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Imitation Learning II
So far in the course

Reinforcement Learning: Learning policies guided by sparse rewards, e.g., win the game.

- **Good**: simple, cheap form of supervision
- **Bad**: High sample complexity

Where is it successful so far?

- In simulation, where we can afford a lot of trials, easy to parallelize
- Not in robotic systems:
  - action execution takes long
  - we cannot afford to fail
  - safety concerns

Learning from Demonstration for Autonomous Navigation in Complex Unstructured Terrain, Silver et al. 2010
Reward shaping

Ideally we want *dense in time* rewards to closely guide the agent closely along the way.

Who will supply those shaped rewards?

1. **We will manually design them:** "cost function design by hand remains one of the 'black arts' of mobile robotics, and has been applied to untold numbers of robotic systems"

2. **We will learn them from demonstrations:** "rather than having a human expert tune a system to achieve desired behavior, the expert can demonstrate desired behavior and the robot can tune itself to match the demonstration"
Reward shaping

Ideally we want **dense in time** rewards to closely guide the agent closely along the way.

Who will supply those shaped rewards?

1. We will manually design them: "*cost function design by hand remains one of the 'black arts' of mobile robotics, and has been applied to untold numbers of robotic systems*"

2. We will learn them from demonstrations: "*rather than having a human expert tune a system to achieve desired behavior, the expert can demonstrate desired behavior and the robot can tune itself to match the demonstration*"

---

Learning from Demonstration for Autonomous Navigation in Complex Unstructured Terrain, Silver et al. 2010
Imitation Learning

For taking this structure into account, numerous formulations have been developed:

- **Direct**: Supervised learning for **policy** (mapping states to actions) using the demonstration trajectories as ground-truth (a.k.a. behavior cloning)

- **Indirect**: Learning the latent **rewards/goals** of the teacher and planning under those rewards to get the policy, a.k.a. Inverse Reinforcement Learning (later in class)

Experts can be:

- Humans

- Optimal or near Optimal Planners/Controllers
Last lecture

- Behavior Cloning: Imitation learning as supervised learning
- Compounding errors
- Demonstration augmentation techniques
- DAGGER
- Structured prediction as Decision Making (learning to search)
- Imitating MCTS

This lecture:

- Inverse reinforcement learning
- Max margin planning
- Maximum entropy IRL
- Adversarial Imitation learning
- Value Iteration Networks
Inverse Reinforcement Learning

Given \( \pi \), let’s recover \( R \)!
Problem Setup

- **Given:**
  - State space, action space
  - No reward function

- Dynamics (sometimes) \( T_{s,a}[s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t] \)

- Teacher’s demonstration:
  \[ s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, s_2, a_2, \ldots \]
  \( (= \text{trace of the teacher’s policy } \pi^*) \)

- **Inverse RL**
  - Can we recover R?

- **Apprenticeship learning via inverse RL**
  - Can we then use this R to find a good policy?

- **Behavioral cloning (last lecture)**
  - Can we directly learn the teacher’s policy using supervised learning?
Assumptions (for now)

- Known Dynamics (transition model) $T$
- Reward is a linear function over fixed state features $\phi$
Inverse RL with linear costs/rewards

\[ \pi^*: x \rightarrow a \]

Expert

Interacts

Demonstration

\[ y^* = (x_1, a_1) \rightarrow (x_2, a_2) \rightarrow (x_3, a_3) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow (x_n, a_n) \]

\[ w^T f (y^*) = w^T \]

Expert trajectory cost
Principle: Expert is optimal

• Find a reward function $R^*$ which explains the expert behavior

• Find $R^*$ such that

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi^* \right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi \right] \quad \forall \pi
$$
Feature Based Reward Function

(We assume reward is linear over features)

Let \( R(s) = w^T \phi(s) \) where \( w \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and \( \phi : S \to \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t) \middle| \pi \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t w^T \phi(s_t) \middle| \pi \right]
\]

\[
= w^T \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \phi(s_t) \middle| \pi \right]
\]

\[
= w^T \mu(\pi)
\]
Feature Based Reward Function

(We assume reward is linear over features)

