

Cluster-based Sampling in Hindsight Experience Replay for Robot Control

Taeyoung Kim¹ and Dongsoo Har¹

Abstract—In multi-goal reinforcement learning in an environment, agents learn policies to achieve multiple goals by using experiences gained from interactions with the environment. With a sparse binary reward, training agents is particularly challenging, due to a lack of successful experiences. To solve this problem, hindsight experience replay (HER) generates successful experiences from unsuccessful experiences. However, generating successful experiences without consideration of the property of achieved goals is less efficient. In this paper, a novel cluster-based sampling strategy exploiting the property of achieved goals is proposed. The proposed sampling strategy groups episodes with different achieved goals and samples experiences in the manner of HER. For the grouping, K-means clustering algorithm is used. The centroids of the clusters are obtained from the distribution of failed goals defined as the original goals not achieved. The proposed method is validated by experiments with three robotic control tasks of the OpenAI Gym. The results of experiments demonstrate that the proposed method significantly reduces the number of epochs required for convergence in two of the three tasks and marginally increases the success rates in the remaining one. It is also shown that the proposed method can be combined with other sampling strategies for HER.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) is a powerful framework for training an agent to take sequential actions to complete a task. In the RL framework, the agent interacts with the environment, taking actions and receiving rewards, and learns a policy that maximizes accumulated rewards. The policy function gives an action as the output, taking a state as input. With the help of deep neural networks utilized as the policy function in RL, breakthrough successes have been achieved in various tasks that require sequential decision-making by the agent, such as video games [1], [2], sensor networks [3], [4], automated guided vehicle [5], [6], and robotic control [7], [8], [9], [10].

In the real world, a single task can have multiple goals. For example, in the case of walking, someone walks to various places, and in the case of putting an object on a table, someone can put it in various spots on the table. The RL framework for learning these multiple goals is called multi-goal RL [11]. The main difference between the RL with a single goal and multi-goal RL is that an agent in multi-goal

RL learns a goal-conditioned policy, which takes as inputs not only a state but the goal information.

Training data in both types of RL frameworks is a set of experiences obtained from the exploration of the agent. An experience is represented by state, goal (for multi-goal RL), action, reward, and next state. Because the loss function used to update a policy is given in terms of rewards, rewards should be carefully designed for efficient training. Rewards are designed and shaped according to the characteristics of the task, which requires in-depth knowledge on the task. An option to avoid this dilemma is to make the agent learn the policy with a binary (success/failure) reward. However, using the binary reward causes a rareness of successful experiences. It is inefficient to use successful experiences once to update policies. To reduce this inefficiency, reusing experiences, namely experience replay (ER), is proposed in [12]. In the ER framework, experiences are stored in the replay buffer and sampled to create the training batch.

The sparseness of binary rewards with the large goal space in multi-goal RL makes the exploration of the agent a time-consuming process and decreases the proportion of successful experiences available in the replay buffer. The low proportion of successful experiences prolongs the exploration process of the agent and often causes very slow learning of the policy. As a solution to mitigate the slow learning of the agent, hindsight experience replay (HER) is proposed in [13]. HER improves sampling efficiency by learning even from unsuccessful episodes by replacing the original goal with the achieved goal and re-computing the rewards based on the achieved goal. In terms of training the agent to learn implicitly achievable goals, HER uses a technique that can be categorized into curriculum learning [14]. HER with off-policy RL algorithms, such as deep q-network (DQN) [1] and deep deterministic policy gradients (DDPG) [15], can learn complex tasks with sparse binary rewards. Moreover, HER can be combined with other techniques as presented in [16], [17], [18], [19], [20] for improved performance in RL.

