

Foundations for Transfer in Reinforcement Learning: A Taxonomy of Knowledge Modalities

Markus Wulfmeier¹, Arunkumar Byravan¹, Sarah Bechtle¹, Karol Hausman¹ and Nicolas Heess¹

¹Google DeepMind

Contemporary artificial intelligence systems exhibit rapidly growing abilities accompanied by the growth of required resources, expansive datasets and corresponding investments into computing infrastructure. Although earlier successes predominantly focused on constrained settings, recent strides in fundamental research and applications aspire to create increasingly general systems. This evolving landscape presents a dual panorama of opportunities and challenges in refining the generalisation and transfer of knowledge - the extraction from existing sources and adaptation as a comprehensive foundation for tackling new problems. Within the domain of reinforcement learning (RL), the representation of knowledge manifests through various modalities, including dynamics and reward models, value functions, policies, and the original data. This taxonomy systematically targets these modalities and frames its discussion based on their inherent properties and alignment with different objectives and mechanisms for transfer. Where possible, we aim to provide coarse guidance delineating approaches which address requirements such as limiting environment interactions, maximising computational efficiency, and enhancing generalisation across varying axes of change. Finally, we analyse reasons contributing to the prevalence or scarcity of specific forms of transfer, the inherent potential behind pushing these frontiers, and underscore the significance of transitioning from designed to learned transfer.

Contents

1	Introduction	2	4.1	Preparation	12
2	Knowledge Modalities in Reinforcement Learning	4	4.2	Application: Generalisation and Adaptation	12
2.1	Reinforcement Learning Formalism	4	5	Knowledge Modalities in Transfer	14
2.2	Model-based & Model-free Reinforcement Learning	4	5.1	Data	14
2.3	Knowledge Modalities	5	5.2	Dynamics Models	17
2.3.1	Data	6	5.3	Reward Models	19
2.3.2	Dynamics Models	7	5.4	Value Functions	20
2.3.3	Reward Models	7	5.5	Policies	23
2.3.4	Value Functions	7	6	Discussions and Conclusions	27
2.3.5	Policies	8	6.1	Connections and Trade-offs	28
2.4	The Role of Representations	8	6.1.1	Comparing Knowledge Modalities	28
3	Transfer Learning Background	8	6.1.2	Comparing Transfer Mechanisms	30
3.1	Transfer Definition	8	6.2	Benchmarks for Transfer Learning	31
3.2	Transfer Targets	9	6.3	Ongoing and New Trends	33
3.3	Transfer Metrics	9	6.3.1	Modularity & Distributed Learning	33
3.4	Connections to Multi-Task and Meta RL	10	6.3.2	In-Context & Meta Learning	34
3.5	Connections to Continual and Lifelong Learning	11	6.3.3	Large Pre-trained & Foundation Models	35
4	Transfer Mechanisms	11	6.3.4	Large-Scale Data Sources	36
			6.4	Concluding Remarks	37

1. Introduction

*'Ex nihilo nihil fit'*¹ - Nothing comes from nothing. While this principle engenders ongoing discourse in philosophy [Chapman, 2015], in machine learning we have to take a pragmatic stance. Performance and accuracy of our models do not materialize spontaneously but rather rely on different sources of information to effectively model a system. These sources of information are commonly either labor-intensive manual design, or vast quantities of data. Given the nontrivial costs associated with both endeavors, the ability to reuse or transfer previously obtained, relevant information assumes crucial significance for efficient and effective learning.

The reuse and transfer of previously acquired knowledge is prevalent in natural learning in humans and other animals [Spelke et al., 1992]. Nature provides us with ample examples of rapid adaptation to variations in environments, tasks, objects, and even alterations to the embodiment induced by factors such as growth or injury [Wolpert et al., 2001]. This process of transfer is not confined to an individual's lifetime but extends to an evolutionary scale, facilitated by diverse mechanisms, including the transmission of genetic material [Fox et al., 1996]. Indeed, evolution itself has engendered multiple mechanisms for transfer and reuse of information [Michod, 2000], underscoring the inherent relevance of transfer for living beings.

For artificial learning systems, recent triumphs in supervised [He et al., 2019, Huh et al., 2016] or self-supervised learning [Brown et al., 2020, Devlin et al., 2018, Grill et al., 2020] result from the transfer of large pre-trained models, often referred to as foundation models (FMs) [Bommasani et al., 2021], which can be adapted to new tasks requiring only relatively small amounts of additional data. In reinforcement learning, where the agent actively shapes its own training data, the impact of transfer compounds. It affects two stages of the optimisation process: The initial model, which can be rendered closer to optimality, and the data distribution, which builds the foundation for all subsequent optimisation. The coalescence of both paths amplifies the importance of effective transfer, especially in active learning settings like reinforcement learning, as opposed to passive scenarios where the dataset remains fixed.

Reinforcement learning (RL) provides a formalism and framework describing the emergence of complex, goal-oriented behaviours through interaction, offering a paradigm more akin to natural learning than the conventional supervised learning from fixed datasets [Sutton and Barto, 2018]. Beyond this conceptual alignment, RL's practical merit, in contrast to supervised learning, lies in its expansive access to data. Less constrained by our ability to assemble suitable datasets, the system determines itself which data is most relevant. Improving this data collection process and define apt optimization criteria includes many challenges and represents an avenue for ongoing research, with the potential for scalability surpassing human-curated datasets in the long term. In nature, this process of acquiring information is continuous - everything is built on top of previously acquired knowledge, creating a perpetually evolving set of abilities. Conversely, in many scenarios in which RL is currently being explored, knowledge is not carried over between learning problems; each solution is learned anew, in isolation and from scratch. Transfer learning has the potential to disrupt this pattern and offers a trajectory where once-acquired knowledge is repurposed and adapted. It not only holds promise for enhancing results but also expedites experimental iteration, thereby accelerating research cycles. The underlying insights that knowledge can generalise or be adapted more effectively transcends machine learning [Taylor and Stone, 2009], finding a place in diverse fields such as psychology [Skinner, 1953, Woodworth and Thorndike, 1901] and biology [Michod, 2000, Wolpert et al., 2001].

¹Parmenides, in Aristotle's *Physica* - Latin version. Its origin lies in philosophical discussions in ancient Greek cosmology as to the questions surrounding a world emerging out of nothing.

Much like the diverse mechanisms employed by natural systems for the storage and adaptation of knowledge, our current reinforcement learning agents exhibit a spectrum of representations for knowledge, encompassing policies, value functions, dynamics models, and reward models — all derived from data as the original source of knowledge. An agent’s ability to transfer or generalise is inseparably connected to the manner in which knowledge is encapsulated and stored. This taxonomy structures its discourse around these *knowledge modalities* (policies, value functions, dynamics models, reward models, and data), their properties and transfer mechanisms. Leveraging these considerations, we classify and analyse various forms of transfer in RL. Consider for intuition the impact of changes in tasks on different modalities, dynamics remain consistent while optimal policies change. Similarly, computational requirements differ strongly for learning and generating behaviour between the two modalities. While a predominant focus within the field centers on the transfer of explicit representations of behavior, such as policies or state-action value functions [Kirk et al., 2021], it is important to underscore how the remaining modalities can facilitate transfer, a more prevalent perspective before the recent surge of successes in deep learning techniques [Taylor and Stone, 2009].

This taxonomy focuses on transfer from a sequential perspective, progressing from an existing knowledge source, whether derived from one or multiple RL experiments or fixed datasets, to improve an RL agent’s abilities during subsequent experiments. We can divide this process into two phases: an initial preparation phase for extracting and preparing knowledge modalities, which is followed by an application phase wherein we deploy and potentially adapt the prepared modalities in a target domain. In the application phase, we will consider both zero-shot generalisation [Kirk et al., 2021] (the direction application of a trained model) as well as more involved processes that require further adaptation or optimisation. Although framing our discussion in terms of sequential transfer, we further consider approaches which have been developed in alternative settings (e.g. multi-task and meta learning) but can be deployed for transfer learning. We highlight these connections where appropriate, offering a comprehensive exploration of transfer methodologies that transcend the application in a sequential setting.

Transfer plays several roles in the long-term development of RL research. Practically, it serves as a catalyst enabling the solution of harder tasks. It creates a strong conceptual connection to natural learning and finally it constitutes an elementary step to create lifelong learning systems. Going forward, it is necessary to reflect on previous ‘bitter lessons’ of research in artificial intelligence [Sutton, 2019]. Historically, a predominant focus has been on transfer from smaller sets of domains or tasks [Taylor and Stone, 2009, Zhu et al., 2020c], where the intricacies of the relationship between original sources and transfer targets assume a disproportionately influential role. Transfer methods have often been tailored to optimize performance for specific relationships, posing limitations on flexibility. To enable increasingly flexible transfer, it is imperative to reduce the amount of manual design and pivot towards learning how to adapt from immense source training distributions, akin to prevalent practices in supervised learning and the domain of large pretrained models. Following the perspective of sequential decision making and RL in this context enables us to scrutinize foundation models in relation to the knowledge modalities, as dynamics or rewards models, value functions or policies.

Our goal is to provide a comprehensive overview of existing research and a systematic categorisation of methods in terms of benefits and trade-offs such as overall performance, data-efficiency, and suitability for specific changes between source and target MDP. In particular, computational cost and ease of implementation have considerable impact on the usefulness of methods for transfer. Although quantifying these properties poses challenges, our commitment is to engage in their qualitative discussion, offering useful insights for informed design choices. This structure allows us to survey the field and steers the discourse towards untapped research opportunities, guiding the discussion towards the potential for improvements in transfer. This taxonomy starts with a discussion of the

reinforcement learning setting in Section 2, delving into the roles and advantages of different knowledge modalities within this context. We proceed with a definition of transfer, an examination of different metrics, and an exploration of related fields in Section 3. Section 4 presents a high-level perspective on diverse transfer methods in a modality-agnostic manner, which is extended to transfer via the specific knowledge modalities in Section 5. We finally conclude in Section 6 with a discussion of the interplay between transfer and various modalities. Here, we illuminate open avenues for research and opportunities as well as current and future challenges for transfer in RL at a time when our ambitions for transfer, datasets, and models grow exponentially. While we aim to provide a broad coverage of the entire field and adjacent areas, the fast-paced nature of this domain inevitably results in some omissions of relevant work. Nonetheless, we trust that our work serves as a valuable guide, providing a comprehensive overview and insightful direction for future research endeavors for those striving to enhance generalization and transfer capabilities in reinforcement learning.

