

# Ensemble-based Offline Reinforcement Learning with Adaptive Behavior Cloning

Danyang Wang<sup>1</sup>; Lingsong Zhang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, Purdue University

Algorithm 1 Ensemble-based Actor Critic with Adaptive Behavior Cloning (EABC)

**Input:** offline dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , number of Q-ensembles K, confidence level  $p \in [0, 1]$ . Initialize critic network ensemble  $Q_{\theta_i}$  for i = 1, ..., K, and actor network  $\pi_{\phi}$ , with random parameters  $\theta_i$ 's,  $\phi$ . Initialize target networks  $\tilde{\theta}_i \leftarrow \theta_i$ ;  $\tilde{\phi} \leftarrow \phi$ . **for** i = 1 **to** T **do** Sample batch of N transitions  $\{(s, a, r, s', d)\}$  from  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $\tilde{a}' \leftarrow \pi_{\tilde{\phi}}(s') + \epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon \sim clip(\mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{\sigma}), -c, c)$ . Compute pess $(Q_{\tilde{\theta}}(s', \tilde{a}'))$ .  $y = r + \gamma(1 - d) \text{pess}(Q_{\tilde{\theta}}(s', \tilde{a}'))$ . Update critics:  $\theta_i \leftarrow \underset{\theta_i}{\operatorname{argmin}} N^{-1} \sum (Q_{\theta_i}(s, a) - y)^2$ . **if** t % *policy update frequency* == 0 **then**  $\tilde{a} \leftarrow \pi_{\phi}(s)$ . Compute pess $(Q_{\theta}(s, \tilde{a}))$ .  $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{N^{-1} \sum |\operatorname{pess}(Q_{\theta}(s, \tilde{a}))|}$ .

## Introduction

- Offline reinforcement learning (RL) algorithm TD3+BC [1] achieved state-of-the-art performance when it was proposed.
  However, it performs poorly on offline datasets with inferior behavior policy.
- We propose an offline RL algorithm, *Ensemble-based actorcritic with Adaptive Behavior Cloning* (EABC), built on TD3+BC, aiming to improve performance on datasets collected with inferior behavior policy.
- We use a *pessimistic ensemble of Q-value estimates* to reduce variance, and leverage a *weight function* with user-

Sample  $w(s, a) \sim Bernoulli(p)$ . Update actor:  $\phi \leftarrow \underset{\phi}{\operatorname{argmin}} N^{-1} \sum_{\phi} \left[ -\lambda \operatorname{pess}(Q_{\theta}(s, \tilde{a})) + w(s, a)(\pi_{\phi}(s) - a)^2 \right]$ . Update target networks:  $\tilde{\theta}_i \leftarrow \tau \theta_i + (1 - \tau) \tilde{\theta}_i$ ;  $\tilde{\phi} \leftarrow \tau \phi + (1 - \tau) \tilde{\phi}$ . end if end for

### Adjust the extent of behavior cloning

based on the quality of behavior policy Given a user specified confidence level  $p \in [0, 1]$ , we adjust the extent of BC through a Bernoulli random variable.  $w(s, a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - p. \end{cases}$ 

- Essentially a hyperparameter fine-tuning issue, a common challenge in almost all algorithms.
- A set of five numbers {0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0}, covering representative scenarios of p.

#### Boosting the performance with a pessimistic halfe hopp Q value ensemble walk

specified confidence level *p* to adjust the extent of behavior cloning, accounting for the quality of the underlying offline dataset.

• See Algorithm 1 to the left. The code is at the website: https://github.com/Penguin0007/EABC.