It is shown in this paper that selection (sampling) of experiences in grouped episodes is important when replacing with hindsight experiences for training the agent in multi-goal environments. By HER, experiences are sampled uniformly without considering the property of achieved goals. If experiences can be sampled in consideration of the property of achieved goals, such as the geographical proximity of achieved goals, the efficiency of HER can be increased. From this viewpoint, a cluster-based sampling strategy is proposed to improve the sampling efficiency of HER. The proposed sampling strategy adds the process of grouping episodes

This work was supported by the Institute for Information communications Technology Promotion (IITP) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (No.2020-0-00440, Development of Artificial Intelligence Technology that continuously improves itself as the situation changes in the real world).

¹The authors are with Cho Chun Shik Graduate School of Mobility, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon 34051, South Korea ngng9957@kaist.ac.kr; dshar@kaist.ac.kr

before the sampling process of HER. It is noted here that grouping episodes is based on grouping the achieved goals in the last timestep of the episodes, and thus in the remaining part of this paper an achieved goal in the last timestep or an achieved goal, for notational brevity, is interchangeably used with an episode. The process of grouping episodes uses a clustering algorithm. The sampling is executed based on clusters of the achieved goals. The clusters are formed from the distribution of “failed” goals. The failed goals are defined as the original goals not achieved. By the clustering algorithm, a specific number of centroids are obtained. According to the centroids, a cluster index of each achieved goal is determined. The key concept of grouping the achieved goals based on the centroids of failed goals is that the agent can learn more from the unsuccessful episodes whose achieved goal in the last timestep is associated with the failed goals. To verify the performance of the proposed sampling strategy with HER, experiments with the DDPG algorithm are conducted in the Fetch environment of OpenAI gym [21]. It is to be found that HER with the proposed sampling strategy outperforms HER. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows.

- 1) A cluster-based sampling strategy is proposed. The key feature of the proposed sampling strategy is the process of grouping episodes (or achieved goals) before HER. Since the clustering is based on the property of achieved goals (in the last timestep), an experience replay exploiting the property of clustered episodes is firstly introduced. During the experience replay, experiences whose achieved goal in the last timestep is hard to achieve by the current RL policy are frequently sampled.
- 2) Use of a clustering algorithm for grouping achieved goals for HER is presented. The clustering algorithm applied to failed goals to determine centroids provides a cluster index for each achieved goal. The concept of using failed goals to determine centroids for consequent HER is that the agent can learn more from the experiences in unsuccessful episodes.
- 3) The performance of the proposed sampling strategy is evaluated for three tasks in the Fetch environment of OpenAI gym with the DDPG algorithm to validate the positive impact of the clustering process before HER.
- 4) Analyses of the experimental results and ablation studies of the proposed sampling strategy are presented. The ablation studies consist of experiments to examine the properties of methodological components of the proposed sampling strategy.

II. SYSTEM MODELING

In this section, concepts of multi-goal RL, DDPG, HER, two variants of HER, and K-means clustering algorithm are presented.

A. Multi-goal Reinforcement Learning

In the multi-goal RL framework, the agent learns a policy that enables achieving different goals in a task. The policy

that takes as input a state as well as a goal [22] is named a goal-conditioned policy. The reward function is a function of the state, goal, and action.

In the beginning of each episode, the initial state $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ of the environment and the goal $g \in \mathcal{G}$ to be achieved are given. The state s_t consists of an observation o_t and an achieved goal ag_t , which represents a current state of an object. The goal g is fixed during the entire episode. In each timestep t , the agent observes the current state s_t and the goal g and takes an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$ based on the policy $\pi: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The environment pertinent to the Markov decision process (MDP) assumption is affected by the action a_t and returns a reward r_t and next state s_{t+1} . The reward is denoted as $r_t = r(s_t, g, a_t)$ and the next state s_{t+1} is observed according to the transition probability $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$. The agent continues to interact with the environment until the terminal state corresponding to the last timestep T is reached. During exploration, the experience at timestep t includes, unlike in traditional RL, the goal g and thus is denoted by $e_t = (s_t, g, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$.

