

Student/Teacher Advising through Reward Augmentation

Cameron Reid

Abstract

Transfer learning is an important new subfield of multiagent reinforcement learning that aims to help an agent learn about a problem by using knowledge that it has gained solving another problem, or by using knowledge that is communicated to it by an agent who already knows the problem. This is useful when one wishes to change the architecture or learning algorithm of an agent (so that the new knowledge need not be built “from scratch”), when new agents are frequently introduced to the environment with no knowledge, or when an agent must adapt to similar but different problems. Great progress has been made in the agent-to-agent case using the Teacher/Student framework proposed by (Torrey and Taylor 2013). However, that approach requires that learning from a teacher be treated differently from learning in every other reinforcement learning context. In this paper, I propose a method which allows the teacher/student framework to be applied in a way that fits directly and naturally into the more general reinforcement learning framework by integrating the teacher feedback into the reward signal received by the learning agent. I show that this approach can significantly improve the rate of learning for an agent playing a one-player stochastic game; I give examples of potential pitfalls of the approach; and I propose further areas of research building on this framework.

Introduction

Reinforcement Learning

Reinforcement learning describes a variety of methods that are used to solve sequential decision problems in which some agent is interacting with and receiving feedback from an environment. Generally, the problem is formulated such that the feedback is in the form of a cost (which the agent should minimize), or a reward (to be maximized). (Sutton and Barto 2018) provide an excellent primer on the discipline of reinforcement learning.

Tabular Q-Learning

The agent discussed in this paper uses a tabular Q-learning approach to reinforcement learning described by (Watkins 1989). This is a simple but effective approach to reinforcement learning that allows an agent to eventually learn an exact optimal policy for every state. Put simply, we keep a large, relatively high-dimensional table with one entry per state-action pair; at every step, we observe a state S and take an action a based on a policy $\pi(s, a|Q)$. The agent then receives its new state S' , and a reward R , and makes an update to the Q-table as follows:

$$Q(S, a) = Q(S, a) + \alpha[R + \gamma \max_a Q(S', a) - Q(S, a)]$$

(Sutton and Barto 2018)

where γ is a discount factor (lower values make the resulting policy more “short-sighted”) and α is some

step size. Under some simple assumptions, this simple algorithm will eventually converge to a perfectly optimal policy with probability 1 (Watkins and Dayan 1992).

Transfer Learning

Even the best reinforcement learning methods can be quite slow to converge to an optimal solution. *Transfer learning* describes one attempt to solve that problem – given an agent which has been trained on a problem, how can we transfer the knowledge it has gained to another agent, or generalize that knowledge to another problem?

One proposed solution in this paradigm is the Teacher-Student framework proposed by (Torrey and Taylor 2013), in which an agent who is an “expert” in the problem provides advice to a learning agent to help speed the training of the learning agent. This advice is provided by essentially telling the learning agent which action to take at certain states. (Da Silva, Glatt, and Costa 2017) expanded on this framework by proposing a system in which agents learning simultaneously can all be either advisor or advisee (or both) during training.

While those show impressive results, they make a few assumptions that I believe are unrealistic and exhibit a departure from the fundamental reinforcement learning problem: for example, the advice is treated as a special case, rather than an additional environmental signal. Here, I attempt to begin to bring those methods into harmony with the generic reinforcement learning problem formulation.

To that end, I propose an approach for shaping the reward of a learning agent which will help guide the learning agent as it learns by modifying the reward received from the environment with an additional punishment based upon the knowledge of the teaching agent.

Methods

Hunter/Prey Game

To examine this problem, I’ve used a simple Gridworld hunter/prey game. The learning agent is a hunter, whose job is to catch the prey by moving into the space occupied by the prey. The prey, in turn, moves in a random direction at each step as long as it is not captured. The agent is given a reward of -1 on each step that the prey has not been captured, and a reward of 0 when it has.

The environment of the game is fully observable to the agent; at each step, the agent receives a tuple of $\langle h_x, h_y, p_x, p_y \rangle$, where $h_{\{x,y\}}$ and $p_{\{x,y\}}$ are the hunter’s and prey’s x- and y- coordinate, respectively.

The action space in this game are integers from 0 to 3 which encode cardinal directions in the gridworld – 0 moves the agent down, 1 moves the agent to the right, etc.

Building the Advisor

The advisor and agent use the same parameters for learning the policy. First, the advisor learns a policy by playing 20,000 episodes of the game (i.e., restarting every time the prey is captured) with the Q-learning algorithm described above. The learning rate, α , was set to 0.1; the discount factor, γ , was set to 1.0 (so, undiscounted learning).