### **D4RL Benchmark Experiments**

-	Task Name	BC	TD3	TD3+BC	CQL	IQL	wPC	EABC (ours)
t 	halfcheetah-r hopper-r walker2d-r	$2.2 \pm 0.0$ $3.7 \pm 0.6$ $1.3 \pm 0.1$	32.0±2.2 26.8±5.1 -0.1±0.2	$11.0{\pm}1.1$ $8.5{\pm}0.6$ $1.6{\pm}1.7$	$17.5 \pm 1.5$ $7.9 \pm 0.4$ $5.1 \pm 1.3$	$13.1 \pm 1.3$ $7.9 \pm 0.2$ $5.4 \pm 1.2$	$19.7{\pm}0.8$ $20.9{\pm}9.4$ $1.3{\pm}2.3$	<b>32.4</b> ±0.7 <b>31.5</b> ±0.4 1.7±1.7
	halfcheetah-m hopper-m walker2d-m	$43.2{\pm}0.6$ $54.1{\pm}3.8$ $70.9{\pm}11.0$	$33.8 \pm 11.8 \\ 0.7 \pm 0.0 \\ 0.6 \pm 1.0$	$48.3 \pm 0.3$ $59.3 \pm 4.2$ $83.7 \pm 2.1$	$47.0{\pm}0.5$ $53.0{\pm}28.5$ $73.3{\pm}17.7$	$47.4{\pm}0.2$ $66.2{\pm}5.7$ $78.3{\pm}8.7$	53.2±0.3 79.4±2.0 71.0±31.6	67.3±0.9 92.4±3.9 89.0±0.6
	halfcheetah-m-r hopper-m-r walker2d-m-r	$37.6 \pm 2.1$ $16.6 \pm 4.8$ $20.3 \pm 9.8$	$42.3 \pm 7.8$ $44.4 \pm 23.8$ $31.0 \pm 14.2$	$44.6{\pm}0.5$ $60.9{\pm}18.8$ $81.8{\pm}5.5$	45.5±0.7 88.7±12.9 81.8±2.7	$44.2 \pm 1.2$ $94.7 \pm 8.6$ $73.8 \pm 7.1$	$48.1{\pm}0.4$ $94.5{\pm}3.8$ $84.0{\pm}11.0$	61.4±1.6 102.6±1.4 93.2±2.9
	halfcheetah-m-e hopper-m-e walker2d-m-e	$44.0 \pm 1.6$ $53.9 \pm 4.7$ $90.1 \pm 13.2$	$6.2{\pm}7.1$ $0.7{\pm}0.1$ $0.7{\pm}1.1$	90.7±4.3 98.0±9.4 110.1±0.5	75.6±25.7 <b>105.6</b> ±12.9 107.9±1.6	86.7±5.3 91.5±14.3 109.6±1.0	63.7±10.8 64.7±29.1 91.4±39.1	92.9±1.9 104.0±3.6 112.0±0.3
	halfcheetah-e hopper-e walker2d-e	91.8±1.5 107.7±0.7 106.7±0.2	-2.7±0.3 1.3±0.5 1.8±0.3	$96.7 \pm 1.1$ 107.8 $\pm 7$ 110.2 $\pm 0.3$	96.3±1.3 96.5±28.0 108.5±0.5	$95.0 \pm 0.5$ $109.4 \pm 0.5$ $109.9 \pm 1.2$	64.9±13.0 44.4±49.2 68.1±53.9	<b>97.6</b> ±0.2 <b>111.2</b> ±0.3 <b>110.8</b> ±0.1

Simple implementation of ensemble:  $\{Q_{\theta_i}\}_{i=1}^K$ , with default number of ensembles K constrained to 10.  $\bar{Q}_{\theta} := \frac{1}{K} \left( \sum_{i=1}^K Q_{\theta_i} \right)$  $\widehat{\sigma} := \sqrt{\frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{i=1}^K (Q_{\theta_i} - \bar{Q}_{\theta})^2}$  $pess(Q_{\theta}(s, a)) = \bar{Q}_{\theta}(s, a) - \widehat{\sigma}$ 



#### Learning curves of EABC

Average

#### Conclusions

- With adjustable behavior cloning, we effectively improved algorithm performance on inferior data.
- Benefiting from the ensemble approach, the performance is stable with low variance.
- EABC has a simple, intuitive structure, and a short runtime, while achieving state-of-the-art performance.
- One potential future extension could involve automating the determination of *p*.
- Utilization of pre-known expert information can be immensely valuable. By leveraging such supervised information (confidence level *p* regarding the offline dataset), we can potentially avoid extensive parameter tuning and complex training strategies.

# References

[1] Scott Fujimoto and Shixiang Shane Gu. A