Let $R(s) = w^T \phi(s)$ where $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\phi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t) | \pi\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t w^T \phi(s_t) | \pi\right]
$$

$$
= w^T \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \phi(s_t) | \pi\right]
$$

expected discounted sum of feature values or feature expectations—dependent on state visitation distributions

Sub/t/ing into

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi^*\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi\right] \quad \forall \pi
$$

gives us:

Find $w^*$ such that $w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) \quad \forall \pi$
Challenges: Reward function is ambiguous

(We assume reward is linear over features)

Let \( R(s) = w^T \phi(s) \) where \( w \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and \( \phi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t) | \pi \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t w^T \phi(s_t) | \pi \right] \\
= w^T \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t \phi(s_t) | \pi \right] \\
= w^T \mu(\pi)
\]

expected discounted sum of feature values or feature expectations—dependent on state visitation distributions

Sub/tling into

\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi^* \right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R^*(s_t) | \pi \right] \quad \forall \pi
\]

gives us:

Find \( w^* \) such that \( w^{*T} \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^{*T} \mu(\pi) \quad \forall \pi \)
Max-margin Classifiers

"Minimize $\|\vec{w}\|$ subject to $y_i (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i - b) \geq 1$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$"
Max-margin Classifiers

• We are given a training dataset of $n$ points of the form

$$(\vec{x}_1, y_1), \ldots, (\vec{x}_n, y_n)$$

• Where the $y_i$ are either 1 or -1, each indicating the class to which the point $\vec{x}_i$ belongs. Each $\vec{x}_i$ is a $p$-dimensional real vector.

• We want to find the “maximum-margin hyperplane” that divides the group of points $\vec{x}_i$, for which $y_i = 1$ from the group of points for which $y_i = -1$, which is defined so that the distance between the hyperplane and the nearest point $\vec{x}_i$ from either group is maximized.

• Any hyperplane can be written as the set of points $\vec{x}$ satisfying

$$\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x} - b = 0$$

where $\vec{w}$ is the normal vector the the hyperplane
• Standard max margin:

\[
\min_w \|w\|_2^2 \\
\text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) + 1 \quad \forall \pi
\]
Max Margin Planning

- Standard max margin:
  \[
  \min_w ||w||_2^2 \\
  \text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) + 1 \quad \forall \pi
  \]

- “Structured prediction” max margin:
  \[
  \min_w ||w||_2^2 \\
  \text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) + m(\pi^*, \pi) \quad \forall \pi
  \]

- Justification: margin should be larger for policies that are very different from \( \pi^* \)

- Example: \( m(\pi^*, \pi) = \) number of states in which \( \pi^* \) and \( \pi \) disagree

Maximum Margin Planning, Ratliff et al. 2006
Expert Suboptimality

- Structured prediction max margin with slack variables:

\[
\min_{w, \xi} \|w\|_2^2 + C\xi \\
\text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) + m(\pi^*, \pi) - \xi \quad \forall \pi
\]

- Can be generalized to multiple MDPs (could also be same MDP with different initial state)

\[
\min_{w, \xi(i)} \|w\|_2^2 + C \sum_i \xi(i) \\
\text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)*}) \geq w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)}) - \xi^{(i)} \quad \forall i, \pi^{(i)}
\]
Complete Max-margin Formulation

\[
\min_w \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_i \xi^{(i)}
\]

s.t. \[ w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)*}) \geq w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)}) - \xi^{(i)} \quad \forall i, \pi^{(i)} \]

• **Challenge**: very large number of constraints. **Solutions**:
  
  • iterative constraint generation
Constraint Generation

- Iterate $\Pi^{(i)} = \emptyset$ for all $i$ and then iterate

- Solve $\min_w \|w\|_2^2 + C \sum_i \xi^{(i)}$

  $$\text{s.t. } w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)*}) \geq w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)}) - \xi^{(i)} \quad \forall i, \pi^{(i)} \in \Pi^{(i)}$$

