

# What model does MuZero learn?

Jinke He  
Delft University of Technology  
j.he-4@tudelft.nl

Thomas M. Moerland  
Leiden University  
t.m.moerland@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

Frans A. Oliehoek  
Delft University of Technology  
f.a.oliehoek@tudelft.nl

## ABSTRACT

Model-based reinforcement learning has drawn considerable interest in recent years, given its promise to improve sample efficiency. Moreover, when using deep-learned models, it is potentially possible to learn compact models from complex sensor data. However, the effectiveness of these learned models, particularly their capacity to plan, i.e., to improve the current policy, remains unclear. In this work, we study MuZero, a well-known deep model-based reinforcement learning algorithm, and explore how far it achieves its learning objective of a value-equivalent model and how useful the learned models are for policy improvement. Amongst various other insights, we conclude that the model learned by MuZero cannot effectively generalize to evaluate unseen policies, which limits the extent to which we can additionally improve the current policy by planning with the model.

## KEYWORDS

Model-based reinforcement learning, MuZero

### ACM Reference Format:

Jinke He, Thomas M. Moerland, and Frans A. Oliehoek. 2024. What model does MuZero learn?. In *Proc. of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2024)*, Auckland, New Zealand, May 6 – 10, 2024, IFAAMAS, 10 pages.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, reinforcement learning (RL) [28] has made remarkable progress, finding applications in various real-world applications, including video compression [21], chip design [23], inventory management [20] and plasma control for nuclear fusion [5]. A particular class of RL methods, known as *model-based* reinforcement learning (MBRL) [19, 24, 27], makes additional updates to the policy through planning, with the potential to improve data efficiency. The combination of deep learning and MBRL has given rise to a class of *deep model-based RL (DMBRL)* approaches. Unlike tabular methods that aim to learn dynamics and reward for each state-action pair, DMBRL approaches typically focus on learning a state representation, on top of which dynamics or reward functions are estimated [11–14, 25, 31, 32]. However, determining relevant information to include in these states and how to learn them remains a challenge, as not all aspects of observations are relevant [18], and some relevant aspects may be missing, leading to history dependence [22].

One approach to address this challenge is the development of value equivalent models [8–10]. These models are specifically trained to predict the (multi-step) Bellman update, focusing solely on value relevant aspects of the task, which is what we ultimately care about. A well-known example of a value-equivalent-based

algorithm is MuZero [25], which has achieved state-of-the-art and superhuman performance in Atari games and the game of Go, Chess, and Shogi. MuZero inherits much of its structure from its predecessor AlphaZero [26]: it acts through Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [3], where the search is guided by both a learned policy network (to bias action selection) and a learned value network (to estimate values of leaf nodes). Notably, while AlphaZero leverages a ground-truth model for simulation and search, MuZero utilizes a model that is jointly learned with the value and policy networks.

The nuances between AlphaZero and MuZero are often oversimplified, leading to misconceptions. While AlphaZero’s underlying mechanisms have been well studied in the literature [1, 2, 7], equating MuZero to "AlphaZero with a learned model" is reductive. Such a view neglects the inherent challenges and complexities of model learning as opposed to leveraging predefined models. The dynamics, particularly pertaining to the role of the learned model in MuZero, could diverge significantly from those of AlphaZero. With most empirical evaluations centered on learning curves, it becomes crucial to take a deeper look at the capabilities of the learned model.

The most relevant study in this direction is by Hamrick et al. [15], who investigate the role of planning in MuZero’s learning. They discover that planning with the learned model primarily boost the learning of the policy network by generating more informative data and constructing better training targets. Surprisingly, their findings reveal that in most domains, planning at evaluation time does not significantly improve performance compared to using the policy network alone, even with large search budgets. One explanation is that the policy network has converged to the optimal policy, rendering planning useless. However, it could also suggest that the agent does not learn a good (value equivalent) model. If the latter is the case, then the question becomes what does MuZero’s model actually learn, and why does it give a benefit during training?

In this work, we take a deeper look at MuZero’s learned models. We empirically investigate two fundamental questions: 1) To what extent does MuZero learn a value equivalent model? and 2) To what extent does MuZero learn a model that supports effective policy improvement (through planning)? Addressing these questions can help us better understand MuZero’s empirical success and inform the design of future algorithms or extensions.

Our empirical evaluations isolate different aspects of MuZero’s model throughout training, resulting in these findings: (i) MuZero’s learned model is generally not accurate for policy evaluation, and (ii) the accuracy of the model for policy evaluation decreases as the policy to evaluate deviates further from MuZero’s data collection policy. When it turns to policy improvement, we observe that (a) the inability of the learned model to accurately evaluate policies, especially those that are different to the data collection policy, limits the extent to which we can find a good policy via planning, and (b) introduction of the policy prior alleviates the problem, by biasing the search towards actions where the model is more accurate. This implies a second function of the policy network in MuZero:

not only does it accelerate MCTS, but it also restricts the amount of model error that enters the search.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the essential background on Markov Decision Processes, MuZero, and the value equivalence principle. Section 3 studies trained MuZero models in the policy *evaluation* setting (the objective for which the models were trained). Section 4 extends the analysis to the policy *improvement* setting (planning). Finally, Section 5 discusses the limitation and outlook of this work.