2. Knowledge Modalities in Reinforcement Learning

2.1. Reinforcement Learning Formalism

In reinforcement learning, an agent observes its environment, takes an action, and receives a reward after the state of the environment changes. This can be formalised as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) consisting of the state space \mathcal{S} , the action space \mathcal{A} , and the transition probability $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ of reaching state s_{t+1} from state s_t when executing action a_t . The agent’s behaviour is given in terms of a policy $\pi(a_t|s_t)$. Often, not all aspects of the environment state can be observed. In the resulting case of a Partially Observable MDP, the agent only has access to observations $o_t \in \mathcal{O}$ that are partial mappings of the state $o_t = f(s_t)$. In line with the majority of recent work, we simplify the notation and denote agent inputs as s_t . We only briefly work with the extended notation in later sections when we explicitly discuss the mapping between state and observations.

The agent aims to maximise the sum of discounted future rewards, commonly referred to as returns. This is captured by the objective in Eq. 1 below

$$J(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{[\rho(s_0), p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_t|s_t)]_{t=0 \dots T}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \right], \quad (1)$$

where γ is the discount factor, $r_t = r(s_t, a_t)$ is the reward and $\rho(s_0)$ is the initial state distribution.

For an agent to successfully act in its environment, we need to determine the agent’s optimal behaviour $\pi^*(a_t|s_t)$ which maximises Equation 1. In order to generate optimal behaviour, the agent needs to implicitly understand both the dynamics of a system as well as the task itself, as described by the reward function or additional observations. The general assumption in RL is that both the true environment dynamics and the true reward are not known in advance; instead they can only be estimated via interaction with the environment.

2.2. Model-based & Model-free Reinforcement Learning

Optimal behaviour can be generated in different ways. In general, methods can be split into *model-free* and *model-based* approaches, respectively directly optimising behaviour or intermediately estimating explicit modalities for reward and dynamics.

Model-free approaches directly optimise the agent’s policy or the state-action value function. Often even direct policy learning is supported via estimating a state-action value function (also described as critic) or state value function via dynamic programming or Monte Carlo estimation. Alternatively,




Figure 1 | The different knowledge modalities and most common connections among them. Optimal behaviour can be derived either from a single or multiple modalities. The detailed description of these connections is provided in Section 2.

model-based methods fit a dynamics model to estimate the transition function and can additionally learn a reward model or use a defined ground truth reward. In a second step, they either apply model predictive control or learn the policy or value function by interacting with the learnt models. All approaches rely on data to extract these functions, either from interaction with an environment or an existing dataset.

2.3. Knowledge Modalities

We can estimate one or several of the following functions from existing data to represent specific types of knowledge.

- **Policy** $\pi(a_t|s_t)$ - a mapping from states to actions directly describing the agent’s behaviour.
- **State/State-Action Value Function** $V_\pi(s_t)/Q_\pi(s_t, a_t)$ - a function that maps from states (or state-action pairs) to the expected future return when acting under a particular policy π .
- **Dynamics Model** of the environment $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ - a function that predicts the next state given the current state and action.
- **Reward Model** $r(s_t, a_t)$ - a function predicting the reward provided by the environment for a specific state-action pair.

We will refer to these functions as “Knowledge Modalities” (KMs). Each of them characterises a specific aspect of the information extracted by RL agents from the MDP (such as transition dynamics, reward or (optimal) behaviour). Data, commonly the agent’s experience, constitutes the underlying source of raw information which can be distilled into each of the modalities discussed above. By representing unprocessed information rather than a specific mapping, it provides an important mechanism for transfer and is therefore included as another knowledge modality. Each of these modalities provides a different angle to the transfer of information, has different properties with respect to generalisation and adaptation, and will be suited under different circumstances. Therefore, we structure this taxonomy of transfer learning through the lens of these knowledge modalities. Figure 1 visualises

the connections between the different knowledge modalities together with common mechanisms for conversion across them. We will discuss these high-level ideas in further detail in Sections 5 and 6.

Going forward, we will denote the transition dataset used for learning with D . From transitions in D it is possible to directly estimate models for

$$\begin{aligned} \{s_t, a_t\} &\rightarrow \pi_b(a_t|s_t) \\ \{s_t, a_t, r_t\} &\rightarrow r(s_t, a_t) \\ \{s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}\} &\rightarrow p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We use π_b to denote the behavioural policy that generated the data and which, in general, does not have to be optimal for any task. All of these knowledge modalities are direct in the sense that it is possible to observe and learn directly from a subset of the data.

In contrast, the state and state-action value functions (or critic), respectively V^π and Q^π (for any policy π), and the policy π itself require further expensive data processing. There are exceptions such as when the data stems from an optimal expert and the behaviour policy is already the optimal, but in general these modalities have higher computational costs due to the aggregation of information across transitions. The optimal policy π^* maximises the expected future return described in Equation 1 and the optimal value functions V^* and Q^* are simply the value functions for the optimal policy (i.e. $V^* = V^{\pi^*}$, $Q^* = Q^{\pi^*}$). In general, we can write the equations for the value functions as follows with the Monte Carlo estimates (determined over complete trajectories) in Equations 3 and 5 and the Temporal Difference estimates (determined over individual transitions) in Equations 4 and 6:

$$Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = r(s_t, a_t) + \mathbb{E}_{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_{t+1}|s_{t+1})} \left[\sum_{t'=t+1}^T [\gamma^{t'-t} r(s_{t'}, a_{t'})] \right] \quad (3)$$

$$= r(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_{t+1}|s_{t+1})} [Q^\pi(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})] \quad (4)$$

and

$$V^\pi(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_t|s_t)} \left[\sum_{t'=t}^T [\gamma^{t'-t} r(s_{t'}, a_{t'})] \right] \quad (5)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t), \pi(a_t|s_t)} [r(s_t, a_t) + \gamma V^\pi(s_{t+1})] \quad (6)$$

In the rest of this section, we will discuss the properties of these knowledge modalities and approaches to generating (optimal) behaviour from each of them. We will build upon these concepts in later sections to cover the transfer of different modalities.

2.3.1. Data

Data includes the raw information from which the other modalities are distilled. It provides information about the transition dynamics, the agent's objective via the rewards, and the underlying behaviour policy which generated the dataset. Note, the latter is often not equal to the optimal policy. Data can be used to learn a value function or policy using model-free offline RL algorithms. It further can be used to first estimate a dynamics model and reward function to perform model-predictive control or model-based RL.

Even incomplete data can be useful. When any aspect is missing, information about the remaining parts can be extracted. Imagine data with missing or sparse information about rewards. Here, we can still fit a model for the dynamics or the behaviour policy [Pomerleau, 1988]. Given sufficient assumptions, we can further indirectly extract information about missing components. For example,

if the rewards are unavailable but we assume the data to be expert trajectories, we can apply inverse reinforcement learning to train a reward function [Ng and Russell, 2000]. While first person experience in the form of states and actions is the most versatile form of data, state-only sequences or sequences of third-person observations include relevant information but may be more restricted in the inferences they allow and the processing that is needed to generate (optimal) behaviour. In summary, data enables all further modalities. From it, we can extract parametric functions either online during interaction with an environment or offline via supervised learning or offline RL. However, data is limited as in order to generate behaviour, we generally need to first extract a function for any of the other modalities.

2.3.2. Dynamics Models

Dynamics models capture the underlying transition dynamics of the agent embodiment and its environment. Model learning is usually formulated as (self-)supervised learning (estimating the conditional transition density $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$ or deterministic transition function $s_{t+1} = f(s_t, a_t)$) [Sutton, 1991].

The predominant way to use dynamics models to generate behaviour is via model-based planning within a model-predictive control loop [Garcia et al., 1989, Mayne, 2014, Morari and Lee, 1999]. To generate a single action, the dynamics model has to be evaluated multiple times, which can be both computationally more expensive as well as accumulate errors across steps. Other ways to leverage models directly within the policy optimisation process can be broadly categorised as distilling knowledge from the model into a policy or value function. Examples include using the model to generate imagined transitions for model-free RL or value gradients for policy training. These approaches commonly require access to a reward function – either learned or pre-specified.

2.3.3. Reward Models

Models of the reward may be learned via supervised learning of the probabilistic ($p(r_t|s_t, a_t)$) or the deterministic model $r_t = g(s_t, a_t)$. In some cases reward models can also be inferred from reward-free trajectories if we assume they are generated by task experts, for example, via inverse reinforcement learning [Ng and Russell, 2000].

Given access to both the dynamics and reward models, we can generate optimal behaviour as previously discussed. If only the reward model is available, information about the dynamics has to be additionally provided. For example, we can apply model-free offline RL with a dataset containing only state transitions in combination with a learned reward model. Generally, behaviour generation with reward models relates to dynamics models in terms of computational cost as well as accumulation of errors.

2.3.4. Value Functions

Unlike dynamics models or rewards which directly represent per-transition properties of the underlying environment or task, value functions make aggregated predictions about the future. In particular, a state-action value function or critic $Q^\pi(s, a)$ predicts the return obtained with a particular policy π , as a function of the current state-action pair (while state value functions $V^\pi(s)$ condition on the state alone). Consequently, it entangles information about the system dynamics, agent behaviour and objective function. Value functions can be optimised either via Monte Carlo (MC) methods [Michie and Chambers, 1968] or Temporal Difference (TD) learning [Sutton and Barto, 1990], the latter enables partial verification of the value function from individual transitions via the TD error.

Behaviour can be generated from state-action value functions either by performing non-parametric

optimisation over sampled actions or by amortising this step by sampling actions from a parametric policy that is trained in parallel (e.g. in the actor-critic setting). Pure state value functions fulfil a different role in RL and are often constrained to actor-critic algorithms to accelerate or stabilise learning a policy. Several sub-classes of value functions provide additional flexibility and preferable properties for transfer and generalisation which are covered in more detail in Section 5.

2.3.5. Policies

Policies represent behaviour as deterministic $a = \pi(s)$ or stochastic mappings $\pi(a|s)$ from states to actions and are directly trained to maximise the future returns. This optimisation can be done either directly from perceived rewards [Williams, 1992] or via the intermediate step of learned state-action value functions [Witten, 1977] or dynamics models [Sutton, 1991].

