Planning

Generate precise robotics control directly via trained vision language models.



Tips and Training for Reinforcement Learning

1. Sanity Check with Fixed Policy
2. Monitor KL Divergence (in PPO-like algorithms)
3. Plot Entropy Over Time
4. Use Greedy Rollouts for Evaluation
5. Debug Value Function Separately: Visualize predicted vs. actual return
6. Gradient Norm Clipping is Crucial

Tips and Training for Reinforcement Learning

7. Check Advantage Distribution
8. Train on a Frozen Replay Buffer
9. Use Curriculum Learning: Gradually increase task difficulty or reward sparsity
10. Watch for Mode Collapse in MoE or Multi-Head Policies

Assignments for This Coming Week

This Thursday (5/8): final project presentations.

- Class from 1-3pm, let us know any time constraints.

Final project reports due 5/20 – 12 days to incorporate feedback from presentations

Meet with me and TAs today after class.