## 2 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Markov Decision Processes

A Markov decision process (MDP) is a model that describes the interaction between a decision-making agent and an environment. Formally, an infinite-horizon discounted MDP is a 6-tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mu, \gamma)$  where  $\mathcal{S}$  represents the state space of the environment and  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the set of actions that the agent can take. The initial state of the environment,  $s_0$ , follows a distribution  $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ . At each time step  $t$ , the agent observes the environment state  $s_t$  and selects an action  $a_t$ , causing the environment to transition to a new state  $s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{T}(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$  and return a numerical reward  $r_t = \mathcal{R}(s_t, a_t)$ . Given a stationary policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ , the value function  $V$  measures the expected discounted sum of future rewards from a state following  $\pi$  afterwards,  $V^\pi(s) = E[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t | \pi, s_0 = s]$ , where  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor. In this work, we specifically focus on environments with deterministic dynamics, where the next state  $s_{t+1}$  is solely determined by the current state  $s_t$  and action  $a_t$  with probability 1:  $s_{t+1} = \mathcal{T}(s_t, a_t)$ .

### 2.2 MuZero

MuZero [25] is a recent MBRL method that has achieved state-of-the-art performance in Atari games and matched the superhuman performance of AlphaZero [26] in Go, chess and shogi.

**Components** Similar to other MBRL methods, MuZero learns a deterministic world model that consists of a representation function  $h_\theta$  and a dynamics function  $g_\theta$ . The representation function encodes an environment state  $s_t$  into a latent state  $z_t^0 = h_\theta(s_t)$ . Here the subscript denotes the real time step at which the encoding occurs, and the superscript denotes the number of time steps that have been spent in the learned model since then. Given a latent state  $z_t^k$  and an action  $a_{t+k}$ , the dynamics function predicts the next latent state  $z_{t+k}^{k+1}$  and the reward  $u_t^k$ ,  $(z_{t+k}^{k+1}, u_t^k) = g_\theta(z_t^k, a_{t+k})$ . Apart from the representation and dynamics functions, MuZero uses a prediction function to predict the value and policy at a latent state,  $\pi_t^k, v_t^k = f_\theta(z_t^k)$ . For ease of notation, we split the prediction function into a policy function  $\pi_\theta(z_t^k)$  and a value function  $v_\theta(z_t^k)$ . To distinguish between the policy function  $\pi_\theta$  and the MuZero policy  $\pi^{\text{MuZero}}$ , which runs MCTS, we will refer to the former as the policy prior and the latter as MuZero’s behavior policy.

**Acting** MuZero makes decisions by planning with the learned model. At each time step  $t$ , MuZero encodes the environment state  $s_t$  into a latent state  $z_t^0$  and uses it as the root node to perform MCTS. As the result of the search, MuZero selects the action  $a_t$  by sampling from a distribution that is constructed using the visit

counts at the root node and a temperature parameter  $T \in (0, \infty)$ :

$$\pi^{\text{MuZero}}(a|s_t) = \frac{N(z_t^0, a)^{1/T}}{\sum_b N(z_t^0, b)^{1/T}}$$

MuZero’s planning differs from traditional MCTS methods like UCT [16] in two key ways. First, rather than employing random rollouts for leaf node value estimation, MuZero uses its learned value function  $v_\theta$ . Second, MuZero integrates the policy prior into its action selection, guiding the simulation of actions at tree nodes:

$$\arg \max_a [Q(z, a) + c \cdot \pi_\theta(a|z) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\sum_b N(z, b)}}{1 + N(z, a)}]$$

where  $c = c_1 + \log(\frac{\sum_b N(z, b) + c_2 + 1}{c_2})$  with  $c_1 = 1.25$  and  $c_2 = 19652$ .  $Q$  and  $N$  are the estimated values and visit counts of actions. MuZero inherits much of this search mechanism from AlphaZero, including the use of policy prior and value function. A recent study by Grill et al. [7] shows that the use of policy prior in MCTS effectively makes the action visit distribution at the root node track the solution of a local regularized policy optimization problem.

