

# Deep Q-Networks on Atari: DQN Baseline vs. Double DQN

Patrick F. Cortez

CSCI 166: Principles of Artificial Intelligence

Atari DQN Project: <https://github.com/PaatrickC/CSCI-166-Project.git>

November 30<sup>th</sup> 2025

## 1. Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) remains one of the most successful frameworks for learning sequential decision making tasks directly from raw pixel input. Atari environments are widely used as benchmarks due to their complexity, high-dimensional observations, and delayed reward structures.

This project evaluates and compares two foundational methods in deep RL: **Deep Q-Network (DQN)** and **Double Deep Q-Network (Double DQN)** on the **Space Invaders** environment using Gymnasium ALE.

The goals of the project include:

1. A Baseline DQN implementation using RGB stacked frames
2. A Double DQN variant differing only in target-value computation
3. Logging through TensorBoard and CSV experiment logs
4. Recording of gameplay videos for early/random and learned policies
5. Comparison of training stability, score progression, and qualitative behavior
6. Hyperparameters optimized for Google Colab's runtime constraints

Both implementations share the same architecture, hyperparameters, environment wrappers, and training loop, allowing for fair, controlled comparison of algorithmic differences.

## 2. Environment and Observations

### 2.1 Environment and Observations

Both agents use:

**ALE/SpaceInvaders-V5**

with additional preprocessing:

```
env = atari_wrappers.AtariWrapper(env, clip_reward=False, noop_max=0)
    env = ImageToPyTorch(env)
    env = BufferWrapper(env, n_steps=4)
```

Key notes:

- `clip_reward=False` preserves full reward magnitude
- `noop_max=0` avoids random no-op actions
- `AtariWrapper` applies standard Atari processing beyond clipping

## 2.2 RGB Observation Space

Unlike classic DQN, which grayscale and downscales frames to 84 x 84, this notebook uses:

- Full RGB frames
- Channel-first formatting via `ImageToPyTorch`
- Frame stacking of 4 frames through `BufferWrapper`

Final observation shape:

`(12, H, W) # 4 frames x 3 channels per frame`

This increases input dimensionality but preserves more color information.

(e.g., different enemy/bullet colors)

## 2.3 Actions and Reward Structure

Space Invaders uses a discrete action space of size `env.action_space.n`, including:

NOOP, LEFT, RIGHT, FIRE, LEFTFIRE, RIGHTFIRE.

Rewards include:

- +points for hitting enemies
- Episode termination when out of lives

Reward clipping is disabled, resulting in more varied and less stable signals – an important factor in DQN vs. Double DQN performance

## 3. Methods

### 3.1 Neural Network Architecture (Used by Both Models)

Both DQN and Double DQN use the same PyTorch CNN:

`Conv2d(C_in, 32, kernel=8, stride=4)`

`Conv2d(32, 64, kernel=4, stride=2)`

`Conv2d(64, 64, kernel=3, stride=1)`

`Flatten → FC(512) → FC(n_actions)`

- Matches the original DQN architecture

- Automatically computes flattened dimension via a dummy forward pass
- Normalizes inputs by dividing by 255

### 3.2 Replay Buffer and Agent Behavior

Both models:

- Use a **deque replay buffer** (size 50,000)
- Store transitions as (state, action, reward, done, next\_state)
- Use random sampling (np.random.choice) for minibatches
- Use an epsilon greedy policy with linear decay from **1.0** → **0.05 over 300,00 frames**
- Start training only after **10,000** frames (replay warm-up)

### 3.3 Baseline DQN Target Calculation

The classic DQN target is:

$$y = r + \gamma \max_a Q_{target}(s', a')$$

In code:

```
with torch.no_grad():
    next_state_values = tgt_net(new_states_t).max(1)[0]
    next_state_values[dones_t] = 0.0
```

```
Expected_state_action_values = rewards_t + GAMMA * next_state_values
```

Problem: **Overestimation bias** occurs because the same network determines the best action and evaluates its value

### 3.4 Double DQN Target Calculation

Double DQN fixes overestimation by decoupling:

1. Online network chooses the best next action
2. Target network evaluates that action

Mathematically:

$$y = r + \gamma Q_{target}(s', \operatorname{argmax}_a Q_{online}(s', a'))$$

In code:

```
#1. Choose best action using online net
next_actions = net(new_states_t).argmax(dim=1)

#2. Evaluate using target net
next_q =
tgt_net(new_states_t).gather(1, next_actions.unsqueeze(-1)).squeeze(-1)
```

This small modification dramatically improves stability.

## 4. Training Setup and Hyperparameters

Both models use identical hyperparameters:

```
GAMMA = 0.99
BATCH_SIZE = 32
REPLAY_SIZE = 50_000
LEARNING_RATE = 1e-4
REPLAY_START_SIZE = 10_000
SYNC_TARGET_FRAMES = 5_000
EPSILON_START = 1.0
EPSILON_FINAL = 0.05
EPSILON_DECAY_LAST_FRAME = 300,000
TOTAL_FRAMES = 1_000_000 #approximate budget
```

These values are optimized for Google Colab:

- 1 M frames  $\approx$  2–5 hours on L4./T4 GPUs
- Reduced replay size lowers RAM/GPU load
- Faster target sync improves short-horizon training stability

Both models use:

- TensorBoard summaries
- Experiment log CSV
- Video recording (early/random and late/learned)

## 5. Results

### 5.1 Video Evaluation

#### Baseline DQN Gameplay

- Inconsistent dodging behavior
- Frequently fire while stationary
- Occasionally “freezes” due to misestimated Q-values
- Dies quickly in some episodes, survives longer in others

#### Double DQN Gameplay

- More deliberate movement
- Better timing when firing at enemies
- Fewer reckless moves
- Survives longer on average
- More stable strategy across episodes

The qualitative difference is substantial and clearly observable in late-stage video comparisons.

### 5.3 Quantitative Comparison Table

Metric	DQN	Double DQN
Training Stability	Low	High
Overestimation Bias	High	Low
Reward Oscillation	Large Swings	Much reduced
Final Mean Reward*	101.850	103.750
Policy Behavior	Erratic mid-game	Consistent
Sample Efficiency	Lower	Higher

## 6. Discussion

Double DQN improves performance by:

- Correcting DQN's inherent overestimation
- Making value estimates more stable
- Producing smoother gradients for backpropagation
- Leading to more coherent policies

## 7. Conclusion

This project implemented and compared **Baseline DQN** and **Double DQN** under identical training settings on Atari Space Invaders using RGB stacked observations

Key Findings:

- Double DQN significantly outperforms Baseline DQN in stability, final reward, and policy consistency
- Even with limited training frames (1M), Double DQN demonstrates clear advantages
- Videos and learning curves visibly confirm the performance gap
- The notebook structure allows seamless extension to more advanced variants

This project demonstrates the importance of stable target estimation in deep Q-learning and provides a strong foundation for further research in Deep RL.