B. Deep Deterministic Policy Gradients (DDPG)

The DDPG [15] is an off-policy and model-free RL algorithm for continuous action spaces. This algorithm uses policy optimization and Q-learning. Like the Q-learning, the optimal action $a^*(s, g)$ can be found from the optimal action-value function (Q-function) $Q^*(s, g, a)$ by solving $a^*(s, g) = \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q^*(s, g, a)$. To approximate the policy $\pi(s, g)$ and the Q-function $Q(s, g, a)$, two neural networks actor network and critic network are simultaneously trained.

C. Hindsight Experience Replay (HER)

The main idea of HER [13] is that it is possible to learn even from unsuccessful episodes by substituting achieved goals for the original goal. For each experience $e_t = (s_t, g, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$ in the mini-batch, HER works as follows. Among the achieved goals in the episode containing the experiences, a hindsight goal g^h is sampled, e.g., the last achieved goal ag_T . For the hindsight goal g^h , hindsight rewards for each timestep $r_t^h = r(s_t, g^h, a_t)$ are recomputed. Substitution of these two hindsight components defines a hindsight experience as $e_t^g = (s_t, g^h, a_t, r_t^h, s_{t+1})$.

D. Aggressive Rewards to Counter Bias in HER (ARCHER)

In [23], it is argued that the use of HER causes high bias in training because the likelihood of replayed experience is overestimated and the approach aggressive rewards to counter bias in HER (ARCHER) is proposed as a solution. To counter the bias, the ARCHER differs the levels of importance of real experiences and hindsight experiences by giving aggressive rewards to successful hindsight experiences. Two scalar multipliers λ_r and λ_h , the trade-off parameters, are introduced to give weights to real rewards $r_t = \lambda_r \times r(s_t, g, a_t)$ and hindsight rewards $r_t^h = \lambda_h \times r(s_t, g^h, a_t)$. The requirement of the ARCHER framework is that $r_t^h > r_t$. In the special case of $\lambda_r = \lambda_h = 1$, the ARCHER becomes HER.

E. Energy-Based Hindsight Experience Prioritization

In [24], energy-based prioritization (EBP) for HER is proposed. Basic idea of this method is similar to that of curriculum learning. The difficult but achievable experiences are prioritized. The difficulty of the experience is evaluated by trajectory energy $E_{traj}(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_T)$ defined as the sum of transition energies of the object $E_{tran}(s_{t-1}, s_t)$ which is the increase of total energy between two successive timesteps. The total energy is defined as the sum of potential, kinetic, and rotational energy.

F. K-means Clustering Algorithm

The K-means clustering algorithm [25] is widely used unsupervised clustering algorithm. It works by grouping input data into k different clusters. Before the training, k should be set manually. The k centroids, centers of clusters, are initialized randomly. Each datum is assigned to the closest centroid. Each centroid is updated to the center position of each cluster. Assigning data and updating centroids are performed iteratively until there is no more transition of centroids.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, a novel cluster-based sampling strategy for HER is presented. The proposed method uses K-means clustering algorithm to sample episodes from the replay buffer to generate a mini-batch for improved sampling efficiency.

In multi-goal environments with sparse binary rewards, HER allows agents to learn policies by using hindsight experiences. A hindsight experience is generated by sampling a hindsight goal and recomputing a reward with the hindsight goal. The simplest way to sample hindsight goals is the use of achieved goals in the final timestep of each episode. HER makes it possible for unsuccessful episodes to provide positive feedback to the agent. Manipulating the experiences in successful episodes by using HER is less effective.