**Training** The key difference between MuZero and many prior work in MBRL lies in their approach to learning the model. In Figure 1, we illustrate the loss function of MuZero. Essentially, given a segment of a real episode that starts from state  $s_t$ , MuZero unrolls its model for  $K$  simulated time steps (below the dotted line) and compares these to real experiences (above the dotted line). This comparison results in a loss consisting of three terms for each of the  $K$  steps. The first term is the per-step reward prediction loss, with the target being the real reward received. The second term is the policy prediction loss, with the target being the action visit distribution of the MCTS at the root node. The third term is the value prediction loss, with the target being the discounted sum of  $n$ -step real rewards plus a value estimation bootstrapped from MCTS  $n$  steps into the future  $v_t^{\text{target}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \gamma^k r_{t+k} + \gamma^n v_t^{\text{MCTS}}$ . For simplicity, we omit the links for value targets in Figure 1. All components of MuZero are trained jointly end-to-end by minimizing the aggregated loss. In practice, MuZero incorporates various additional techniques from the literature, such as prioritized experience replay, to improve training. It also introduces a novel algorithm called ‘reanalyse’ to generate fresh targets from old trajectories by re-running MCTS on them using the latest network.





Figure 1: An illustration of MuZero’s loss function.



**Figure 2: Online performance of MuZero agents in Cart Pole (Left), Lunar Lander (Middle) and Atari Breakout (Right) at various training steps. For the same agent, we plot the performance of MuZero’s behavior policy (with planning) and policy prior (without planning). Note that the X-axes are in logarithmic scales. Planning at decision time substantially improves the performance of an agent, compared to taking actions directly from the policy prior.**

### 2.3 The value equivalence principle

The value equivalence principle, introduced by Grimm et al. [8, 9, 10], is motivated by the consideration that the construction of a model should take into account the final use of the model. It defines the order- $k$  value equivalence class  $\mathcal{M}^k(\Pi, \mathcal{V})$  as the subset of all models that can predict the correct  $k$ -step bellman update for any  $\pi \in \Pi$  and  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  in a set of policies  $\Pi$  and functions  $\mathcal{V}$ . For  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , an additional proper value equivalence class  $\mathcal{M}^\infty(\Pi)$  is defined, which excludes the set of functions from the specification. In essence, a model in the proper value equivalence class must have the true value function as the fixed point of the bellman operators for all policies in this set. As such, these models can be seen as the  $Q^\Pi$ -irrelevance abstractions for the MDP [18]. Notably, the largest proper value equivalence class that guarantees optimal planning is  $\mathcal{M}^\infty(\Pi^{\text{DET}})$ , where  $\Pi^{\text{DET}}$  is the set of all deterministic policies. Moreover, Grimm et al. [8] show that a simplified version of MuZero’s loss upper bounds the proper value equivalence loss, making an explicit connection between the theory of value equivalence principle and the strong empirical performance of MuZero. Despite the promise of the value equivalence principle in explaining MuZero’s strong performance, there are gaps between the theory and the practical algorithm. One such gap is that the models in the value equivalence principle are constructed on the original state space of the environment, while MuZero’s model operates on a latent state representation that evolves jointly with the model.

## 3 POLICY EVALUATION EXPERIMENTS

We are interested in the extent to which MuZero’s learned model supports additional policy improvement, which is crucial for MuZero’s sample efficiency as a MBRL method. Our hypothesis is that, since MuZero’s model is trained on data collected by previous policies, it is not generally value equivalent for all policies, especially those that have not been executed. As accurate policy evaluation is the basis for effective policy improvement, this will limit the extent to which MuZero can additionally improve its policy through planning. In this section, we verify this hypothesis.

### 3.1 Training MuZero agents

For our empirical analysis, we used three fully observable deterministic environments (as MuZero was designed for this setting): Cart Pole, a deterministic version of Lunar Lander, and Atari Breakout. We trained 30 MuZero agents with different random seeds for Cart Pole and Lunar Lander, and 10 for Atari Breakout. For each agent, we saved the model weights at different training steps. In the figures below, we aggregate results from different seeds/agents and report their means along with the corresponding standard errors.

In Cart Pole and Lunar Lander, we extensively trained the MuZero agents, for 100K and 1M steps. This way, we can conduct our analysis on the trained agents throughout their lifecycle of learning. For Atari Breakout, we adopted the same setup as EfficientZero [31] but extended the training from 100K steps to 500K steps. Details on the training of these agents can be found in Appendix A.

Figure 2 shows the online performance of MuZero agents at various training steps, which make decisions by performing MCTS planning (see Figure 7 in Appendix A for the full learning curves). For reference, we also plot the performance of the policy prior of the same agent, which samples actions directly from the policy network,  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | h_\theta(s_t))$ . In Cart Pole and Lunar Lander, the MuZero agents have almost converged to optimal performance. Throughout training, planning enables MuZero to achieve a substantially better performance than directly using the policy prior. It is important to note that the improved performance may not only come from the model but may also come from the value network, which is used to estimate the value of leaf nodes in MuZero’s MCTS. In the following, we will take a deeper look at how much the learned model contributes to this.

### 3.2 Evaluating the learned model

To assess MuZero’s learned model in the context of policy evaluation, we will compare it to the ground-truth model. Through experiments, we aim to answer questions in the format of *how much value prediction error should we expect when using MuZero’s learned model to evaluate a policy  $\pi$ ?*




Figure 3: Value prediction error of using MuZero’s learned model to evaluate its own behavior policy.