The learned policy was then kept to help inform the teaching policies described below.

Teaching the Student

Once the advisor is trained, its policy was used to provide feedback to the learning agent using a few hand-coded policies.

In the first policy, the advisor augmented the reward the agent received by a tunable, fixed value (set to -10 in these experiments) if the action chosen by the

agent is not the optimal action as determined by the Q function learned by the advisor. In another policy, the teaching agent only augments the reward signal if the chosen action is the *worst* among the four available actions. The third policy augments the reward signal by an amount proportional to the difference between the chosen action and the optimal action (again, as determined by the advisor’s Q function).

Note that, while these policies are fixed and provided here, the problem of learning these policies is easily translated to a reinforcement learning problem, and an optimal policy could easily be learned.

Defining Punishment

As mentioned above, I address three punishment schedules in this paper. For simplicity’s sake, I define a function $\mathbf{pun}(s, a)$ whose value is an amount by which the reward signal is augmented before being provided to the learning agent who has taken action a in state s . This function is defined in a few different ways, corresponding to each of the punishment schedules.

Punishing Sub-optimal Actions

The first punishment schedule imposes additional cost to agents who choose an action which is not optimal according to the teacher’s Q value for that state. More formally, the reward is augmented by

$$\mathbf{pun}_{\text{sub}}(s, a) = C\mathbf{1}_{\text{sub}} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\text{sub}}$ is the indicator function whose value is 1 when $a \neq \max_b Q_{\text{teacher}}(s, b)$, and 0 otherwise.

Punishing Anti-Optimal Actions

The next punishment schedule examined is similar, but only imposes an additional cost when the learning agent chooses an action that would be the worst among all actions. In other words

$$\mathbf{pun}_{\text{anti}}(s, a) = C\mathbf{1}_{\text{anti}} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{\text{anti}} = 1$ when $a = \min_b Q_{\text{teacher}}(s, b)$ and 0 otherwise.

Continuous Punishment By Severity

The final punishment schedule imposes an additional cost to the learning agent that is proportional to the difference between the expected value of the chosen action and the value of the optimal action based on the teacher’s action-value function. That is,

$$\mathbf{pun}_{\text{cont}}(s, a) = C(Q_{\text{teacher}}(s, a) - \max_b Q_{\text{teacher}}(s, b)) \quad (3)$$

Results




Figure 1: Comparison of Q Learning and Suboptimal Action Punishment

Figure 1 shows the results of augmenting the learning agent’s reward by Eq. 1 with $C = 10$; that is, the reward received by the agent at each step was

$$\hat{R}_{\text{agent}} = R_{\text{agent}} - \mathbf{pun}_{\text{sub}}(s, a) \quad (4)$$

Notice that the guidance from the teacher causes impressive improvements in training speed; however, learning quickly levels off after only a couple thousand episodes at a level of performance that is inferior to what simple Q-learning achieves by the final episode. This is likely the result of the teacher continuing to punish for slight variations to the teacher’s policy which might actually be improvements.




Figure 2: Comparison of Q Learning and Anti-Optimal Action Punishment

Figure 2 shows the results of augmenting the learning agent’s reward by Eq. 2 with $C = 10$. In this case, the reward became

$$\hat{R}_{\text{agent}} = R_{\text{agent}} - \text{pun}_{\text{anti}}(s, a) \quad (5)$$

In this case, the increase in convergence speed was less significant; however, because the teacher only punishes if the student chooses the *worst possible* action, the negative effects are diminished, and the student manages to perform better than the teacher at every episode.

Figure 3 shows the result of augmenting the reward signal by Eq 3 with $C = 10$, i.e.,

$$\hat{R}_{\text{agent}} = R_{\text{agent}} - \text{pun}_{\text{cont}}(s, a) \quad (6)$$

Similarly to above, it appears that, once the student has learned a similar-enough version of the teacher’s




Figure 3: Comparison of Q Learning and Continuous Proportional Punishment

policy, the difference between the values of the chosen action and the teacher’s guess of the optimal action are too small to make much difference, and so the student’s learning curve remains below the teacher’s throughout every episode.

In this paper, I have ignored the problem of *budgeting* advice, which is prominent elsewhere in the literature. Because the continuous punishment schedule requires advice at every step, it would certainly require a lot of interaction with the learning agent, which most likely makes it intractable for problems where there is a cost to interaction. Due to this fact and the fact that the suboptimal schedule leads to poor overall convergence, I consider the anti-optimal schedule to be the most useful.