Generating behaviour with policies is low-cost compared to other approaches such as on-the-fly optimization with MPC, as function outputs have to be computed only once. Sub-optimal policies can be further used as starting point for fast refinement by guiding exploration as well as reducing the learning problem. For example, we can use stochastic policies as a proposal distributions in model-based RL [Silver et al., 2016, Wang and Ba, 2019] or prior to perform additional re-weighting or filtering (e.g. using a Q-function) for action selection in the model-free case [Barreto et al., 2018, Galashov et al., 2020].

2.4. The Role of Representations

The transfer of representations has an important role across the research landscape to simplify and improve the training of policies, value, or other functions. In practice, representations are commonly integrated within RL agents through the use in one or several of the discussed modalities. For this reason, we are discussing relevant work directly within the context of each modality. There are several useful resources for a separate discussion and explicit focus on different forms of representation learning [Bengio et al., 2013, Finlayson, 2020, Schölkopf, 2019].

3. Transfer Learning Background

This section discusses general goals and metrics for transfer in RL and connects to related fields. We begin by discussing a broad definition for transfer to capture key aspects and structure the taxonomy, and create bridges to prior work [Lazaric, 2012, Taylor and Stone, 2009],

3.1. Transfer Definition

We formalise transfer in reinforcement learning as a process where knowledge extracted in a source MDP \mathcal{M}_S (or a set or distribution thereof) - either directly via interaction or via an intermediate dataset - is used to improve performance and accelerate learning in a target MDPs \mathcal{M}_T (or a set or distribution thereof). The objective function of transfer in RL can be intuitively expressed as:

$$J^T(\pi_T, \mathbf{KM}_S) = \mathbf{E}_{\rho_T(s_0), p_T(s'|s, \mathbf{a}), \pi_T(\mathbf{a}|s, \mathbf{KM}_S)} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_T(\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t),$$

where subscript S and T correspond to the source and target MDPs respectively and \mathbf{KM}_S corresponds to the knowledge modality being transferred from the source domain. While we use Equation 3.1 to describe the *single source MDP single target MDP* setting for simplicity, a distribution over MDPs is possible for both aspects. Generally, this transfer setting assumes that the agent cannot collect

further information from the source MDP \mathcal{M}_S once transferred and interacting with the target MDP \mathcal{M}_T . It can however take advantage of the transferred knowledge modalities. If there is no additional training in \mathcal{M}_T , we evaluate generalisation or 0-shot performance and, if we continue training, we can evaluate adaptation performance via the metrics discussed in Section 3.3.

We are using the term $\pi_T(\mathbf{a}|\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{KM}_S)$ not to denote an explicitly represented policy but from a more general perspective. Instead of inference of an explicit policy mapping from states to actions, it describes any optimisation mechanisms which generates this mapping. This includes the simple execution of a function for the policy, but also planning with a model and even learning a new mapping using information from \mathbf{KM}_S . It serves as common representation for all paths of transferring knowledge modalities discussed later in Sections 5.

3.2. Transfer Targets

We previously defined transfer in RL as a process that allows the agent to improve performance in the target MDP \mathcal{M}_T based on prior knowledge extracted from a source MDP \mathcal{M}_S via interaction or corresponding dataset. Different changes of the MDP can cause the need for transfer and we will refer to them as *transfer targets*.

Common targets are given by new tasks (described by new reward functions [Kalashnikov et al., 2021, Teh et al., 2017]), system dynamics (e.g. when transferring from simulation to real hardware [Nagabandi et al., 2018a, Yu et al., 2017], changes in the mapping from states to observations (e.g. lighting or other visual changes [Bousmalis et al., 2018, Wulfmeier et al., 2017a]), or changes in the initial state distribution (e.g. in autonomous or reset-free RL [Gupta et al., 2021, Zhu et al., 2020a]). One step further we can also consider changes in the state or action space (e.g. when transferring from general, non-robotic data for applications in robotics [Chen et al., 2021a, Smith et al., 2019] or between different robotic embodiments [Truong et al., 2021, Zakka et al., 2022]). Overall, different transfer targets often favor different methods which we will further discuss in Section 5.

3.3. Transfer Metrics

While the principal objective of transfer learning is captured by the performance of the agent in the target MDP \mathcal{M}_T , we can use additional criteria to disentangle different facets of the impact of transfer. Extending further than pure unsupervised or supervised learning with existing, pre-defined datasets, the problem of transfer is particularly important in reinforcement learning. In addition to affecting the initial transferred function and therefore the starting point of the optimisation, transfer can affect the future training data distribution by guiding exploration. In order to cover these facets, there are multiple key metrics to describe the effectiveness of transfer in RL:

1. initial performance of the source agent in the target MDP \mathcal{M}_T ,
2. amount of target data required to reach a certain performance in \mathcal{M}_T ,
3. asymptotic performance of the agent additionally trained on data from \mathcal{M}_T

The first metric displayed in Fig. 2 describes 0-shot performance or generalisation of a transferred agent without further training in the target domain. The other two provide different perspectives on the effectiveness and efficiency of adaptation or how well an agent performs after additional training ².

²See Taylor and Stone [2009] for further perspectives on related metrics .




Figure 2 | The principal performance metrics for transfer in RL. Without further training we can measure pure generalisation via an agent’s initial performance. Adaptation can be measured both via time to a specified threshold performance or the agent’s asymptotic performance after convergence.

As the metrics above focus on the data efficiency and performance, it is important to investigate and understand other relevant aspects of transfer. In particular computational and memory requirements critically affect cost and time required for experimentation. If a mechanism or modality requires vast computational resources, we are limited to specific hardware and in the extreme case might not be able to generate behaviour in real time during inference [Brohan et al., 2023, Schubert et al., 2023]. Further metrics can include interpretability, naturalness, robustness, and safety of the transferred behaviour, as well as ease of implementation and use. While these are important aspects for any sub-field of machine learning, we will focus the discussion on the most common, limited resources with performance, data-efficiency and computational cost.

3.4. Connections to Multi-Task and Meta RL

The problem formulation of meta reinforcement learning [Duan et al., 2016, Finn et al., 2017, Schmidhuber, 1994, Wang et al., 2016] shares many commonalities with the transfer learning setting. Indeed, meta learning can be considered as a special case of transfer learning: given access to a distribution of source MDPs, meta learning directly optimises an agent’s ability to transfer efficiently (e.g. with regards to variants of the criteria listed above). Transfer learning, in general, is less prescriptive and does not necessarily explicitly optimise for fast adaptation.

A narrow view of multi-task RL, in contrast to sequential transfer, does not inherently distinguish between training and transfer. Multi-task RL assumes that all the tasks of interest are solved simultaneously, while the term transfer learning frequently implies a sequential scenario. Multi-task learning assumes access to the source MDP \mathcal{M}_s throughout training, while transfer learning assumes that \mathcal{M}_s cannot be accessed during transfer, but only during the preparation phase. For a broader overview of multi-task learning we refer to [Caruana, 1997, Crawshaw, 2020].

These distinctions, while important, are orthogonal to the main categorisation of knowledge modalities of this taxonomy and for this survey, it is highly relevant to connect to the use of different modalities in multi-task and meta RL works as examples of mechanisms for transfer.




Figure 3 | Knowledge modalities in transfer. Top: preparation of KM involves learning from dataset or environment interaction which the potential application of meta learning. In the target domain, different transfer mechanisms exist to adapt to new tasks, we can coarsely categorise these as: fine-tuning, transfer of representations, composition, conditioning, and indirect transfer. We provide detailed descriptions regarding these categories for each KM in Section 5.

3.5. Connections to Continual and Lifelong Learning

Transfer in RL is intimately connected to the field of continual or lifelong learning [Parisi et al., 2019, Ring et al., 1994, Thrun, 1998]. In fact, it can be considered as an elementary building block of a system that learns continually: transfer in RL allows an agent to quickly acquire a new behaviour, but it is not explicitly concerned with many of the challenges associated with scenarios in which agents are required to repeatedly acquire new behaviours or skills (like growing knowledge representations, or catastrophic forgetting [Goodfellow et al., 2013, Kirkpatrick et al., 2017]). Thus, while there exist differences, we believe that many of the challenges encountered in transfer learning scenarios are also fundamental for continual learning scenarios and advances in the former will transfer to the latter.

4. Transfer Mechanisms

Following the discussion of transfer learning as a field and its connections to relevant areas, this section provides a broad overview of mechanisms relevant for transfer across all modalities. We can loosely split the transfer problem into two stages: preparation and application. Preparation denotes any agent interaction with the source MDP. Examples can include training a policy either with direct environment interaction or offline from data from the source MDP. Application refers to both initial 0-shot generalisation and further adaptation. Figure 3 provides a schematic visualisation of different mechanisms with generic input output pairs to cover all modalities.

All modalities can be largely prepared in the same ways and we will cover the preparation in this section. The application, including mechanisms for adaptation, will then be discussed separately for each modality in Section 5. We will add individual examples for explanatory purpose and expand on breadth and details in the following sections.

4.1. Preparation

A coarse categorisation of mechanisms for the preparation stage includes:

- learning with fixed datasets (unsupervised/self-supervised, supervised learning)
- reinforcement learning (with given rewards or unsupervised)
- meta learning (in combination with any of the above)
- hand-designed/engineered modalities (e.g. PID controllers)

Supervised and self-supervised/unsupervised learning enable us to extract policies, value functions, dynamics and reward models from existing datasets. For example, this could be training a policy encoder via input reconstruction [Lange and Riedmiller, 2010, Wulfmeier et al., 2021], supervised learning of reward functions [Ebert et al., 2018, Singh et al., 2019], or imitation learning and distillation of policies [Lange and Riedmiller, 2010, Ross et al., 2011, Tirumala et al., 2020]. With reinforcement learning, we can extract these modalities while training on related source MDPs given rewards [Byravan et al., 2020, Wulfmeier et al., 2020a] or when rewards are not given via agent-intrinsic objectives such as curiosity, diversity or empowerment [Eysenbach et al., 2019, Gregor et al., 2017, Groth et al., 2021]. In addition, learning to learn or meta learning [Schmidhuber, 1987, Thrun, 1998] can be introduced into these steps to improve the efficiency of any later adaptation. Finally, we can apply more classical engineering techniques to generate mappings such as a PID controller [Rana et al., 2021] or other manually scripted behaviour [Johannink et al., 2019, Torrey et al., 2007] for the agent’s policy.