Considering that MuZero does not train or employ the model for infinite-horizon rollouts, we impose a limit on the evaluation horizon when assessing the value prediction error. For each state  $s_t$ , we define the discounted sum of future rewards for taking an action sequence  $(a_t, \dots, a_{t+h-1})$  as:

$$v^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t) = \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} \gamma^k r_{t+k} \quad (1)$$

where  $r_{t+k} = \mathcal{R}(s_{t+k}, a_{t+k})$  and  $s_{t+k+1} = \mathcal{T}(s_{t+k}, a_{t+k})$ , assuming the environment is deterministic. As mentioned in Section 2.2, MuZero predicts the value of this action sequence by first encoding the state into a latent state  $z_t^0 = h_\theta(s_t)$  and then rolling out the model from the latent state:

$$\hat{v}^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t) = \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} \gamma^k u_t^k \quad (2)$$

where  $z_t^{k+1}, u_t^k = g_\theta(z_t^k, a_{t+k})$ . Then, we can define the value prediction error of the learned model for the action sequence  $a_{t:t+h-1}$ .

*Definition 3.1.* The value prediction error of using the learned model to evaluate the action sequence  $a_{t:t+h-1}$  at state  $s_t$  is:

$$|v^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t) - \hat{v}^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t)| \quad (3)$$

As a stationary policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$  that operates in the original environment defines a distribution over such action sequences:

$$\Pr(a_{t:t+h-1}|s_t, \pi) = \prod_{k=0}^{h-1} \pi(a_{t+k}|s_{t+k} = \mathcal{T}(s_{t+k-1}, a_{t+k-1})) \quad (4)$$

We can define the value prediction error for evaluating  $\pi$ .

*Definition 3.2.* The value prediction error of using the learned model to evaluate a stationary policy  $\pi$ , which operates in the original environment, for horizon  $h$  is:

$$|v_h^\pi(s_t) - \hat{v}_h^\pi(s_t)| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{t:t+h-1} \sim \Pr(\cdot|s_t, \pi)} [v^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t) - \hat{v}^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t)] \right| \quad (5)$$


### 3.3 How accurately can MuZero’s learned model predict the value of its own behavior policy?

As the model is trained on data collected by MuZero’s behavior policy  $\pi^{\text{MuZero}}$ , we expect it to be at least accurate on this data collection policy. Therefore, we begin our investigation by examining the model’s prediction performance on this policy. Due to the continuous state spaces of our environments, it is not feasible to enumerate all states and compute the error for each one of them. Instead, we sample states from MuZero’s on-policy state distribution  $d_{\pi^{\text{MuZero}}}$ . For each sampled state, we conduct the evaluation and aggregate the errors. To facilitate tractable evaluation, at every state  $s$ , we use Monte Carlo sampling to estimate both the true value  $v_h^{\pi^{\text{MuZero}}}(s)$  and the value predicted by MuZero’s model  $\hat{v}_h^{\pi^{\text{MuZero}}}(s)$ .

In Figure 3, we report the value prediction error (Y-axis) under various evaluation horizons (lines) across different training steps (X-axis). The maximum evaluation horizons are set to the number of unrolling steps during training, which are  $\{10, 10, 5\}$  for Cart Pole, Lunar Lander, and Atari Breakout respectively. In all environments, value predictions for short horizons are highly accurate, with errors approaching zero. However, as the evaluation horizon increases, the errors consistently grow larger. On the one hand, this is not surprising because learned models are known prone to accumulate errors during long rollouts [17]. On the other hand, this shows that models learned by MuZero cannot be fully value equivalent as they are not even accurate enough to predict values for the policy that collects the training data. Errors at different training steps are generally not comparable due to the different state distributions, but the decreasing errors observed at the end of training suggest the convergence of the policy as a possible explanation.

### 3.4 How accurately can MuZero’s learned model evaluate policies that are different from the behavior policy?

To assess whether MuZero’s learned model effectively supports planning, we will investigate its capacity to generalize and accurately predict values beyond its own data collection policy. Our



**Figure 4: X-axis: action sequences sorted by their probabilities of being taken by the behavior policy (from unlikely to likely). Y-axis: the probabilities (blue, from small to large) and the corresponding value prediction errors (yellow, from small to large). Action sequences with higher probabilities to be taken by MuZero’s behaviour policy tend to incur lower value prediction errors when evaluated by MuZero’s learned model. This implies that the learned model is less value equivalent for policies that are different than the current data collection policy.**


hypothesis is that the model will exhibit increasing inaccuracies when evaluating policies that differ significantly from the behavior policy, which is responsible for collecting the training data.