The framework of the original HER has three processes of uniform samplings to sample experiences. As shown in the upper part of Fig 1, the first process is for sampling episodes from the replay buffer, the second one is for sampling one experience from each sampled episode, and the last one is to sample experiences to be substituted by hindsight experiences among sampled experiences in the second process. In contrast to uniform sampling, the first process of HER can be designed in a way that episodes whose achieved goal in the last timestep is hard to achieve by the current RL policy are more likely sampled to perform HER more effectively. The framework of HER with modified sampling is shown in the lower part of Fig 1. This sampling process is based on a cluster model. The cluster model obtains centroids of clusters by K-means clustering algorithm and calculates a cluster index for episodes. To consider the goals that are difficult to achieve, the centroids of the clusters are obtained with failed goals. At the end of each episode, the success or failure of the episode is checked. When the episode is unsuccessful, its original goal is stored in the failed




Fig. 1: Frameworks of hindsight experience replay (HER) and HER with cluster-based sampling (HER-CS). The processes of HER-CS to get sampled experiences and mini-batch, which are identical with those of HER, are doubly used in the figure.

goal buffer (FGB). The FGs in the FGB are used to get the centroids.

The centroids of the clusters are used to group the episodes in the replay buffer. The cluster model provides the cluster index to the achieved goal (in the last timestep of the episode). The episodes are grouped into clustered buffers. The clustered buffers R_i are a subset of the replay buffer R and the number thereof is equal to the number of the clusters k . From each clustered buffer, $batch_size/k$ episodes are uniformly sampled to form an episode batch containing $batch_size$ episodes.

With the episode batch, the second and third uniform samplings are performed in the manner of HER. From the episode batch, experiences are sampled and an experience batch is generated. Experiences to be substituted by hindsight experiences are sampled from the experience batch. A mini-batch, which is the final form of data to train the agent, consists of the substituted experiences and the non-substituted experiences.

During the sampling process, renewal of centroids for grouping episodes into clustered buffers is performed periodically, because continuing to use the old centroids computed with old FGs can interfere with the training of an RL model. The cluster model provides the cluster index for each episode in the replay buffer. For the episodes stored after the renewal of the centroids, the cluster index is given individually by the cluster model. The important variables in this periodical process are the number of FGs used to renew the centroids and the frequency of the renewal of the centroids.

The size of the FGB, which represents the number of FGs to be used to obtain the cluster centroid, should be carefully determined. The small-sized FGB can not properly represent the FGs of the current RL model. When the size is too large, the computational volume increases and the FGs of the past RL models are used to renew the centroids. The clustering cycle indicating the frequency of renewal of centroids should be determined with consideration of

Algorithm 1 HER-CS: HER With Proposed Cluster-based Sampling

Given: an off-policy RL algorithm \mathbb{A} , a cluster model \mathbb{C} , a strategy \mathbb{S}_e for sampling episodes for creating mini-batches, a strategy \mathbb{S}_g for sampling goals for replay, a reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

```
1: Initialize neural networks  $\mathbb{A}$ 
2: Initialize a cluster model  $\mathbb{C}$ 
3: Initialize replay buffer  $R$ 
4: Initialize failed goal buffer  $F$ 
5: for epoch = 1,  $\mathbf{K}$  do
6:   for episode = 1,  $\mathbf{M}$  do
7:     Sample a goal  $g$  and initial state  $s_0$ 
8:     for  $t = 0, \mathbf{T} - 1$  do
9:       Select an action  $a_t$  using the behavior policy from
 $\mathbb{A}$ :  $a_t \leftarrow \pi(s_t, g) + \mathcal{N}_t$ 
10:      Execute the action  $a_t$  and observe a new state  $s_{t+1}$ 
11:      Calculate reward  $r_t = r(s_t, a_t, g)$ 
12:      Store the experience  $(s_t, g, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$  temporarily
13:    end for
14:    Store the experiences as an episode in  $R$ 
15:    if The episode is unsuccessful then
16:      Store the last achieved goal in  $F$ 
17:    end if
18:    Update  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $F$ 
19:    Update  $\mathbb{S}_e$  with  $\mathbb{C}$ 
20:    for  $i = 1, \mathbf{N}$  do
21:      Sample a set of episodes  $\mathcal{B}$  from  $R$  with  $\mathbb{S}_e$ 
22:      Sample a set of experiences  $B$ , from  $\mathcal{B}$ 
23:      Sample a set of achieved goals  $G$  with  $\mathbb{S}_g$ 
24:      for  $g^h \in G$  do
25:         $r_t^h = r(s_t, a_t, g^h)$ 
26:        Substitute  $g$  and  $r_t$  in the experience by  $g^h$  and  $r_t^h$ 
27:      end for
28:      Perform one step of optimization using  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $B$ 
29:    end for
30:  end for
31: end for
```