Importance of Designing the Feedback Policy

Despite the promising results discussed above, I encountered one instance where the reward augmentation scheme caused severe problems for learning.

Figure 4 shows the results of attempting to augment the reward signal by providing *positive* feedback when the learning agent chooses the action that is optimal according to the teacher’s Q function, and *negative*




Figure 4: Q-learning with Encouragement

feedback as described in Eq. 5. Clearly, this led to a severe hindrance to training speed, perhaps eliminating any convergence altogether; my guess in this situation is that the agent learned to ignore the goal and instead move to states where it had previously chosen the optimal action by chance. Clearly, it is important to ensure that the advice provided by the teacher is advice that will help the student learn and not create perverse incentives.

Tuning the C Parameter

Here we examine the effect of the C parameter on convergence.

Figure 5 shows the effect of tuning the C parameter in the “anti-optimal” schedule. Of note is that small C values lead to a less-impressive speedup in convergence, but result in less harmful negative effects at later episodes. Meanwhile, a larger value of C leads to more impressive initial speedup but leads to a policy which is not as good. Also interesting is that performance seems to flip for every schedule at around the 15,000 episode mark: before that, higher values of C produce better performance but after that, higher values of C seem to prevent further improvement.

Figure 6 shows the effect of the C parameter on the “suboptimal” schedule. Notably, there doesn’t appear




Figure 5: Various C -values under the “suboptimal” schedule




Figure 6: Various C -values under the “anti-optimal” schedule

to be any negative impact on later training episodes like was apparent in Figure 6. In fact, higher values of C seem to have purely positive effects. Presumably, this is because the feedback is mostly applied early in training, but once the policy becomes relatively good, it’s unlikely that the agent will take the worst possible action and so feedback is sparse and training continues as normal.




Figure 7: Various C -values under the “continuous” schedule

Figure 7 shows the effect of tuning the C parameter for the “continuous” schedule. The effect is similar to what was seen in Figure 5: higher values of C allow the agent to learn more quickly, but it doesn’t negatively impact learning at later epochs when the agent has learned a reasonable policy and the difference between its chosen action and the teacher’s best action is probably small.

Conclusions & Future Work

In this paper I’ve proposed an extension of the teacher/student framework initially developed by (Torrey and Taylor 2013) which allows the teacher to provide advice to the student via the existing structure of reinforcement learning problems by augmenting the reward signal that the learning agent receives from the environment. I’ve shown that using this

approach can significantly speed up learning. Furthermore, this approach sidesteps some of the shortfalls of approaches like that of (Da Silva, Glatt, and Costa 2017) – namely, my approach extends naturally to agents which make use of function approximation in their learning algorithms, while the most effective approaches in (Da Silva, Glatt, and Costa 2017) require a record of visits to a state. In problems with a large state space where function approximation is necessary, it is unreasonable to expect that an agent will visit any given state even two times, so the assumption that we can count visits to a state don’t hold.

The obvious next steps for this approach would be to replicate the results of (Da Silva, Glatt, and Costa 2017) with co-learning agents. This would require developing some metric of confidence in a state for an agent to avoid negative impact, but that is a tractable problem.

Another obvious path forward would be to remove the hand-coded punishment policies in favor of a trained meta-agent that learns how to guide learning agents. This would allow not only the punishment schedule to be optimized, but it would also lead to a formulation of the advice budget that allows the training agent to optimize the feedback it provides based on an actual cost of providing that feedback, again bringing the concept of “budget” into the general framework of the reinforcement learning problem.

References

Da Silva, Felipe Leno, Ruben Glatt, and Anna Helena Reali Costa. 2017. “Simultaneously Learning and Advising in Multiagent Reinforcement Learning.” In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 1100–1108. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents; Multiagent Systems.

Sutton, Richard S, and Andrew G Barto. 2018. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT press.

Torrey, Lisa, and Matthew Taylor. 2013. “Teaching on a Budget: Agents Advising Agents in Reinforce-

ment Learning.” In *Proceedings of the 2013 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 1053–60. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents; Multiagent Systems.

Watkins, Christopher JCH, and Peter Dayan. 1992. “Q-Learning.” *Machine Learning* 8 (3-4). Springer: 279–92.

Watkins, Christopher John Cornish Hellaby. 1989. “Learning from Delayed Rewards.” King’s College, Cambridge.