To test this hypothesis, we conduct an experiment focusing on the relationship between the value prediction error for an action sequence  $|v^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t) - \hat{v}^{a_{t:t+h-1}}(s_t)|$  and the probability of the behavior policy selecting this action sequence  $\Pr(a_{t:t+h-1}|s_t, \pi^{\text{MuZero}})$ .

We sample states from MuZero’s on-policy state distribution  $d_{\pi^{\text{MuZero}}}$  and compute the probabilities and value prediction errors for *all* action sequences of length  $\{8, 4, 4\}$  for Cart Pole, Lunar Lander and Breakout (limited by computation budget). Considering that both probabilities and errors are real-valued and non-uniformly distributed, we aggregate results as follows: first, for each state, we rank action sequences by their probabilities of being chosen by MuZero’s behavior policy. Then, we compile statistics for action sequences with the same ranks. Finally, we combine results from different agents and report their means and standard errors.

In Figure 4, we present the results of this experiment. Here, the X-axis represents the action sequences that are sorted by their likelihood of being taken by the current behavior policy, ranging from unlikely to likely. On the Y-axis, we plot both the probabilities (blue) and the corresponding value prediction errors (yellow). The results clearly show that as the likelihood of the behavior policy selecting the action sequence decreases, the value prediction error for that action sequence increases. This trend is consistently observed across different environments and training steps. Moreover, it seems to become more evident with more training, possibly because the behavior policy becomes more deterministic. This finding supports our hypothesis that the model is more reliable in predicting values for the behavior policy, which collects the training data. Consequently, evaluating a policy using MuZero’s learned model may yield increasingly inaccurate results as the policy to evaluate deviates further from the behavior policy.





**Figure 5: Cross model policy evaluation.** We evaluate MuZero’s behavior policy at training step Y (column) with the learned model at training step X (row) and measure the value prediction error. Results are aggregated over states sampled from MuZero’s on-policy state distribution at training step X (same as model).

### 3.5 How accurately can MuZero’s learned model from one training step evaluate the behavior policy of the same agent from another training step?

In our last experiment, we investigated the generalization capability of the learned model in predicting values for policies that differ from the behavior policy. We accomplished this by considering all action sequences of length  $h$  at each state, possibly including actions that are unlikely to be taken by any sensible policy. In this experiment, we conduct a similar analysis but with a focus on more interesting policies. Specifically, we assess the accuracy with which the model at training step X (row) can evaluate the policy (of the same agent) at training step Y (column). The idea is that if a model cannot accurately evaluate high-performing future policies, planning with it would not be effective in finding a good policy. For this experiment, we set the evaluation horizon for each environment to the number of unrolling steps during training. Results are aggregated over states sampled from MuZero’s on-policy state distribution at training step X (same per row as the model). Note that errors at different model steps (rows) are not directly comparable due to the different state distributions.

It is clear from Figure 5 that models at all training steps are most accurate when evaluating policies at the same training steps, as the error per row is smallest at the diagonal. This aligns with our earlier finding: learned models are more accurate when assessing action sequences with a higher selection likelihood by the current behavior policy. Notably, we can see that using early models to evaluate future policies results in large errors in Cart Pole and Lunar Lander. This may have important implications for policy improvement: *if the model at the current training step cannot accurately evaluate a future policy, which performs better, then the extent to which we can improve our current policy will be limited.* Intuitively, if the model does not know a high-performing policy is good, then a deeper search in the model would not help us find the policy. This phenomenon is less evident in Breakout, possibly because the evaluation horizon is too short in this environment to allow for an observable difference in rewards across the policies (5 vs 10 in the other environments).


## 4 POLICY IMPROVEMENT EXPERIMENTS

Our policy evaluation experiments indicate that MuZero’s learned model can become increasingly inaccurate when evaluating policies differing from the data collection policy, particularly those unseen during training. In this section, we investigate the natural follow-up question, the question that we are most interested in: what is the effect of this on policy improvement through planning?

Intuitively, if the agent is given the ground-truth model and has an infinite budget for planning, then it can act optimally by searching exhaustively with the model. In this case, the sample efficiency is maximized because the agent does not need any sample from the environment for learning. However, in real-world scenarios, there’s always a constraint on planning budget, both during training and deployment. To improve planning with these constraints, AlphaZero and MuZero employ a learned policy prior to guide the action simulation in MCTS. If the policy prior is well-trained, it can greatly enhance planning, but if not, it might diminish efficiency.

We evaluate planning using MuZero’s learned model both with and without the guidance of the policy prior. In the latter case, we replace the policy prior with a uniform prior, allowing for a form of “free search”. To focus on evaluating the contribution of the learned model, we modify MuZero’s MCTS by replacing the value network’s predictions at leaf nodes with random rollouts in the model, a standard approach to estimating the value of a leaf node in MCTS. To address the computational costs of long rollouts in neural models, we restrict the planning horizon to  $\{16, 128, 32\}$  in Cart Pole, Lunar Lander, and Atari Breakout. For comparison, we include the baselines of the policy prior and planning with the ground-truth model using the same MCTS. The goal of this experiment is to answer two questions: (a) how effectively does MuZero’s learned model support free search? (b) to what extent can MuZero improve its policy by planning with the learned model?