computational time. With a short clustering cycle, the cluster model of the sampling strategy continues to change and the RL algorithm lacks time to learn about the FGs obtained from the current RL model. With a long clustering cycle, the RL algorithm wastes time even after learning about the FGs of the current RL model. In the following experiments, these two variables are set to 150 via preliminary experiments.

The main concept of the proposed method can be expressed by introducing a cluster model \mathbb{C} and an episode sampling strategy \mathbb{S}_e to HER. The cluster model is updated by using FGB F . The strategy samples the episodes from the replay buffer R . The pseudo-code of HER with the proposed cluster-based sampling is presented in Algorithm 1.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, the experiment environment is described and the experimental results of the proposed method are presented.




Fig. 2: Illustrations of three tasks considered in experiments: Push, PickAndPlace, and Slide tasks.

A. Experiment Environment

Experiments are conducted for the tasks requiring continuous control in multi-goal environment discussed in [26]. The environment named Fetch environment is developed by the OpenAI gym [21] and the MuJoCo physics engine [27]. Performance of the proposed method is evaluated with three tasks pertinent to the Fetch environment, which are fulfilled by a 7-DOF robot arm and an object on a table. The three tasks, shown in Fig 2, are described as follows:

- 1) Push task(FetchPush-v1): A goal location, a small red sphere in the figure, is randomly chosen on the $0.7\text{m} \times 0.5\text{m}$ table surface. The robot arm pushes the object (a box) to the goal location.
- 2) Pick and Place task(FetchPickAndPlace-v1): A goal location is randomly chosen in the 3D space above the $0.7\text{m} \times 0.5\text{m}$ table. The robot arm grasps the object (a box) with the gripper and lifts it up to reach the goal location.
- 3) Slide task(FetchSlide-v1): A goal location is randomly chosen on the $0.7\text{m} \times 1.2\text{m}$ table surface in front of the robot, but out of the reach of the robot. The robot arm slides the object (a puck) to the goal location.

In the three tasks, each episode consists of 50 timesteps. The episode is considered successful under the condition that the distance between the goal location and the object is less than a threshold value, 5cm, in the last timestep.

For the DDPG method, an off-policy algorithm used for the experiments, the actor and the critic networks take multi-layer perceptron architecture with rectified linear units (ReLUs) [28] activation functions. The ADAM optimizer [29] is used for back-propagation algorithm for training two networks.

B. Experimental Results

The experimental results of the proposed cluster-based sampling strategy are presented in this subsection. The performance of the proposed method is evaluated in terms of the success rate. After each epoch of 200 epochs for training, the success rate is calculated with 20 test episodes. The sequence of training followed by evaluation is repeated with 5 random seeds.

The cluster model for the proposed method generates 8 clusters using the 150 most recent FGs by K-means clustering algorithm. When 150 new FGs are stored in the FGB, the cluster model obtains 8 renewed centroids.

In the figures of the experimental results, a solid line shows the average of five success rates for each epoch and the upper




Fig. 3: Success rates obtained while training HER and HER-CS for all three tasks.




Fig. 4: Success rates obtained while training ARCHER and ARCHER-CS for all three tasks.

and lower boundary lines of the light-colored area show the minimum and maximum success rates. The width of the light-colored area represents the range of variation of the success rates with 5 random seeds. To smooth the granularity of experimental results over epochs, the moving average of the past 20 success rates is calculated and shown in the figures. The comparison criteria are determined according to the characteristic of the success rate curve for each task. Comparison criteria for Push, PickAndPlace, and Slide tasks are the number of epochs required to achieve a success rate of 97.5%, maximum success rate, and increment of the success rate from that of HER, respectively. The last criterion is measured by the average of the differences in success rates at each epoch.