4.2. Application: Generalisation and Adaptation

When transferring the resulting modalities to the target MDP, we have multiple options for their application. From a high-level perspective, we can identify two principal schemes. First, we can transfer and directly apply previously learned modalities to generate behaviour as discussed in Section 2, and continue learning. A common example is direct fine-tuning of a transferred policy. Second, we can apply modalities indirectly to affect the optimisation of other modalities which we use to generate behaviour. Staying with the example of policies, we can also regularise a new student policy towards a transferred expert. In order to make use of transferred data, we are commonly required to indirectly integrate it into the training process for other modalities which can be applied to generate behaviour. There is however a small set of exceptions where data is a direct part of the behaviour generating mechanism [Pari et al., 2021] which we will discuss in Section 5.1.

Direct Application of Modalities We will categorise the application of modalities along the following list of mechanisms and provide a very short description with more details and specific examples for each modality to follow in the next section. Many of these mechanisms are orthogonal and complementary and can be combined to improve performance or learning speed. The main mechanisms are:

- generalisation and 0-shot transfer
- fine-tuning
- representation transfer
- hierarchy: conditioning
- hierarchy: composition
- meta learning

In many cases, pure **generalisation or 0-shot transfer** of learned functions has shown impressive results when the target MDP can be treated as close to the distribution of source MDPs [Chapman

and Kaelbling, 1991, Finn and Levine, 2017, Kirk et al., 2021]. A common example is the use of domain randomisation for transfer between simulation and real hardware for robotics [Sadeghi and Levine, 2016, Tobin et al., 2017]. The generalisation setting focuses on the first metric from Section 3: the initial zero-shot performance. Section 2 describes how the different modalities can be used to generate behaviour without further adaptation and discusses the trade-offs involved.

However, there are many scenarios where 0-shot transfer does not suffice and different adaptation methods are required. The simplest mechanism to consider is **fine-tuning** [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006] which continues to train the pre-trained model. One of the key benefits of adapting via fine-tuning is its engineering simplicity. The only requirement is the reloading of a previous modality and the training algorithm can remain unchanged.

Instead of transferring complete instances of modalities and fine-tuning, **transferring representations** [Taylor and Stone, 2007] generally enables the combination of parts from randomly initialised and previously trained models. This mechanism enables transfer across less related domains as similarity is not required with respect to optimal behaviour but only the usefulness of representations for further optimisation [Reid et al., 2022].

The application of **hierarchical RL** provides another, modular perspective to the combination of initialised and transferred modalities. Commonly, a new learned modality can be used to **condition** the transferred one by providing inputs, e.g. by direct optimisation in an embedding space [Peng et al., 2020], or the space of conditioning functions [Heess et al., 2016, Nachum et al., 2018]. Composition provides another mechanism to reuse and adapt multiple modalities (e.g. multiple policies) in a hierarchical setting. We can learn to compose a solution from multiple objects rather than modulate the function of a single one via conditioning. Common examples include composition of multiple policies [Andreas et al., 2017, Wulfmeier et al., 2020a] or value functions [Barreto et al., 2016, Sutton et al., 1999].

Finally, **meta learning** targets explicit optimisation for fast adaptation and generally builds on other optimisation mechanisms which are themselves being rendered more efficient. General categories of meta learning include gradient-based approaches [Finn et al., 2017] or sequence modelling or in-context learning [Duan et al., 2016, OpenAI et al., 2019b, Wang et al., 2016]. Meta learning stands out in comparison to other forms of adaptation as we cannot spontaneously decide to apply it during adaptation if it has not been used during preparation. Meta learning uses the preparation phase in order to discover how to quickly adapt.

Indirect Application of Modalities Indirect application describes the use of modalities to guide optimisation rather than direct usage for behaviour generation. Specifically, we can differentiate two approaches:

- transfer via (auxiliary) objectives
- transfer via data (e.g. by shaping exploration)

A common path for indirect transfer is via (auxiliary) optimisation **objectives**. Examples include distillation of knowledge by training with regularisation towards previous policies [Tirumala et al., 2020], the use of data to define a reward function [Ho and Ermon, 2016, Merel et al., 2018, Wulfmeier et al., 2015], optimisation targets for policies and Q-functions by executing planning with transferred models [Hafner et al., 2019], or using transferred Q-functions directly as targets [Wang et al., 2020a].

The other indirect way to use knowledge modalities is via **data** for the optimisation process. For example, we can use previous policies for data generation and learn off-policy from this experience

[Campos et al., 2021, Vezzani et al., 2022]. An agent’s original experience (as data) is commonly used for indirect transfer via learning another modality. Often we directly reload previous data into the agent’s replay buffer [Nair et al., 2020a, Vecerik et al., 2017]. Special cases are represented by the direct use as a foundation for an engineered reward function [Hasenclever et al., 2020, Peng et al., 2018a] or a non-parametric policy [Pari et al., 2021]. While the distinction between transfer via the objective and via data is important, we will summarise both into the category of indirect transfer for all following sections for simplification.

5. Knowledge Modalities in Transfer

In this section, we will cover how different knowledge modalities have been used for transfer in RL. They generally represent and transfer knowledge in distinct ways, offering varying degrees of generalisation, flexibility and adaptability, and necessitating diverse computational efforts for adaptation and the generation of functional behaviors. From data to models to policies, computational costs for inferring optimal behaviour are being reduced, albeit at the potential expense of loss of information. The functions underlying policies, for instance, allow direct execution for determining new actions and generating trajectories, but their utility is intricately tied to both system dynamics and reward functions.

At the opposite end, data represents the raw source of all information from which dynamics models, policies, and rewards can be distilled. However, the extraction of behavior from data demands heightened computational resources. Beyond these fundamental constraints, we are going to explore how various forms of transfer apply across the entire spectrum, offering a comprehensive understanding shared patterns.

5.1. Data

Raw data can provide unprocessed information about the environment dynamics, task, or (optimal) behaviour. As discussed in Section 2.3.1, different types of data carry these distinct types of information and require respective processing steps in order to derive optimal behaviour. Beyond the focus on action-centric data for training with different reinforcement or imitation learning methods, the inclusion of domain-external data sources can be used for representation training. While unlocking access to expansive datasets, this approach is inherently limited in providing insights into specific aspects of the problem. Notably, leveraging large image datasets for the pre-training of early layers in deep networks exemplifies this paradigm [Dittadi et al., 2021, Lange and Riedmiller, 2010, Wulfmeier et al., 2021, Xiao et al., 2022b], as detailed in the representation transfer section for each respective modality.

With minor exceptions, domain-specific data is predominantly applied *indirectly* to transfer knowledge by integration into the optimisation process, commonly either as addition to new data or via auxiliary objectives. Noteworthy exceptions involve the mechanisms for effective retrieval and processing of existing trajectory data during behavior generation, exemplified by studies such as [Du et al., 2023, Goyal et al., 2022, Humphreys et al., 2022, Pari et al., 2021]. However, these instances constitute a minority within the spectrum of data usage. Consequently, while the other modality sections broadly adhere to the categorization delineated in Section 4, this section adopts a more granular lens, delving into nuances surrounding the indirect transfer via data.

Transfer of Data or Intermediate Modalities The use of data can follow two general paths. We can integrate data directly into an online experiment, or first extract another knowledge modality offline

which to apply in the online setting, the latter of which we will cover in the respective modalities' sections. In particular, transition data (including actions) can be used online in the context of off-policy [Andrychowicz et al., 2017, Ball et al., 2023, Cabi et al., 2019, Hester et al., 2018, Tao et al., 2021, Tirinzoni et al., 2018b, Vecerik et al., 2017, Walke et al., 2022, Xie et al., 2020], or imitation learning [Ebert et al., 2022]. It can further shape the agent's behaviour via additional objectives [Abdolmaleki et al., 2021, Davchev et al., 2021, Ho and Ermon, 2016, Nair et al., 2018a].

The alternative application is via an (offline) preparation step, during which an intermediate knowledge modality - for instance a model of the system dynamics, a value function, or a policy - is computed (see for example [Ebert et al., 2018, Fujimoto et al., 2018, Levine et al., 2020, Nair et al., 2020a, Singh et al., 2020b, Song et al., 2022]). The resulting modality can then be transferred directly or indirectly to optimise behaviour in the target domain. Detailed cases are being discussed in the subsections of the respective modalities, while this section focuses on the transfer of data into the new agent to aid learning in the target MDP.

Adapting Datasets Data can provide information about system dynamics and tasks. If the system dynamics remain unchanged between source and target, data can be relabelled across different tasks and reward functions [Andrychowicz et al., 2017]. This makes it possible to learn off-policy or offline for new objectives. This can target a number of discrete tasks [Laroche and Barlier, 2017, Riedmiller et al., 2018] as well as a dense goal space [Davchev et al., 2021]. It can be beneficial to either use data indiscriminately to learn about all tasks [Lambert et al., 2022], or to learn more effectively, e.g. by selecting specific states as goals that were visited as part of a trajectory [Andrychowicz et al., 2017]. Similarity-based data filtering methods have been further extended for image-based, high-dimensional data [Chebotar et al., 2021, Du et al., 2023]. Further mechanisms have been proposed for determining suited tasks for more effective data relabelling [Eysenbach et al., 2020, Li et al., 2020b, Sharma et al., 2021].

When learning multiple tasks from the same data, a policy or value function requires additional conditioning inputs to distinguish between different tasks. Different task descriptors have been used in this context with the simplest case being task IDs [Wulfmeier et al., 2020a]. Naturally, there exist better suited spaces for identifying and describing structure across tasks. For example, similarities between tasks should give rise to shorter distances between their descriptors. Examples are given by goal positions [Andrychowicz et al., 2017], images [Chebotar et al., 2021], or language commands [Lynch and Sermanet, 2020]. Even without any task descriptors or rewards, offline RL can incorporate existing data. When these are unknown, the data still includes information about system dynamics [Singh et al., 2020b].

We can further combine various data sources such as agent embodiments or source tasks [Brohan et al., 2022, Reed et al., 2022, Zhou et al., 2022b]. However, there are challenges when integrating heterogeneous data sources. These issues range from different dynamics and task distributions which can be addressed via importance sampling or weighting techniques [Chebotar et al., 2021, Zhou et al., 2022b] to varying observation and action types which require flexible agent architectures such as transformer models [Brohan et al., 2022, Reed et al., 2022, Vaswani et al., 2017]. This area is of particular interest when scaling data access for data-expensive domains and is further discussed under Section 6.