We present our results in Figure 6. In Cart Pole, MuZero’s learned model exhibits some degree of support for free search (orange dashed) after some training. However, it significantly underperforms compared to free search with the ground-truth model (green dashed) in terms of both planning efficiency and asymptotic performance. In Lunar Lander and Atari Breakout, free search with



**Figure 6: MCTS planning with (i) MuZero’s learned model (orange) and (ii) the ground-truth model (green), under the guidance of (a) MuZero’s policy prior (solid line) and (b) the uniform prior (dotted line)). The X-axis is the number of simulations per step and the Y-axis is the episodic return.**

the learned model (orange dashed) fails completely. Consequently, the potential for finding a good policy through planning with the learned model will be effectively limited.

In Cart Pole and Lunar Lander, with enough MCTS simulations, planning with the learned model improves performance over using the policy prior alone. However, it is evident that the extent to which we can improve upon the policy prior via planning is still very limited compared to the ground-truth model. This is a clear sign that the model error is restricting the extent to which we can further improve the policy by planning. In Atari Breakout, while planning with more simulations using the learned model improves the agent’s performance, it cannot outperform the policy prior.

One interesting observation is that when comparing planning with the policy prior to planning with the uniform prior, there is consistently a larger gap for the learned model compared to the ground-truth model except in Atari Breakout. Furthermore, unlike the ground-truth model, it does not seem that the gap for the learned model will quickly collapse with more simulations,

suggesting an additional role of the policy prior beyond accelerating MCTS. According to the results in Figure 4, action sequences with higher probabilities of being selected by the behavior policy tend to be more accurately evaluated by the learned model. As the policy prior is directly learned to match the behavior policy, it is reasonable to assume that the values of action sequences favored by the policy prior can also be more accurately predicted by the learned model. This suggests that *apart from biasing the search, the policy prior may also serve to prevent the search from exploring directions where the learned model is less accurate.*

## 5 DISCUSSION

*Limitation.* In this study, we analyzed MuZero, it being one of the most successful DMBRL methods, while at the same time being supported by the clean principle of value equivalence. The conclusions we draw can therefore not be directly generalized to other DMBRL methods, certainly not those that employ other auxiliary loss functions on top e.g., [6, 29, 31]. However, our analysis clearly

shows that despite its elegant simplicity, using the value equivalence principle does not imply that we learn models that are actually value equivalent. Even when restricting the predictions to its own behavior policy, MuZero’s learned model leads to prediction errors that quickly grow with the horizon of prediction. As such, our study does serve as a warning for other DMBRL methods that aim to use only value equivalence as their guiding principle.

*Outlook.* We have demonstrated that MuZero’s model, trained with a value-equivalence-based loss, struggles to generalize and predict values accurately for unseen or unfamiliar policies. This raises the question of how different losses for model learning would behave and compare in our analysis, such as the reconstruction-based loss [12–14, 32] and the recently proposed temporal-consistency [4, 29, 31]. Specifically, we hypothesize that while the value equivalence loss is the most flexible loss as it does not directly impose requirements on state representation, other losses may have an advantage in generalization when data is limited thanks to the richer supervision signal. Another exciting direction for future research is to explore the role of the learned model beyond policy improvement through planning, such as its impact on exploration.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we empirically studied the models learned by MuZero. Our analysis focuses on two questions: (1) to what extent does MuZero learn a value equivalent model? and (2) to what extent does the learned model support effective policy improvement by planning? We find that MuZero’s learned model cannot generally evaluate policies accurately, especially those that further deviate from the data collection policy. The failure of the model to predict values for policies that are out of the training distribution prevents effective planning from scratch and limits the extent to which MuZero can additionally improve its policy via planning, which might be crucial for its sample efficiency.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Anthony, Zheng Tian, and David Barber. 2017. Thinking fast and slow with deep learning and tree search. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [2] Dimitri Bertsekas. 2022. *Lessons from AlphaZero for optimal, model predictive, and adaptive control*. Athena Scientific.
- [3] Cameron B Browne, Edward Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M Lucas, Peter I Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. 2012. A survey of monte carlo tree search methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in games* 4, 1 (2012), 1–43.
- [4] Joery A. de Vries, Ken S. Voskuil, Thomas M. Moerland, and Aske Plaat. 2021. Visualizing MuZero Models. *arXiv:2102.12924* (March 2021).
- [5] Jonas Degraeve, Federico Felici, Jonas Buchli, Michael Neunert, Brendan Tracey, Francesco Carpanese, Timo Ewalds, Roland Hafner, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Diego de las Casas, Craig Donner, Leslie Fritz, Cristian Galperti, Andrea Huber, James Keeling, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jackie Kay, Antoine Merle, Jean-Marc Moret, Seb Noury, Federico Pesamosca, David Pfau, Olivier Sauter, Cristian Sommariva, Stefano Coda, Basil Duval, Ambrogio Fasoli, Pushmeet Kohli, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, and Martin Riedmiller. 2022. Magnetic control of tokamak plasmas through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* (Feb. 2022).
- [6] Carles Gelada, Saurabh Kumar, Jacob Buckman, Ofir Nachum, and Marc G. Belle-mare. 2019. DeepMDP: Learning Continuous Latent Space Models for Representation Learning. In *ICML*.
- [7] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florent Althé, Yunhao Tang, Thomas Hubert, Michal Valko, Ioannis Antonoglou, and Remi Munos. 2020. Monte-Carlo Tree Search as Regularized Policy Optimization. In *ICML*. 3769–3778.
- [8] Christopher Grimm, André Barreto, Gregory Farquhar, David Silver, and Satinder Singh. 2021. Proper value equivalence. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 34. 7773–7786.
- [9] Christopher Grimm, André Barreto, and Satinder Singh. 2022. Approximate Value Equivalence. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 35.