- For current $w$, find most violated constraint for all $i$ by solving:

  $$\max_{\pi^{(i)}} w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)})$$

Maximum Margin Planning, Ratliff et al. 2006
Constraint Generation

- Iterate $\Pi^{(i)} = \{\}$ for all $i$ and then iterate

- Solve $\min_w ||w||^2 + C \sum_i \xi^{(i)}$

  s.t. $w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)*}) \geq w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)}) - \xi^{(i)} \quad \forall i, \pi^{(i)} \in \Pi^{(i)}$

- For current $w$, find most violated constraint for all $i$ by solving:

  $\max_{\pi^{(i)}} w^T \mu(\pi^{(i)}) + m(\pi^{(i)*}, \pi^{(i)})$

  for all $i$ add $\pi^{(i)}$ to $\Pi^{(i)}$

- If no constraint violations were found, we are done

Assumes an RL algorithm that can find the optimal policy for a given reward function! Nested RL problem. However, as we assumed known dynamics, it is more like a nested planning problem.

Maximum Margin Planning, Ratliff et al. 2006
Max Margin Planning

trained to follow roads

trained to hide in the trees

Maximum Margin Planning, Ratliff et al. 2006
Learning to step (mimicking footsteps)

Where should we place the foot next?
Learned Cost Function Examples
Learned Cost Function Examples
Learned Cost Function Examples
Feature Matching

• Inverse RL starting point: find a reward function such that the expert outperforms other policies

Let $R(s) = w^T \phi(s)$, where $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\phi : S \to \mathbb{R}^n$

Find $w^*$ such that $w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) \quad \forall \pi$

Abbeel and Ng 2004
Feature Matching

• **Inverse RL starting point:** find a reward function such that the expert outperforms other policies

\[
R(s) = w^T \phi(s), \text{ where } w \in \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ and } \phi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n
\]

Find \( w^* \) such that \( w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) \quad \forall \pi \)

• **Observation in Abbeel and Ng, 2004:** for a policy \( \pi \) to be guaranteed to perform as well as the expert policy \( \mu^* \), it suffices that the feature expectations match:

\[
\| \mu(\pi) - \mu(\pi^*) \|_1 \leq \epsilon
\]

Implies that for all \( w \) with \( \| w \|_\infty \leq 1 \):

\[
| w^T \mu(\pi) - w^T \mu(\pi^*) | \leq \epsilon
\]

Abbeel and Ng 2004
Apprenticeship Learning [Abbeel & Ng, 2004]

- Assume $R_w(s) = w^T \phi(s)$ for a feature map $\phi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

- Initialize: pick some policy $\pi_0$

- Iterate for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$
  
  - **“Guess” the reward function:**
    Find a reward function such that the teacher maximally outperforms all previously found policies

  $$
  \max_{\gamma, w : \|w\|_2 \leq 1} \gamma
  $$

  s.t. $w^T \mu(\pi^*) \geq w^T \mu(\pi) + \gamma \quad \forall \pi \in \{\pi_0, \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{i-1}\}$

  - **Find optimal control policy** $\pi$ for the current guess of the reward function $R_w$

  - $\gamma \leq \varepsilon / 2$ exit the algorithm
Maximum Entropy Inverse Optimal Control

Roads have unknown costs linear in features
Roads have unknown costs linear in features

**Paths** have unknown costs, sum of road costs
Maximum Entropy Inverse Optimal Control

Roads have unknown costs linear in features

**Paths** have unknown costs, sum of road costs

Let's marry probabilistic reasoning with optimal control and reward functions:

- the costs induce a distribution over paths! $P(\tau)$
- path probability based on unknown cost
Feature matching using path probabilities

Features \( f \) can be:

# Bridges crossed

# Miles of interstate

# Stoplights

Feature matching:

\[
\sum_{\text{Path } \tau_i} P(\tau_i) f_{\tau_i} = \tilde{f}
\]
Which path distribution to pick?

