Paper summary: Image augmentation is all you need: regularizing deep reinforcement learning from pixels

May 21, 2022

- 1 Idea in few sentences
- 2 Explanation of the central concept
- 3 Methodology
- 4 Initial rambly notes

4.1 Abstract

The method is dubbed DrQ: Data regularized Q. Can be combined with any model-free RL alg. Works better than CURL.

4.2 Introduction

Direct quote:

Simultaneously training a convolutional encoder alongside a policy network is challenging when given limited environment interaction, strong correlation between samples and a typically sparse reward signal. Naive attempts to use a large capacity encoder result in severe over-fitting, and smaller encoders produce impoverished representations that limit task performance.

The authors identify that you can go with the following:

- 1. pretraining with self-supervised learning (SSL), followed by supervised learning
- 2. supervised learning with an additional auxiliary loss
- 3. supervised learning with data augmentation

The problem is, in sample-efficient RL you're working with $10^4 - 10^5$ transitions from a few hundred trajectories. The authors opt for a data augmentation approach. This is used, of course, generate more samples without sampling trajectories, but also to regularize the Q-function — and nothing more. Hence, no additional losses are needed.

4.3 Method

The idea is to use optimality invariant state transformations. This is defined as a mapping $f: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T} \to \mathcal{S}$ that preserves the Q-values:

$$Q(s, a) = Q(f(s, \nu), a), \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \nu \in \mathcal{T}$$
(1)

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are the parameters of $f(\cdot)$ drawn from the set of all possible parameters \mathcal{T} , ex. random image translations. This enables variance reduction in Q-value estimates. This works as follows. For an arbitrary distribution of states $\mu(\cdot)$ and policy π , instead of using a single sample $\boldsymbol{s}^* \sim \mu(\cdot), \boldsymbol{a}^* \sim \pi(\cdot|\boldsymbol{s}^*)$, with the expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{s} \sim \mu(\cdot), \boldsymbol{a} \sim \pi(\cdot|\boldsymbol{s})} \left[Q(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{a}) \right] \approx Q(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{a}^*) \tag{2}$$

we can generate K samples via random transformations and use the following estimate with lower variance:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{s} \sim \mu(\cdot), \boldsymbol{a} \sim \pi(\cdot|\boldsymbol{s})} \left[Q(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{a}) \right] \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} Q(f(\boldsymbol{s}^*, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k), \boldsymbol{a}_k)$$
(3)

where $\nu_k \in \mathcal{T}$ and $a_k \sim \pi(\cdot|f(s^*,\nu_k),a_k)$. This suggest two distinct ways to regularize the Q-function. First, use data augmentation to compute target values for every transition tuple (s_i, a_i, r_i, s_i') as

$$y_i = r_i + \gamma \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{\theta}(f(\mathbf{s}'_i, \mathbf{\nu}'_{i,k}), \mathbf{a}'_{i,k})$$

$$\tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{a}'_{i,k} \sim \pi(\cdot | f(\mathbf{s}'_i, \mathbf{\nu}'_{i,k}))$ and where $\mathbf{\nu}'_{i,k} \in \mathcal{T}$ corresponds to a transformation parameter of \mathbf{s}'_i . Then the Q-function is updated using these targets through an SGD update with learning rate λ_{θ} :

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \lambda_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Q_{\theta}(f(\boldsymbol{s}_{i}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}), \boldsymbol{a}_{i}) - y_{i})^{2}$$
 (5)

4 can also be used for different augmentations of s_i , resulting in the second regularization approach:

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta - \lambda_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i=1}^{N,M} (Q_{\theta}(f(\boldsymbol{s}_{i}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i,m}), \boldsymbol{a}_{i}) - y_{i})^{2}$$
 (6)

where $\nu_{i,m}$ and $\nu'_{i,k}$ are drawn independently.

4.4 DrQ

If [K=1,M=1] is exactly RAD up to choice of hyper-parameters and data augmentation functions. DrQ uses [K=2,M=2].