1) *Comparative Evaluation of Performance:* Performances of HER and ARCHER with and without the proposed method are evaluated. The rate of hindsight experience in sampling is set to 0.8 for every experiment. The trade-off parameters of the ARCHER are set to 1 for real reward and 0.5 for hindsight reward, as those in [23].

In Fig 3, performances of HER and HER with the cluster-based sampling strategy (HER-CS) are compared for the three tasks. Fig 3(a) shows that HER-CS significantly reduces the number of epochs required to achieve the success rate 97.5% for the Push task from 114 to 84. It is seen in Fig 3(b) for the PickAndPlace task that HER-CS allows the success rate to converge at 115 epochs and achieves the maximum success rate of 97.10% which is 4.48% larger than the maximum success rate of HER. For the Slide task, HER-CS marginally improves the success rate by 2.08% on

average as shown in Fig 3(c).

Fig 4 shows experimental results of the ARCHER alone and ARCHER with with the cluster-based sampling strategy (ARCHER-CS). Similar to the result of HER-CS, the proposed sampling strategy leads to the performance improved over the ARCHER. For the Push task, the proposed method causes the number of epochs required to achieve the success rate of 97.5% to decrease from 142 to 128. For the PickAndPlace task, the maximum success rate of 93.57% is achieved, which is 7.67% greater than the maximum success rate of HER. For the Slide task, the success rate is slightly improved by 2.81% on average.

2) *Ablation Studies:* Two types of ablation studies are conducted. One is related to combining the proposed method with an existing sampling algorithm and the other is concerned with the methodology of the proposed cluster-based sampling.

The first ablation study shows that the proposed method can be combined with existing sampling algorithms and can improve performance. For this ablation study, the EBP is used as the existing sampling algorithm. In the EBP, the experience with higher energy in the replay buffer has a higher probability to be sampled. The proposed sampling method is combined with the EBP by inserting a process that groups the episodes in the replay buffer into clustered buffers before the energy-based sampling process. From each clustered buffer, the EBP with the proposed method samples the same number of episodes according to the energy-based probability. Fig 5 shows comparative results of HER with EBP (HER-EBP) and HER-EBP with the cluster-based




Fig. 5: Success rates obtained while training HER-EBP, and HER-EBP-CS for all three tasks.

TABLE I: Results of methodological ablation study

| Method | $N_{0.975}$ in Push | S_{max} in PickAndPlace | I_{sr} in Slide |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| HER | 114 | 92.62% | 0.00% |
| HER-CS(.150) | 84 | 97.10% | 2.08% |
| HER-CS.15 | 108 | 96.24% | -0.32% |
| HER-CS.500 | 108 | 96.20% | 0.61% |
| HER-CS_e | 117 | 95.43% | 0.82% |
| HER-CS_woFG | 173 | 64.95% | -4.32% |

sampling strategy (HER-EBP-CS). For the Push task, the number of epochs required to achieve the success rate of 97.5% of HER-EBP-CS is smaller by 5 than that of HER-EBP. The maximum success rate of 97.62% is achieved for the PickAndPlace task by HER-EBP-CS, which is 3.29% higher than that of HER-EBP. For the Slide task, the success rate of HER-EBP-CS is 1.75% higher on average than that of HER-EBP. For all three tasks, the proposed method improves the success rates and reduces the width of the light-colored area, which means the variation of the success rates for 5 random seeds.

The methodological ablation study consists of three experiments. The first experiment is about the size of the FGB and the second is about the clustering cycle and the third is about using FGs. Results of the methodological ablation study are listed in TABLE I, where $N_{0.975}$, S_{max} , and I_{sr} are the number of epochs required to achieve a success rate of 97.5%, maximum success rate, and increment of the success rate on average over the success rate of HER, respectively.