Features $f$ can be:

- # Bridges crossed
- # Miles of interstate
- # Stoplights

Feature matching:

$$\sum_{\text{Path } \tau_i} P(\tau_i) f_{\tau_i} = \tilde{f}$$

“If a driver uses 136.3 miles of interstate and crosses 12 bridges in a month’s worth of trips, the model should also use 136.3 miles of interstate and 12 bridges in expectation for those same start-destination pairs.”
Which path distribution to pick?

Features $f$ can be:

- # Bridges crossed
- # Miles of interstate
- # Stoplights

Feature matching:

$$\sum_{\text{Path } \tau_i} P(\tau_i) f_{\tau_i} = \tilde{f}$$

"Many distributions over paths can match feature counts, and some will be very different from observed behavior. In our simple example, the model could produce plans that avoid the interstate and bridges for all routes except one, which drives in circles on the interstate for 136 miles and crosses 12 bridges."
Which path distribution to pick?

Features $f$ can be:

- # Bridges crossed

- # Miles of interstate

- # Stoplights

Feature matching:

$$\sum_{\text{Path} \tau_i} P(\tau_i) f_{\tau_i} = \tilde{f}$$

The one that satisfies feature count constraints without over-committing!
Maximum Entropy Inverse Optimal Control

- Maximizing the entropy over paths: As Uniform As possible
  \[
  \max_P - \sum_{\tau} P(\tau) \log P(\tau)
  \]

- While matching feature counts (and being a probability distribution):
  \[
  \sum_{\tau} P(\tau) f_\tau = f_{\text{dem}}
  \]
  \[
  \sum_{\tau} P(\tau) = 1
  \]
Maximum Entropy Principle

- Maximizing the entropy of the distribution over paths subject to the feature constraints from observed data implies that we maximize the likelihood of the observed data under the maximum entropy (exponential family) distribution (Jaynes 1957)

\[
P(\tau_i | \theta) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} e^{\theta^T f_{\tau_i}} = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} e^{\sum_{s_j \in \tau_i} \theta^T f_{s_j}}
\]

\[
Z(\theta, s) = \sum_{\tau_S} e^{\theta^T f_{\tau_S}}
\]

Strong Preference for Low Cost Paths
Equal Cost Paths Equally Probable
MaxEntIOC: Learning $\theta$

- Maximizing the entropy of the distribution over paths subject to the feature constraints from observed data implies that we maximize the likelihood of the observed data under the maximum entropy (exponential family) distribution (Jaynes 1957)

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} L(\theta) = \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{\text{examples}} \log P(\tilde{\tau}|\theta)$$
MaxEntIOC: Learning $\theta$

- Maximizing the entropy of the distribution over paths subject to the feature constraints from observed data implies that we maximize the likelihood of the observed data under the maximum entropy (exponential family) distribution (Jaynes 1957)

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} L(\theta) = \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{\text{Examples}} \log P(\tilde{\tau}|\theta)$$

- The gradient is the difference between expected empirical feature counts and the learner’s expected feature counts, which can be expressed in terms of expected state visitation frequencies,

$$\nabla L(\theta) = \tilde{f} - \sum_{\tau} P(\tau|\theta)f_\tau = \tilde{f} - \sum_{s_i} D_{s_i}f_{s_i}$$

state visitation frequencies!
Learning from Demonstration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrated Behavior</th>
<th>Model Behavior (Expectation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges crossed: 3</td>
<td>Bridges crossed: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of interstate: 20.7</td>
<td>Miles of interstate: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoplights: 10</td>
<td>Stoplights: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Weight: 5.0</td>
<td>Cost Weight: ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Weight: 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning from Demonstration