- [10] Christopher Grimm, André Barreto, Satinder Singh, and David Silver. 2020. The Value Equivalence Principle for Model-Based Reinforcement Learning. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 33. 5541–5552.
- [11] David Ha and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2018. World Models. *arXiv e-prints*, Article arXiv:1803.10122 (March 2018), arXiv:1803.10122 pages. arXiv:1803.10122 [cs.LG]
- [12] Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Jimmy Ba, and Mohammad Norouzi. 2019. Dream to Control: Learning Behaviors by Latent Imagination. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [13] Danijar Hafner, Timothy P Lillicrap, Mohammad Norouzi, and Jimmy Ba. 2021. Mastering Atari with Discrete World Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0oabwyZbOu>
- [14] Danijar Hafner, Jurgis Pasukonis, Jimmy Ba, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2023. Mastering diverse domains through world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04104* (2023).
- [15] Jessica B Hamrick, Abram L Friesen, Feryal Behbahani, Arthur Guez, Fabio Viola, Sims Witherspoon, Thomas Anthony, Lars Holger Buesing, Petar Veličković, and Theophane Weber. 2021. On the role of planning in model-based deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [16] Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. 2006. Bandit based Monte-Carlo planning. In *European conference on machine learning*, Vol. 4212 LNAI. 282–293.
- [17] Nathan Lambert, Kristofer Pister, and Roberto Calandra. 2022. Investigating compounding prediction errors in learned dynamics models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09637* (2022).
- [18] Lihong Li, Thomas J. Walsh, and Michael L. Littman. 2006. Towards a Unified Theory of State Abstraction for MDPs. In *International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Mathematics, AI&Math 2006, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, January 4-6, 2006*.
- [19] Fan-Ming Luo, Tian Xu, Hang Lai, Xiong-Hui Chen, Weinan Zhang, and Yang Yu. 2022. A survey on model-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09328* (2022).
- [20] Dhruv Madeka, Kari Torkkola, Carson Eisenach, Anna Luo, Dean P. Foster, and Sham M. Kakade. 2022. Deep Inventory Management. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv:2210.03137> arXiv:2210.03137 [cs, math].
- [21] Amol Mandhane, Anton Zhernov, Maribeth Rauh, Chenjie Gu, Miaosen Wang, Flora Xue, Wendy Shang, Derek Pang, Rene Claus, Ching-Han Chiang, Cheng Chen, Jingning Han, Angie Chen, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Jackson Broshear, Julian Schrittwieser, Thomas Hubert, Oriol Vinyals, and Timothy Mann. 2022. MuZero with Self-competition for Rate Control in VP9 Video Compression. arXiv:2202.06626.
- [22] Andrew K. McCallum. 1995. *Reinforcement Learning with Selective Perception and Hidden State*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Rochester.
- [23] Azalia Mirhoseini, Anna Goldie, Mustafa Yazgan, Joe Wenjie Jiang, Ebrahim Songhori, Shen Wang, Young-Joon Lee, Eric Johnson, Omkar Pathak, Azade Nazi, Jiwoo Pak, Andy Tong, Kavya Srinivasa, William Hang, Emre Tuncer, Quoc V. Le, James Laudon, Richard Ho, Roger Carpenter, and Jeff Dean. 2021. A graph placement methodology for fast chip design. *Nature* 594, 7862 (June 2021), 207–212.
- [24] Thomas M Moerland, Joost Broekens, Aske Plaat, Catholijn M Jonker, et al. 2023. Model-based reinforcement learning: A survey. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 16, 1 (2023), 1–118.
- [25] Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Thomas Hubert, Karen Simonyan, Laurent Sifre, Simon Schmitt, Arthur Guez, Edward Lockhart, Demis Hassabis, and Thore Graepel. 2020. Mastering atari, go, chess and shogi by planning with a learned model. *Nature* 588, 7839 (2020), 604–609.
- [26] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, Karen Simonyan, and Demis Hassabis. 2018. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science* 362, 6419 (Dec. 2018), 1140–1144.
- [27] Richard S. Sutton. 1991. Dyna, an integrated architecture for learning, planning, and reacting. *ACM SIGART Bulletin* 2, 4 (July 1991), 160–163.
- [28] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. 2018. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT press.
- [29] Elise Van der Pol, Thomas Kipf, Frans A. Oliehoek, and Max Welling. 2020. Plannable Approximations to MDP Homomorphisms: Equivariance under Actions. In *AAIAS*.
- [30] Aurélie Hainaut Werner Duvaud. 2019. MuZero General: Open Reimplementation of MuZero. <https://github.com/werner-duvaud/muzero-general>.
- [31] Weirui Ye, Shaohuai Liu, Thanard Kurutach, Pieter Abbeel, and Yang Gao. 2021. Mastering Atari Games with Limited Data. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 25476–25488.
- [32] Łukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Babaeizadeh, Piotr Milos, Blażej Osiański, Roy H Campbell, Konrad Czechowski, Dumitru Erhan, Chelsea Finn, Piotr Kozakowski, Sergey Levine, Afroz Mohiuddin, Ryan Sepassi, George Tucker, and Henryk Michalewski. 2020. Model Based Reinforcement Learning for Atari. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1xCPJHtDB>