Objectives for Action Matching Beyond biasing the data distribution for learning, expert data may be used more directly to provide information about the optimal behaviour for a given task [Ross et al., 2011, Shiarlis et al., 2018, Vecerik et al., 2017]. By optimising a policy to imitate expert actions, we can guide agents to overcome exploration challenges, such as given by sparse or noisy rewards.

In an extreme case, when this is the only signal used to train the new policy, the approach reduces to behavioural cloning [Pomerleau, 1988]. In many cases, however, this learning signal is either combined with an RL loss [Nair et al., 2018a], or the data is further weighted, for instance by a reward-based signal [Jeong et al., 2020, Nair et al., 2020a, Wang et al., 2020b].

Objectives for State Matching Where expert actions are not available or not compatible with the target domain, different approaches can encourage a new policy to match the expert’s state visitation distribution [Ho and Ermon, 2016, Ng and Russell, 2000, Ziebart et al., 2008]. While matching states instead of actions commonly comes with the cost of required environment interaction to determine the new agents trajectories, there are multiple benefits for this direction. Behavioural cloning requires that the coverage of the transferred data is sufficient to learn robust controllers and otherwise can lead to compounding errors [Ross et al., 2011]. In contrast, matching the expert’s state distribution often requires fewer expert trajectories at the cost of further environment interaction for the agent. Finally, we can additionally match abstractions or projected features of transferred trajectories [Torabi et al., 2019].

Objectives for matching states can be created by penalising an engineered distance function between pairs of student and expert states [Aytar et al., 2018, Hasenclever et al., 2020, Merel et al., 2018, Peng et al., 2018a] or via a learned distance function. Learned objectives can include inverse reinforcement learning [Abbeel and Ng, 2004, Ratliff et al., 2006, Ziebart et al., 2008] where in particular adversarial settings have gained popularity which train a discriminator to distinguish between agent and transferred trajectories [Fu et al., 2017, Ho and Ermon, 2016, Merel et al., 2017, Wang et al., 2017] as well as other forms of distribution matching [Kim and Park, 2018, Lee et al., 2019]. In these settings, the transferred knowledge can be either data, which is directly used in the optimisation procedure, or intermediate policies which are used to generate data. The latter is discussed in further detail in Section 5.5. Similar to matching actions, methods for matching states can also be combined with a regular reward-based learning signal [Peng et al., 2021, Zhu et al., 2018].

Finally, we can further simplify the learning problem by providing information about suitable initial states for training the agent [Merel et al., 2017, Nair et al., 2018a, Popov et al., 2017]. This application requires the ability to control the initial states of the agent, an ability not available in many real-world settings.

Benefits and Disadvantages Unlike the other modalities, raw data provides information about the original experience that an agent receives and is not affected by any potential loss of information or influence of the inductive bias that may result from fitting a function approximator for another modality. In that sense, data is highly useful as the uncompressed, unbiased representation of available information.

However, this comes at the price of additional inference cost in translating the raw experience into an actionable representation (e.g. via model learning and MPC; or offline value iteration to obtain a policy). Data use can be limited by distribution shift (e.g. data may have been recorded in parts of the state space that are irrelevant for the transfer target). Finally, processing data offline without access to the underlying generating distribution (e.g. the (PO)MDP), can in some cases aggravate instabilities of the inference process (for instance, in the case of offline reinforcement learning [Levine et al., 2020]).

5.2. Dynamics Models

In general, models of the transition dynamics tend to be amenable to task transfer as they capture the dynamics of the underlying environment, albeit with a dependence on the relation between source and target data distributions.

Generalisation and 0-Shot The most common method for transferring models is to transfer pre-trained models onto a target task, where the model can be applied in different ways. In particular, there is a long line of work on training action-conditional predictive models on datasets collected via random, pre-scripted interactions with the environment, followed by model-predictive control (MPC) on top of the frozen pre-trained model to generate actions on downstream tasks, using either a hand-specified or learned reward on the downstream task [Byravan et al., 2017, Ebert et al., 2018, Finn and Levine, 2017, Lenz et al., 2015, Nematollahi et al., 2020].

Early examples cover low-dimensional state-space models [Lenz et al., 2015, Williams et al., 2017] with a combination of offline model learning and MPC for online behaviour generation. MPC can further be leveraged for generating training data for model-training [Levine et al., 2016, Zhang et al., 2016]; demonstrating good generalisation to novel control tasks across manipulation, locomotion and aerial robots.

With the advent of convolutional architectures there is an influx of visual predictive models which directly model the dynamics of visual or depth observations, predominant amongst these is the "Visual Foresight" paradigm [Ebert et al., 2018, Finn and Levine, 2017] which trains action-conditional visual predictive models in an unsupervised manner for robot manipulation. On different target tasks (defined via either pixel locations, goal images or goal classifiers), the transferred model is used together with MPC and designed or learned rewards. Assuming a broad training data distribution, this approach displays good performance even to held-out objects. Several extensions address deformable objects [Hoque et al., 2020, 2021], tool use [Xie et al., 2019] as well as large scale robot data [Dasari et al., 2019] and additional egocentric human videos [Schmeckpeper et al., 2020]. This direction can further be combined with temporally extended sub-goals [Nair and Finn, 2019, Nair et al., 2020b, Paxton et al., 2019] and other forms of low-level skills [Wu et al., 2021].

A concurrent line of work investigates structured variants of predictive models. These can involve models that take into account the dynamics of rigid bodies interacting with manipulators [Byravan et al., 2017, Nematollahi et al., 2020] or adding relational inductive biases to improve the generalisation and transfer ability of dynamics models through the use of Graph Neural Networks [Wu et al., 2020]. The latter approach has shown good results in learning models of simulated characters and robot arms that transfer to different morphologies [Sanchez-Gonzalez et al., 2018] as well as for learning object-centric visual predictive models [Veerapaneni et al., 2020] which can be transferred to predict visual dynamics of different scenes.

Fine-Tuning While zero-shot transfer is a predominant paradigm in model-based RL, performance can be improved via fine-tuning the model directly on the target task [Byravan et al., 2020, 2021, Ha and Schmidhuber, 2018]. Fine-tuning can further improve models generated via task-agnostic exploration [Bucher et al., 2020, Sekar et al., 2020], or when the model is pre-trained on existing offline datasets [Dasari et al., 2019]. Finally, there is a small set of works which consider using model-free RL for fine-tuning [Nagabandi et al., 2018c].

Representations Model transfer is oftentimes combined with representation learning. Prominent examples include the use of state or observation prediction as objective to train temporally consistent representations. After training, we can transfer either the representation in isolation or together with the pre-trained dynamics model [Ha and Schmidhuber, 2018, Zhang et al., 2019].

Hierarchy - Composition Several papers consider different approaches to introduce additional structure into models to improve transfer. Composition structures the model to be built of multiple parts with increased flexibility for transfer to downstream tasks.

Examples are given by combining a global dynamics model which is valid for the entire state space with a task-specific local model [Fu et al., 2016]. This direction has been further extended to learn directly from images by learning latent representations and subsequently predictive models within this latent space [Ha and Schmidhuber, 2018, Zhang et al., 2019].

Decomposed models have been used to transfer knowledge across different robot embodiments, enabling more effective transfer for solving similar tasks across different robots. A simple approach is to train two separate models for agent dynamics and environment dynamics; the latter environment model can be transferred efficiently to different robot embodiments [Richard et al., 2021] and, in addition, can build on data from multiple embodiments [Kang et al., 2021]. Going one step further, we can train action-free latent representations from diverse video datasets followed by action-conditional model training within a model-based RL loop on the target task [Seo et al., 2022].

Hierarchy - Conditioning Alternatively, conditioning provides a way for adaptation wherein a model takes in additional variables (often a latent embedding) that capture variations across tasks and dynamics. Approaches in this direction separate the problem of adapting the dynamics model into two parts: 1) identifying the current dynamics parameters or embeddings, and 2) making predictions conditioned on these parameters. The former is akin to the task of system identification [Ljung, 1998, Nelles, 2001, Yu et al., 2017], and is often done through the estimation of latent parameters that can either be the underlying physical parameters of the system or a learned representation [Ball et al., 2021a, Belkhale et al., 2021, Evans et al., 2022, Kaushik et al., 2020, Killian et al., 2017, Lee et al., 2020b, Sæmundsson et al., 2018, Seo et al., 2020, Yen-Chen et al., 2020].

The model’s predictions are conditioned on these parameters. Here, different architectures have been explored including Hidden Parameter MDPs [Killian et al., 2017], Gaussian Processes [Kupcsik et al., 2017, Sæmundsson et al., 2018] with a recent shift to focus on deep neural networks [Lee et al., 2020b, Seo et al., 2020, Yen-Chen et al., 2020]. Different objectives have been proposed such as maximising the likelihood of forward predictions [Belkhale et al., 2021, Sæmundsson et al., 2018], or the consistency of forward and inverse predictions [Lee et al., 2020b]. On a transfer MDP, the conditioning variables are estimated via an inference procedure, the pre-trained global model is transferred and used together with MPC for action selection.

Furthermore, these types of context-conditioned models can be used to derive intrinsic bonuses for exploration [Zhou et al., 2019b]. Combinations of this approach with conditioned policies can enable enable fast policy adaptation to novel environments [Wang and Van Hoof, 2022]; with further applications in model-based RL instead of pure MPC [Lee and Chung, 2021].

Meta Learning Similar to the other KMs, meta learning has been used to train models that quickly adapt to different tasks or dynamics. Approaches following gradient-based meta learning [Finn et al., 2017] are particularly common [Nagabandi et al., 2018a,b]. Further approaches leverage recurrent

networks for sequence-based meta learning across changes in dynamics and tasks [Nagabandi et al., 2018a, Weinstein and Botvinick, 2017], and Neural Processes [Galashov et al., 2019b].

Benefits and Disadvantages Since dynamics models mainly represent information about the system dynamics, they support transfer by not being tied to a particular reward function or behaviour. In principle, a model of the system dynamics could be combined with any reward function (or model thereof) to estimate value functions or perform policy optimisation. In practice, the generalisation and transfer capabilities of models are highly dependent on their training data and the inductive bias of the parametric function approximator. Furthermore, dynamics models require repeated inference resulting in higher computational requirements for behaviour generation (e.g. MPC, or model-based policy optimisation) which can further be associated with instabilities or compounding errors [Clavera et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2019].