**Demonstrated Behavior**

- Bridges crossed: 3
- Miles of interstate: 20.7
- Stoplights: 10

**Model Behavior (Expectation)**

- Bridges crossed: 4.7
- Miles of interstate: 16.2
- Stoplights: 7.4
- Cost Weight: 5.0
- Cost Weight: 3.0

Cost Weight Change:
- +1.7
- -2.6
Limitations of MaxEntLOC

• Cost was assumed linear over features $f$

• Dynamics $T$ were assumed known

Next:

• **General function approximations** for cost $c_{\theta}$: Finn et al. 2016

MaxEnt IOC general cost function

\[
\max_\theta \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}} \log p_{c_\theta}(\tau)
\]

\[
p(\tau) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-C_\theta(\tau))
\]

\[
Z = \int \exp(-C_\theta(\tau)) d\tau
\]

Cost of a trajectory is decomposed over costs of individual states

\[
C_\theta(\tau) = \sum_t c_\theta(x_t, u_t)
\]
MaxEnt IOC general cost function

\[
\max_{\theta} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}} \log p_{c_\theta}(\tau)
\]

\[
p(\tau) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-C_\theta(\tau))
\]

Cost of a trajectory is decomposed over costs of individual states

\[
C_\theta(\tau) = \sum_t c_\theta(x_t, u_t)
\]

Before:

\[
c_\theta(u_t, u_t) = \theta^T f(u_t, x_t)
\]
MaxEnt IOC general cost function

$$\max_{\theta} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}} \log p_{c\theta}(\tau)$$

$$p(\tau) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-C_\theta(\tau))$$

Cost of a trajectory is decomposed over costs of individual states

$$C_\theta(\tau) = \sum_t c_\theta(x_t, u_t)$$

In the form of a loss function

$$\mathcal{L}_{IOC}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in \mathcal{D}_{demo}} c_\theta(\tau_i) + \log Z$$

Before:

$$c_\theta(u_t, u_t) = \theta^T f(u_t, x_t)$$
Approximating $Z$ with Importance Sampling

\[
\mu = \int_D f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_D \frac{f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} \, q(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{E}_q \left( \frac{f(\mathbf{X})p(\mathbf{X})}{q(\mathbf{X})} \right)
\]

\[
\log Z \approx \log \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\tau_j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{samp}}} \exp(-c_\theta(\tau_j)) \frac{1}{q(\tau_j)}
\]
MaxEntIOC with Importance Sampling

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{IOC}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{demo}}} c_\theta(\tau_i) + \log Z \]
MaxEntIOC with Importance Sampling

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{IOC}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{demo}}} c_{\theta}(\tau_i) + \log Z \]

\[ \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{demo}}} c_{\theta}(\tau_i) + \log \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\tau_j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{samp}}} \frac{\exp(-c_{\theta}(\tau_j))}{q(\tau_j)} \]
MaxEntIOC with Importance Sampling

\[ L_{\text{IOC}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in D_{\text{demo}}} c_\theta(\tau_i) + \log Z \]

\[ \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in D_{\text{demo}}} c_\theta(\tau_i) + \log \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\tau_j \in D_{\text{samp}}} \exp\left(-c_\theta(\tau_j)\right) \frac{1}{q(\tau_j)} \]

\[ w_j = \frac{\exp(-c_\theta(\tau_j))}{q(\tau_j)} \]

\[ \frac{dL_{\text{IOC}}}{d\theta} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau_i \in D_{\text{demo}}} \frac{dc_\theta}{d\theta}(\tau_i) - \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\tau_j \in D_{\text{samp}}} w_j \frac{dc_\theta}{d\theta}(\tau_j) \]
What should be the background sampling distribution \( q \)?