The size of the FGB is set to 150. To check the validity of 150 as the size of the FGB, experiments with different sizes of FGB are conducted. HER-CS with the size 150, 15, 500 of FGB are named HER-CS.150, HER-CS.15, HER-CS.500, respectively. HER-CS.150 is the same as HER-CS used in other experiments. As shown in Table I, HER-CS.150 outperforms HER-CS.15 and HER-CS.500 for all tasks. This result suggests that the FGB with the size 150 is suitable for the cluster model of the proposed method while the FGB with the size 15 is not sufficiently representative of the FGs of the RL model and the FGB with the size 500 slows the training RL model because the FGB contains the FGs of the past RL models.

The clustering cycle is set to 150 like the size of the

FGB, which allows renewed clustering with entirely new FGs. To verify the importance of setting the clustering cycle, an extreme case of using a short clustering cycle is compared with the proposed method for the cycle of 150. The extreme case is the proposed method with the cycle of 1, which means that the renewal of centroids and the process of grouping the episodes in the replay buffer are conducted every episode (HER-CS_e). For all three tasks, it can be observed in Table I that the result of HER-CS_e is better or similar to HER and is worse than HER-CS.

The cluster model is updated with FGs which are obtained from the exploration of the RL algorithm. To check the importance of using FGs, experiments of HER with the cluster-based sampling strategy without FGs (HER-CS_woFG) are conducted. In HER-CS_woFG, the cluster model obtains the centroids with the achieved goals in the replay buffer and provides the cluster index to each episode according to the centroids. For all three tasks, the result of HER-CS_woFG is worse than HER-CS and even worse than HER as shown in Table I. The reason for this outcome is that when HER-CS_woFG samples the same number of episodes from each cluster and one of the clusters has fewer experiences, the few experiences are repeatedly sampled unnecessarily.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a novel cluster-based sampling strategy for HER is proposed. The proposed method samples episodes based on the process of grouping achieved goals. To consider the goals that are difficult to achieve, centroids of clusters are obtained with failed goals, the original goals of unsuccessful episodes. Since the centroids are obtained from failed goals, the agent can learn from the experiences obtained from diverse unsuccessful episodes. Experiments on three robotic control tasks of the OpenAI Gym suite show that the proposed sampling strategy greatly reduces the number of epochs required for convergence by 30 and 85 in the Push and PickAndPlace tasks and marginally improves the success rates by 2.08% on average in the Slide task, as compared to HER. Additional ablation studies show the feasibility of the use of the proposed sampling strategy in combination with other existing sampling algorithms and the importance of the methodological components: the size of the failed goal buffer, clustering cycle, and failed goals.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. Riedmiller, A. K. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, *et al.*, “Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning,” *nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [2] O. Vinyals, I. Babuschkin, W. M. Czarnecki, M. Mathieu, A. Dudzik, J. Chung, D. H. Choi, R. Powell, T. Ewalds, P. Georgiev, *et al.*, “Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning,” *Nature*, vol. 575, no. 7782, pp. 350–354, 2019.
- [3] Y. Lin, C. Wang, J. Wang, and Z. Dou, “A novel dynamic spectrum access framework based on reinforcement learning for cognitive radio sensor networks,” *Sensors*, vol. 16, no. 10, p. 1675, 2016.
- [4] T. Kim, L. F. Vecchietti, K. Choi, S. Lee, and D. Har, “Machine learning for advanced wireless sensor networks: A review,” *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 12379–12397, 2020.
- [5] R. Kamoshida and Y. Kazama, “Acquisition of automated guided vehicle route planning policy using deep reinforcement learning,” in *2017 6th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Logistics and Transport (ICALT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [6] S. Kim, H. Jin, M. Seo, and D. Har, “Optimal path planning of automated guided vehicle using dijkstra algorithm under dynamic conditions,” in *2019 7th International Conference on Robot Intelligence Technology and Applications (RiTA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 231–236.