5.3. Reward Models

Reward functions play a special role in RL, they commonly serve as our interface to design the task to be solved and, in part, the behaviour. However, reward functions are not always straightforward to define especially with complex inputs such as raw images or for achieving sufficiently complex behaviours [Singh et al., 2019]. The challenge can be further split into measuring the state for determining success, designing a reward function for the behaviour or goal of interest, and designing a reward function from which it is easy to learn. These cases often lead to considerable effort in reward engineering [Lee et al., 2020a]. Additionally, auxiliary reward functions, which can be seen as agent-internal instead of coming from the environment [Singh et al., 2009], can be learnt to improve agents' performance in particular for hard exploration tasks [Jaderberg et al., 2017, Wulfmeier et al., 2021].

Often, learned reward function are transferred together with dynamics models, which often can be estimated from the same data, and used in model-based RL [Hafner et al., 2019]; see additional details in Section 5.2. However, the application of transferred reward functions in model-free RL is possible as well [Yoo and Seo, 2022].

Generalisation and 0-Shot Commonly, reward functions are directly transferred without additional adaptation and directly applied via model-based or model-free RL [Ebert et al., 2018, Escontrela et al., 2023, Singh et al., 2019]. The most common source for transferring reward functions is supervised offline training based on existing datasets [Ebert et al., 2018, Singh et al., 2019] and added labels for human preferences [Cabi et al., 2019, Christiano et al., 2016, Daniel et al., 2015, Lee et al., 2021b]. If expert trajectories are given, either via state or state-action sequences, but no explicit reward labels are provided, we can still extract reward functions via Inverse Reinforcement Learning [Abbeel and Ng, 2004, Finn et al., 2016, Fu et al., 2019, Ho and Ermon, 2016, Qi et al., 2022, Ratliff et al., 2006, Wulfmeier et al., 2015, Ziebart et al., 2008].

Different works train reward functions over distributions of tasks to improve generalisation to new tasks. In these cases, each task is defined via a task descriptor in the same feature space as used during training, e.g. via language [Cui et al., 2022, Fu et al., 2019, Nair et al., 2021] or video [Chen et al., 2021a]. For example, it is possible to train a classifier for video similarity which is trained with a broad set of task videos both from human experts and robots [Chen et al., 2021a]. In this way, the classifier can generalise as a reward source for future tasks when these are described via demonstration videos from the same distribution. Extending this direction, rewards from simpler tasks can enable effective reward shaping [Ng et al., 1999] to accelerate the learning of harder tasks

[Brys et al., 2015, Konidaris and Barto, 2006].

Representations A further application is the transfer of pre-trained representations which are transformed into reward functions via manual rules, such as maximising or minimising a particular embedding dimension [Ebert et al., 2018, Grimm et al., 2019, Wulfmeier et al., 2021]. These can be used as auxiliary tasks and for exploration in the target MDP. Recent work has also looked at leveraging pre-trained visual and textual representations from foundation models for generating language/image-conditioned reward functions for a variety of downstream tasks, often unrelated to the data these representations were trained on. While some perform zero-shot transfer of these representations [Cui et al., 2022, Mahmoudieh et al., 2022], others adapt representations on small amounts of labeled data from the target domain to learn reward functions [Xiao et al., 2022a]. Representations can further be optimised specifically to enable learning good reward functions for a variety of downstream transfer tasks [Ma et al., 2022].

Meta Learning Transferring learned reward functions becomes particularly relevant when rewards in the target MDP are unavailable or expensive, but when regular transitions are easily obtained. External rewards from direct human feedback provide one example for this situation. Here, meta learning can be applied to optimise for fast adaptation of transferred reward functions with limited external reward feedback [Agarwal et al., 2019, Li et al., 2021]. For example, [Li et al., 2021] applies gradient-based meta learning [Finn et al., 2017] to update a probabilistic reward classifier with small sets of task demonstrations. Bayesian Optimisation [Agarwal et al., 2019] can provide another alternative.

Benefits and Disadvantages Cheap and automated access to a ground truth reward function renders the transfer of a trained reward model irrelevant. However, reward generation transfer shines when target rewards are directly produced by human operators. Furthermore, efficient reward functions can be hard to manually design and implement in real-world scenarios: optimal behaviour may be implicitly defined (e.g. via human preferences [Ravichandar et al., 2020]), and even well-defined reward functions may require significant instrumentation (e.g. detecting successful states for a robotics task [Kalashnikov et al., 2021]).

Reward models purely represent the task and commonly have the benefit of being easier to transfer compared to policies given dynamics changes between source and target MDPs [Bahdanau et al., 2019, Fu et al., 2019]. At the same time, they require further environment interaction before being able to generate behaviour. Different approaches combine the transfer of both modalities for this reason (e.g. [Qi et al., 2022]).

5.4. Value Functions

State and state-action value functions haven been successfully applied for transfer in RL, however they entangle information about system dynamics, policy and reward function as well as design choices, such as the horizon and discount factor. The fact that different components of the MDP are entangled in the representation of value functions can render it harder to use value functions for transfer. For this reason, historical focus lies on transfer with value functions lies in particular on state-action value function in the critic-only setting where the parameterised value function directly characterises the policy. In the following, we provide examples of different methods that overcome these challenges and use value functions for transfer.

Generalisation and 0-Shot To enable generalisation, value functions can be trained over distributions of MDPs with the potential for further task or goal conditioning to enable specialisation [Kaelbling, 1993]. Universal value functions [Schaul et al., 2015] represent an example of this conditioning. After training, the value functions can generalise to held out tasks based on their task descriptors. Learning the process that provides the conditioning is covered in the hierarchy part of this section. Common forms of universal value functions are presented in [Gupta et al., 2019, Nair et al., 2018b] where the task is to reach goal states.

Fine-Tuning Fine-tuning represents the most common method for adapting value functions. Early examples of successfully fine-tuning a value function are present in [Asada et al., 1994, Selfridge et al., 1985]. In particular, there has been a range of recent works pre-training value functions offline for further online fine-tuning methods [Chebotar et al., 2021, Kostrikov et al., 2021, Kumar et al., 2020a, Lee et al., 2022b, Lu et al., 2022, Nair et al., 2020a]. Similarly, [Lynch et al., 2019] show how pre-training can be combined with imitation learning for fine-tuning during test time. Transfer between simulation and a physical platform represents another common setting [Zhao et al., 2020], where the initial pre-training phase is done in simulation and further fine-tuning is performed via online RL in the real world. When it comes to fine-tuning itself, there are multiple architectural choices available (e.g. training all the weights vs certain layers) [Julian et al., 2020]. Repeated adaptation of this type is particularly common in various works on RL-training curricula (e.g. [Florensa et al., 2017, Narvekar et al., 2020]).

Representations Unsupervised pre-training of representations is an important topic to improve transfer in RL [Bengio, 2012, Mesnil et al., 2012]. Although representation transfer mostly targets the addition of new final layers, more sophisticated schemes for reusing features and augmenting value functions have been considered [Rusu et al., 2016]. Going further than pre-training from individual images, representations can take into context temporal patterns by using videos [Ma et al., 2022]. Pre-training happens in this case via a self-supervised goal-conditioned value-function objective. Further modalities can be included to benefit their specific properties as well. Examples are given by the combination of vision and language representations for downstream robotics tasks [Ma et al., 2023].

Hierarchy - Conditioning Universal value function approximators [Schaul et al., 2015] (UVFAs) commonly are conditioned on a given description of the underlying MDP [Borsa et al., 2018, Grimm et al., 2019, Kulkarni et al., 2016] and trained over distributions of MDPs. After training, we can manually set the conditioning to the description of the new task. If a description is not available, we can instead optimise the conditioning. For example, we can build on Bayesian Optimisation [Arnekvist et al., 2019]. The conditioning can be implicit, e.g. given access to observation histories, an agent can infer sufficient information about the relevant context [Hausman et al., 2018]. Overall, the generalisation utility of task-conditional value functions depends on a suitable distribution of training tasks as well as on a suitable task descriptions. An appropriately conditioned UVFA can also provide a suitable initialisation for further adaptation. A number of recent works describe how UVFAs can be pre-trained and then adapted to new tasks [Eysenbach et al., 2020, Kalashnikov et al., 2021, Yu et al., 2021].

Goal-conditioned value functions represent a special case of UVFAs where the task is to reach a goal state. While there are different reward functions that can be considered for such tasks (e.g. euclidean distance between the final and the goal state [Gupta et al., 2019], or the distance in the goal-embedding space [Nair et al., 2018b]), training of these value functions commonly uses the same

mechanism: hindsight relabelling [Andrychowicz et al., 2017]. Interestingly, goal-conditioned value functions share similarities with model-based RL. Under certain conditions, if the event of reaching the desired goal is associated with a sparse reward of 1.0, they can be considered as a model of the system dynamics predicting the probability of reaching that goal state from the present state and a taken action given a specific policy [Chebotar et al., 2021]. They can be also used in lieu of successor representations, further discussed under compositional transfer below, as shown in [Janner et al., 2020], which allows them to be easily re-purposed to different tasks and reward functions.

While value functions (and other modalities) can be conditioned in various ways to specify tasks, more recently, natural language emerged as a particularly useful interface to facilitate generalisation. The expressiveness and compositionality of language as well as the recent advancements in natural language processing and understanding [Brown et al., 2020, Devlin et al., 2018] render it a promising tool for transfer in reinforcement learning. Language has been used in different ways to support transfer, as an abstraction for hierarchical RL [Jiang et al., 2019], as a general planner that decomposes long-horizon tasks [Ahn et al., 2022, Huang et al., 2022b], as a condition modality [Andreas et al., 2017] or even as a pre-training mechanism [Reid et al., 2022]. For a thorough analysis of how natural language can inform value functions and RL agents, we refer the reader to the survey on this topic [Luketina et al., 2019].

Hierarchy - Composition Successor representations [Dayan, 1993] and successor features are another common mechanism that facilitates transfer to new tasks [Barreto et al., 2016, 2018, Kulkarni et al., 2016]. In general, successor representations and generalised value functions [Sutton et al., 2011] can be considered as partial models which predict the expected future sum of particular features under a policy. Under the assumption that the reward function, describing the target task, is a linear function of the features, the value function can be shown to be linear in the expected discounted sum of these features. Maximising over the actions the value model enables one-step policy improvement (or generalised policy improvement [Barreto et al., 2016] if value functions for multiple policies can be evaluated in this manner). The appeal of successor representations comes from the fact that they decompose a value function into a reward predictor and a successor map [Kulkarni et al., 2016], which mitigates the value-function dependence on a specific reward function. This allows successor representations to be transferable to other, potentially new reward and tasks. These specialised value functions allow to compute the value (of a given policy) for any reward function of the above form. In addition, successor features - extending successor representations past the tabular setting - can be combined to guide exploration and skill discovery for RL agents as shown with variational intrinsic control [Hansen et al., 2019] and count-based exploration [Machado et al., 2020].