# Appendices

## A TRAINING OF MUZERO AGENTS

### A.1 Setup and Hyperparameters

Hyperparameter	Cart Pole	Lunar Lander
Random seeds	0 to 29	0 to 29
Discount factor	0.997	0.999
Total training steps	<b>100000</b>	<b>1000000</b>
Optimizer	Adam	Adam
Initial Learning Rate	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.005</b>
Learning Rate Decay Rate	<b>0.1</b>	<b>No decay</b>
Learning Rate Decay Steps	<b>50000</b>	<b>No decay</b>
Weight Decay	1e-4	1e-4
Momentum	0.9	0.9
Batch Size	128	64
Encoding size	8	10
Fully-connected Layer Size	16	64
Root Dirichlet Alpha	0.25	0.25
Root Dirichlet Fraction	0.25	0.25
Prioritized Experience Replay Alpha	0.5	0.5
Num Unroll Steps	10	10
TD Steps	50	30
Support Size	10	10
Value Loss Weight	1.0	1.0
Replay Buffer Size	500	<b>500</b>
Visit Softmax Temperature Fn	1.0 $\rightarrow$ (5e4) 0.5 $\rightarrow$ (7.5e4) 0.25	0.35

Table 1: Hyperparameters for training MuZero agents in Cart Pole and Lunar Lander. We used default values for most of the hyperparameters. The bold values are those that we tuned to improve the convergence of the agents.

Hyperparameter	Atari Breakout
Random seeds	0 to 9
Total training steps	500000
Learning Rate	0.1 $\rightarrow$ 0.01 with an exponential decay rate of 0.1
Replay Buffer Size	100000
Visit Softmax Temperature Fn	1.0 (fixed throughout training)

Table 2: Hyperparameters for training MuZero agents in Atari Breakout. We used default values from EfficientZero [31] (see Appendix A.1 Table 6) for those hyperparameters that are not mentioned in the table.

For Cart Pole and Lunar Lander, we trained 30 MuZero agents using an open-source implementation of MuZero [30], which is available on GitHub (under the MIT license). The implementation has been extensively tested on various classic RL environments, including Cart Pole and Lunar Lander. While we mostly used the default recommended hyperparameter values from [30], we fine-tuned a few of them to improve the convergence of agents. The comprehensive list of hyperparameters for training MuZero agents in these environments can be found in Table 1. For Atari Breakout, we trained 10 MuZero agents using the official implementation of EfficientZero [31], *excluding* the additional improvements introduced by EfficientZero. This implementation is also available on GitHub (under the GPL-3.0 license). At the time of this research, this was the only plausible way to train MuZero agents in Atari games. See Table 2 for the hyperparameters.

Regarding computation, training each MuZero agent took around 3 hours for Cart Pole and 20 hours for Lunar Lander, using 8 CPUs. For Atari Breakout, it took around 40 hours per agent using 2 GPUs and 48 CPUs. The training was conducted on a shared internal cluster equipped with a variety of CPU types and GPU types (2080Ti/V100/A40).

## A.2 Learning Curves




Figure 7: Full learning curves of MuZero agents in Cart Pole (Left), Lunar Lander (Middle), and Atari Breakout (Right).

In Figure 2, we plot the online performance of MuZero agents at various training steps for running both the policy prior and the behavior policy. There, actions are sampled from policies. In Figure 7, we plot the full learning curves. When running MuZero's behavior policy greedily, we do not add Dirichlet noise to the policy prior during tree search.