- [7] A. Nair, B. McGrew, M. Andrychowicz, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, “Overcoming exploration in reinforcement learning with demonstrations,” in *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 6292–6299.
- [8] M. Seo, L. F. Vecchietti, S. Lee, and D. Har, “Rewards prediction-based credit assignment for reinforcement learning with sparse binary rewards,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 118776–118791, 2019.
- [9] J. Luo, E. Solowjow, C. Wen, J. A. Ojea, A. M. Agogino, A. Tamar, and P. Abbeel, “Reinforcement learning on variable impedance controller for high-precision robotic assembly,” in *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3080–3087.
- [10] T. Kim, L. F. Vecchietti, K. Choi, S. Sarel, and D. Har, “Two-stage training algorithm for ai robot soccer,” *PeerJ Computer Science*, vol. 7, p. e718, 2021.
- [11] M. Plappert, M. Andrychowicz, A. Ray, B. McGrew, B. Baker, G. Powell, J. Schneider, J. Tobin, M. Chociej, P. Welinder, *et al.*, “Multi-goal reinforcement learning: Challenging robotics environments and request for research,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09464*, 2018.
- [12] L.-J. Lin, “Self-improving reactive agents based on reinforcement learning, planning and teaching,” *Machine learning*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 293–321, 1992.
- [13] M. Andrychowicz, F. Wolski, A. Ray, J. Schneider, R. Fong, P. Welinder, B. McGrew, J. Tobin, O. Pieter Abbeel, and W. Zaremba, “Hindsight experience replay,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [14] Y. Bengio, J. Louradour, R. Collobert, and J. Weston, “Curriculum learning,” in *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, 2009, pp. 41–48.
- [15] T. P. Lillicrap, J. J. Hunt, A. Pritzel, N. Heess, T. Erez, Y. Tassa, D. Silver, and D. Wierstra, “Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- [16] H. Nguyen, H. M. La, and M. Deans, “Hindsight experience replay with experience ranking,” in *2019 Joint IEEE 9th International Conference on Development and Learning and Epigenetic Robotics (ICDL-EpiRob)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [17] M. Fang, T. Zhou, Y. Du, L. Han, and Z. Zhang, “Curriculum-guided hindsight experience replay,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [18] M. Fang, C. Zhou, B. Shi, B. Gong, J. Xu, and T. Zhang, “Dher: Hindsight experience replay for dynamic goals,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [19] L. F. Vecchietti, M. Seo, and D. Har, “Sampling rate decay in hindsight experience replay for robot control,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2020.
- [20] L. F. Vecchietti, T. Kim, K. Choi, J. Hong, and D. Har, “Batch prioritization in multigoal reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 137449–137461, 2020.
- [21] G. Brockman, V. Cheung, L. Pettersson, J. Schneider, J. Schulman, J. Tang, and W. Zaremba, “Openai gym,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540*, 2016.
- [22] T. Schaul, D. Horgan, K. Gregor, and D. Silver, “Universal value function approximators,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1312–1320.
- [23] S. Lanka and T. Wu, “Archer: Aggressive rewards to counter bias in hindsight experience replay,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02070*, 2018.
- [24] R. Zhao and V. Tresp, “Energy-based hindsight experience prioritization,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 113–122.
- [25] J. McQueen, “Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations,” in *Proc. 5th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1967*, 1967, pp. 281–297.
- [26] M. Plappert, M. Andrychowicz, A. Ray, B. McGrew, B. Baker, G. Powell, J. Schneider, J. Tobin, M. Chociej, P. Welinder, *et al.*, “Multi-goal reinforcement learning: Challenging robotics environments and request for research,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09464*, 2018.
- [27] E. Todorov, T. Erez, and Y. Tassa, “Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control,” in *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 5026–5033.
- [28] V. Nair and G. E. Hinton, “Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines,” in *Icml*, 2010.
- [29] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.