There are further methods that prepare the value function during the pre-training phase to be particularly amenable to fast adaptation. One commonly-used example of this type of preparation are soft or entropy-regularised value functions [Haarnoja et al., 2017, 2018c]. Soft value functions enable us to retain higher behavioural entropy [Kumar et al., 2020b], which can facilitate later transfer of the obtained strategies to new tasks. The resulting policies can be effectively re-used during the adaptation phase as demonstrated in [Haarnoja et al., 2018b, Hunt et al., 2019, Van Niekerk et al., 2019]. Other examples of creating compositional value functions learn value functions and policies in a way that allows the formulation of new tasks by using Boolean algebra in terms of the negation, disjunction and conjunction of a set of base tasks [Nangue Tasse et al., 2020, Van Niekerk et al., 2019]. Finally, the option framework has been applied to both policies, covered in the respective section, and value functions [Barreto et al., 2019, Singh, 1992]. Options enable the decomposition a set of sequential decision tasks and have been applied for transfer from offline datasets [Shiarlis et al., 2018] as well as related tasks [Barreto et al., 2019].

Meta Learning Context-conditioning of value-functions has been a common mechanism to enable effective meta learning. While there exists a variety of viable context types for conditioning [Fakoor et al., 2019, Laskin et al., 2022, Rakelly et al., 2019], they all showcase the ability to quickly explore and fine-tune to a new task during deployment. In addition to context-conditioning, more recently optimisation-based meta learning has gained traction [Bechtle et al., 2021, Houthoofd et al., 2018, Mitchell et al., 2021, Sung et al., 2017, Zhou et al., 2020]. In particular, [Mitchell et al., 2021] introduces an offline meta RL setting where the RL agent does not need to interact with the environment and relies on a broad stored dataset, even at meta testing time.

Indirect Transfer Instead of directly adapting the online value function, temporal difference learning enables to shape the optimisation objective by using the transferred value function as a target value function on the new task [Wang et al., 2020a]. Further regularisation towards expert behaviour can be provided by adding an auxiliary objective such as minimising the KL distance [Agarwal et al., 2022]. This method is often used in addition to fine-tuning, to prevent strong divergence from the transferred behaviour [Tirumala et al., 2020].

Value functions can further be applied for exploration and data generation in various ways. For example, we can use variational inference to estimate the posterior distribution of the optimal value function for a new reward to improve exploration [Tirinzi et al., 2018a]. While naive context-based exploration can be effective, it is possible to further explicitly adapt the agent’s exploration parameters based on the current experience [Schaul et al., 2019].

Benefits and Disadvantages Traditionally value functions can be deemed challenging for transfer because of their strong coupling of information about behaviour policy, environment dynamics and rewards. In addition, they can be more restrictive due to explicit dependence on other MDP-specific parameters such as the discount factor and episode length. While computing the optimal action requires less effort given a state-action value function than a dynamics model, our standard value functions are bound to make predictions about one reward function. However, different extensions can provide partial models such as universal value functions, goal-conditioned value functions and successor representations that partially break this coupling and facilitate transfer to new tasks. Value-function transfer further allows for RL-based behaviour stitching, where different parts of the state-action space can be connected via the principles of dynamic programming to create chained behaviours as shown in [Singh et al., 2020b].

5.5. Policies

Generating behaviour from policies comes at the lowest computational cost in comparison to all other modalities as we are only required to perform evaluation of the function representing the policy. However, in return, policies are highly specific with respect to both system dynamics as well as task or reward and large changes in either between source and target setting can require further adaptation.

Generalisation and 0-Shot Generalisation or 0-shot transfer of policies demonstrably works well in a range of cases [Brohan et al., 2022, Kirk et al., 2021, OpenAI et al., 2019b]. Commonly, these situations can be categorised into aligning source and target domains either by broadening the distribution of source MDPs or otherwise reducing the differences between both domains. The latter point can be addressed via system identification or additional inductive biases [Müller et al., 2018, Salter et al., 2019, Stone et al., 2021, Zhou et al., 2022a].

Training over distributions of MDPs has proven helpful for transfer between simulations and real systems via domain randomisation of both visual and physical aspects [Bousmalis et al., 2018, Molchanov et al., 2019, Müller et al., 2018, OpenAI et al., 2019b, Sadeghi and Levine, 2016, Tobin et al., 2017]. Similarly, we can sample training tasks from a distribution [Cobbe et al., 2020, Hill et al., 2020, Oh et al., 2017, Schaul et al., 2015] to support transfer over task changes. If we evaluate such a trained agent on new tasks from the same distribution, effective generalisation is possible. In particular, when we provide the agent with additional conditioning task descriptors, defining the specific task or goal and enabling the agent to adapt with respect to this task space [Schaul et al., 2015].

When training over a distribution of configurations, our agents will either need to learn conservative solutions which apply to all configurations or rely on a conditioning that enables the identification of a particular configuration. History conditioning such as fully connected models with stacked observations [Kumar et al., 2021], LSTMs [Humplik et al., 2019, OpenAI et al., 2019b, Wang et al., 2016] and transformer-like models [Duan et al., 2017] have been used to enable this identification or adaptation as part of the neural network inference process by conditioning on the history of inputs. Learning separate models to control the conditioning is discussed later under the corresponding section.

Fine-Tuning In general, policies representing the optimal behaviour for a specific MDP may not transfer well 0-shot to other settings if reward or transition dynamics are sufficiently different. Challenges for generalisation can exist even within the same MDP due to distributional shifts [Ghosh et al., 2021]. However, when target and source MDP are sufficiently similar, the transferred policy can serve as a good starting point for further learning. One of the most common approach for adaptation is the continuation of regular training and fine-tuning of pre-trained parameters [Hinton and Salakhutdinov, 2006]. Recent examples for fine-tuning include policies pre-trained with supervised learning [Cruz Jr et al., 2017, Davchev et al., 2022, Mirhoseini et al., 2020] as well as RL [Held et al., 2017, Mutti et al., 2020, Schwarzer et al., 2021, Tao et al., 2021, Team et al., 2021].

Representations Representation transfer is often applied to policies. For example, fine-tuning can be combined with the introduction of a small set of new parameters such as one or multiple added final layers in a neural network [Parisotto et al., 2015]. A frequent direction is the pre-training of representations via unsupervised or self-supervised objectives such as input reconstruction (e.g. [Dittadi et al., 2021, Lange and Riedmiller, 2010, Nair et al., 2022, Wulfmeier et al., 2021, Xiao et al., 2022b]). Expanding past the familiar approaches, we have involved variations of representation transfer. For example, instead of freezing the earlier layers, we can transfer both an encoder and a policy decoder but adapt only the encoder via a self-supervised objective [Hansen et al., 2021b]. Another common approach is the combination of transferred policy and new learned policy in the agents action space such as via the addition of predicted actions and modelling a residual instead of the absolute action [Johannink et al., 2019, Silver et al., 2018]. Finally, recent approaches leverage pre-trained visual and textual representations from foundation models [Jia et al., 2021, Radford et al., 2021] to train generalisable policies that improve transfer on a variety of downstream tasks [Khandelwal et al., 2022, Lynch et al., 2022, Shridhar et al., 2022].

Hierarchy - Conditioning Hierarchy represents a regular setting for the transfer of policies, reloading one or multiple low-level policies and learning a new high-level controller for adaptation. This setting often can be regarded through the lens of distributions over behaviours that approximately cover the optimal behaviour for multiple tasks and can be specialised and filtered by a new higher-level

controller.

Related to generalisation with policies, a simplified perspective on conditioning in RL [Kaelbling, 1993, Sutton et al., 2011] treats goals or task descriptors naively as another observation for our agents. If this input in the target aligns with closely to their values in the source MDP, we can obtain better generalisation. When a single value in this goal space is insufficient, we can optimise another high-level controller to provide inputs to solve the new problem.

A number of cases can be distinguished. In the simplest setting, we can adapt by training an unconditional high-level controller which does not take into account the agent’s observations. The problem becomes one of inferring a single embedding, a vector which is additionally provided to the transferred policy as input. Examples are given by applying different optimisers such as CMA-ES [Peng et al., 2020, Yu et al., 2019a,b] and Bayesian Optimisation [Arnekvist et al., 2019] in the embedding space to maximise performance in the target MDP. Different variations of the approach exist such as the optimisation of an embedding in a semantically meaningful space including physical parameters [Yu et al., 2017] or to improve data efficiency by adding a probing policy to generate trajectories which are most informative [Yang et al., 2020]. Similarly, we can accelerate adaptation via meta learning and apply CMA-ES also during preparation [Yu et al., 2020b]. The overall approach is limited to inferring constant values such as those representing physical parameters of a system, which renders it suited for transfer between simulation and physical systems [Peng et al., 2020, Yu et al., 2019a].

We can additionally condition these high-level controllers on agent observations [Heess et al., 2016, Levy et al., 2017b, Merel et al., 2018] but this additional flexibility can create the requirement for more data than optimising unconditional embeddings. Commonly, a semantically meaningful space as interface between high- and low-level components, such as moving an locomotion agent into specific directions on a ground plane, can add human interpretability and enable the design for separate rewards for low-level behaviours [Levy et al., 2017a,b, Nachum et al., 2018, 2019a]. However, instead of defining goals in an interpretable part of the agent’s state or observation space, we can also define goals in a learned embedding space [Dayan and Hinton, 1993, Vezhnevets et al., 2017], which can overcome the engineering challenge of designing a task-suited goal space. Across both cases, we commonly define additional reward functions for training the low-level behaviours to fulfil high-level commands.

A final common method to learned interfaces is to treat these as probabilistic latent variables. Here, a whole range of probabilistic models can be applied including variational autoencoders [Hausman et al., 2018, Lynch et al., 2019, Merel et al., 2018, Pertsch et al., 2020, 2021, Rao et al., 2021, Tirumala et al., 2020] or normalising flow-based models [Harnoja et al., 2018a, Singh et al., 2020a].