- **Uniform**: Boularias et al. 2011
- **In the vicinity of demonstrations**: Kalakrishnan et al. 2013
- **Refine it over time!**: Finn et al. 2016
MaxEntIOC with Adaptive Importance Sampling

1: Initialize $q_k(\tau)$ as either a random initial controller or from demonstrations
2: \textbf{for} iteration $i = 1$ to $I$ \textbf{do}
3: \hspace{1em} Generate samples $D_{\text{traj}}$ from $q_k(\tau)$
4: \hspace{1em} Append samples: $D_{\text{samp}} \leftarrow D_{\text{samp}} \cup D_{\text{traj}}$
5: \hspace{1em} \underline{Use $D_{\text{samp}}$ to update cost $c_\theta$ using gradient descent}
6: \hspace{1em} Update $q_k(\tau)$ using $D_{\text{traj}}$ and the method from (Levine \& Abbeel, 2014) to obtain $q_{k+1}(\tau)$
7: \textbf{end for}
8: \textbf{return} optimized cost parameters $\theta$ and trajectory distribution $q(\tau)$

This can be any RL, planning algorithm that given rewards computes a policy (the forward RL problem), e.g. Ho and Ermon 2016 used TRPO

Given expert demonstrations and policy sampled trajectories improve rewards/costs (Inverse RL)
MaxEntIOC with Adaptive Importance Sampling

- Initial distribution $q_0$
- Generate policy samples from $q$
- Update cost using samples & demos
- Update $q$ w.r.t. cost
- Policy $q$
- Cost $c$

Diagram from Chelsea Finn
MaxEntIOC with Adaptive Importance Sampling Sampling

- Initial distribution $q_0$
- Generate policy samples from $q$
- Update cost using samples & demos
- Update $q$ w.r.t. cost (partially optimize)
- Discriminator
- Human demonstrations
- Generator
- Policy $q$
- Cost $c$

Diagram from Chelsea Finn
Generative Adversarial Networks

\[ z \sim \text{uniform}([0, 1]) \]

Goodfellow et. al.
MaxEntLOC with Adaptive Importance Sampling

initial distribution $q_0$

generate policy samples from $q$

generator

update $q$ w.r.t. cost (partially optimize)

policy $q$

discriminator

Update cost using samples & demos

cost $c$

Diagram from Chelsea Finn
Case Study: Generative Adversarial Imitation Learning

- demonstrations from TRPO-optimized policy
- use TRPO as a policy optimizer
- OpenAI gym tasks
• Why we need to have this separate optimization over cost, and then separately planning/RL over this cost to find the policy? Because the dynamics where unknown..

• Let’s assume they are known.

• Can we imitate the expert and backdrop through all the way till the rewards simply by imitating expert behavior (e.g., through supervised learning), in an end-to-end fashion?
Value Iteration Sub-Network

Each iteration of VI may be seen as passing the previous value function $V_n$ and reward function $R$ through a convolution layer and max-pooling layer.

$$Q_n(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a)V_n(s')$$
$$V_{n+1}(s) = \max_a Q_n(s, a)$$

Value Iteration Networks, Tamar et al. 2016
Each iteration of VI may be seen as passing the previous value function $V_n$ and reward function $R$ through a convolution layer and max-pooling layer.

$$Q_n(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} P(s' | s, a) V_n(s')$$

$$V_{n+1}(s) = \max_a Q_n(s, a)$$

By recurrently applying a convolution layer $K$ times, $K$ iterations of VI are effectively performed.
Value Iteration Network

• Notice that the optimal action at each state depends only on the value function of its immediate neighbors—locality—attention

\[
\pi^*(\bar{s}) = \arg\max_a \bar{R}(\bar{s}, a) + \gamma \sum_{\bar{s}'} \bar{P}(\bar{s}'|\bar{s}, a)\bar{V}^*(\bar{s}').
\]

• To estimate the optimal action in each state, I only need to use the value functions in the vicinity of the state, then train and CNN with a standard architecture
## Value Iteration Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>VIN</th>
<th>CNN</th>
<th>FCN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 × 8</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td><strong>99.6%</strong></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 × 16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td><strong>99.3%</strong></td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 × 28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td><strong>97%</strong></td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Value Iteration Networks, Tamar et al. 2016