Hierarchy - Composition Instead of transferring a single low-level controller or skill, a common approach is to transfer sets of skills providing modular behaviours which can be compositionally combined to solve new tasks. Similar to goal-conditioned policies, modular approaches can generalise 0-shot if the task description is compatible with the transferred policies such that e.g. a new task described by a sequence of sub-tasks can be directly solved by applying the corresponding skills in the described order [Andreas et al., 2017, Shiarlis et al., 2018].

Most commonly however, the partial specification given by a set of skills requires further optimisation to identify the optimal behaviour. This usually amounts to optimising a high-level controller, for instance via model-free RL [Daniel et al., 2012, Peng et al., 2019, Wulfmeier et al., 2020a]. A simple case is a bandit formulation for determining the low-level policy choice [Li and Zhang, 2018]. To further reduce the effort of further learning a high-level controller, in some cases we can define manual

heuristics [Haarnoja et al., 2023] or a decision making process based on properties of the low-level skills [Goyal et al., 2019]. When this is impossible and we turn towards training a high-level controller via reinforcement learning, different probabilistic models can be build. This includes mixture [Daniel et al., 2012, Wulfmeier et al., 2020a] or product [Peng et al., 2019] policy distributions with the high-level controller describing the weighting.

Extensions of this perspective use transition policies to simplify switching between transferred skills without overlapping state visitation distributions [Lee et al., 2018, 2021c]. Instead of a new explicit high-level controller, it is possible in the actor-critic setting to use the new critic as an implicit controller by comparing or ranking the values of actions from different low-level components [Kurenkov et al., 2019, Xie et al., 2018]. To accelerate learning in this setting, different approaches additionally transfer their source critics [Galashov et al., 2020, Hunt et al., 2019].

Most previously described approaches focus on the hierarchical setting to shape the agent’s per-timestep distribution over actions, thereby enabling us to guide exploration. Depending on the source of pre-trained skills, the agent’s search space can be further efficiently reduced via temporal abstraction, following the same skill for multiple time steps.

The options framework [Brunskill and Li, 2014, Konidaris and Barto, 2007, Sutton et al., 1999] is a common approach to use temporal abstraction, where each low-level behaviour, each option, additionally includes a termination condition such that the high-level controller only needs to chose new behaviours when the previous one is completed. More recent work applies options to neural networks [Andreas et al., 2017, Bacon et al., 2017, Wulfmeier et al., 2020b]. Alternatively, we can benefit from fixed temporal abstraction by following policies for a defined number of steps [Heess et al., 2016, Li et al., 2020a].

Meta Learning Meta learning is often applied to policies with the goal of optimising for effective adaptation. Common meta learning strategies for policies include sequence-based [Duan et al., 2016, Mishra et al., 2017, Wang et al., 2016] [Humplik et al., 2019, Zintgraf et al., 2020], optimisation-based [Finn et al., 2017, Nichol et al., 2018], and metric-based methods [Lengyel and Dayan, 2007]. Furthermore, meta learning has been applied to improve policies for exploration from supervised [Gupta et al., 2018b, Zintgraf et al., 2021] as well as unsupervised objectives [Gupta et al., 2018a]. These applications have been further extended to applying the preparation phase to offline datasets with adaptation being performed during online learning [Dorfman and Tamar, 2020, Pong et al., 2021].

Indirect Transfer Instead of direct use, we can further integrate the prepared source policy into the training objective for the new agent. A regular application is via the addition of a regularisation term between the action distributions of both agents [Czarnecki et al., 2019, Galashov et al., 2019a, Parisotto et al., 2015, Ross et al., 2011, Rusu et al., 2015, Schmitt et al., 2018, Teh et al., 2017, Tirumala et al., 2020]. In this case, it can be often necessary to decay the influence of the source policy over the course of learning to avoid learning sub-optimal solutions when the source itself is sub-optimal [Haarnoja et al., 2023].

It is possible to regularise an agent’s embedding space instead of the final action space. Options here include embeddings for observations and actions for individual timesteps [Gupta et al., 2017] or extended trajectories [Bohez et al., 2022, Merel et al., 2018]. We can treat this embedding space as an action space for a high-level policy such that methods for hierarchical transfer of low-level behaviours and regularisation in embedding spaces can be conveniently combined [Liu et al., 2022, Tirumala et al., 2020].

A last form of using transferred policies is to shape the optimisation via proposal distributions for model-based RL [Byravan et al., 2021] or as proposals to be specialised and reweighted via task-specific value functions [Galashov et al., 2020].

Instead of aligning distributions over actions, we can optimise alignment over visited states or trajectories. A common approach is the use of adversarial training frameworks to generate rewards based on the discrimination between states visited by agent or transferred expert [Kostrikov et al., 2019, Stadie et al., 2017, Wulfmeier et al., 2017b, Zhang et al., 2020]. By training the discriminator on existing datasets, this method furthermore builds the foundation for transfer of expert knowledge via data instead of policies in Section 5.1. Finally, it is possible to apply policies for exploration and to transfer knowledge via the generated data [Campos et al., 2021, Nachum et al., 2019b, Riedmiller et al., 2018, Smith et al., 2023, Torrey et al., 2007, Vezzani et al., 2022]. In the simplest case, the resulting data can be added to the agent’s replay buffer for off-policy RL.

Benefits and Disadvantages As explicit behaviour representations, policies are well-suited both for fine-tuning and other adaptations as well as shaping the agent’s data distribution when used for exploration. At the same time, they entangle information about the dynamics and rewards and therefore can create the requirement for adaptation as soon as either changes. This presents a stronger theoretical constraint for policies. However, in practice a different reward function often means a different data distribution, which also limits the practical transferability of other modalities such as dynamics models due to challenges in generalisation.

It is worth considering the differences between policies and state-action value functions with regards to their utility for transfer. Both are closely related and given a Q-function the computational expense of obtaining the optimal action is comparably low. However, regular policies contain strictly less information. In particular, they only contain information about the relative value of actions but not about their absolute value and are absent of information about the state value [Peters and Schaal, 2008, Sutton and Barto, 2018]. Whether this additional information is useful in a transfer setting depends on the context. For instance, a simple transformation of the reward may change the absolute value of state-action tuples but may leave the relative value of actions unchanged. Here, a policy would be better suited for transfer and lead to high 0-shot generalisation performance. On the other hand, the state value can be difficult to estimate and prior information from a related task can dramatically speed up estimation in the target task [Galashov et al., 2020].

6. Discussions and Conclusions

The field of transfer learning has demonstrated considerable growth in recent years. Research in RL is targeting tasks of increasing complexity requiring increasing amounts of experience and computation. This situation renders the ability to reuse knowledge ever more valuable.

A lot has changed since Taylor and Stone [2009] discussed about thirty methods in their overview of transfer learning in RL, but several key ideas remain unchanged. Although the research landscape has become more diverse, a strong focus on a subset of knowledge modalities for transfer prevails. While this focus remains relevant in the coming years, we will discuss in Section 6.1.1 how recent developments are likely to further diversify transfer learning.

Overall, the field has made considerable progress across all modalities. Novel ideas have emerged, and new mechanisms for transfer have been introduced and old one extended (Section 6.1.2). The increasing scale of RL problems has brought forward new questions which we will discuss in Section 6.3. However, prevalent challenges remain for research in transfer learning, in particular around

measuring progress. These will be discussed in Section 6.2. We will use this final part to discuss each of these aspects as well as future opportunities.

6.1. Connections and Trade-offs

After providing in detail surveys of work on each modalities and each transfer mechanism, this section summarises main principles underlying overall progress in the field.

6.1.1. Comparing Knowledge Modalities

In the previous sections, we describe the transfer via each KM in detail with a broad set of examples. We will use this section to summarise their connections, benefits, and disadvantages. We can think of the information represented by the KMs (data, dynamics, rewards, values and policies) as lying on a spectrum that goes from raw and immediately observable and verifiable (such as dynamics) to more processed and requiring additional derivation (such as optimal behaviour). As an example, a model of the system dynamics makes prediction about the next state given current state and action. This prediction can be verified against individual transitions in the observed data. Optimal policies, in contrast, make predictions about optimal action choices which, in general, cannot be inferred from a single transition (unless we assume that the current data-generating behaviour is already optimal). The predictions of value functions can be partially verified in the dynamic programming setting via temporal difference error values on individual transitions.

The most processed KMs, policies and value functions, constitute the foundation of much of early work in reinforcement learning [Sutton and Barto, 2018, Watkins and Dayan, 1992, Williams, 1992]. Hence, they also form the core of work on transfer learning [Taylor and Stone, 2009]. Value functions and policies in particular have the benefit of computationally low cost for behaviour generation in comparison to model-based approaches [Yarats et al., 2022] and often simpler infrastructure. At the same time, they entangle information about dynamics and tasks. Due to this entanglement, changes in either can require adaptation and negatively affect initial generalisation.

On the other hand, reward models and dynamics models can be directly inferred from transition data. Because of the disentangled representation of different types of information, these can remain valid if only a part of the system changes. In these cases, the ground-truth reward or dynamics model could be transferred with high generalisation accuracy. If the underlying system dynamics change, a dynamics model needs to be re-learned or adapted. However, the reward model can still be valid. On the other hand, if only the task and corresponding reward change, the dynamics can still be valid. In principle, given the latter only the reward model needs to be adapted. In practice, learned models need to generalise outside the distribution that they were trained on. Changing the task generally changes the optimal policy and therefore the visited state-action distribution. This often leads to increased inaccuracy for learned dynamics models [Byravan et al., 2021]. Improvements in the generalisation of learned models are likely to increase the importance of transferring modalities which do not entangle information between dynamics and task, i.e. dynamics and reward models. These can include inductive biases for improved generalisation such as broader pre-training datasets [Brohan et al., 2022, Reed et al., 2022, Schubert et al., 2023] as well as stronger physical inductive biases [Greydanus et al., 2019].

Figure 4b shows the distributions of works presented in this taxonomy as a function of KM as well as transfer mechanisms. Most of the work focuses of transferring policies and indirect transfer of collected data. While transfer of dynamics or reward models has been less common in the past due to an increased focus on model-free learning [Taylor and Stone, 2009] the number of publications is growing in recent years as described in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 and shown in Figure 4a. This dynamic is


slowly changing in recent times building on growing interest in model-based RL (see Section 2.3.2). Many mechanisms that have been thoroughly investigated for policies or value functions, such as compositional transfer [Barreto et al., 2016, Sutton et al., 1999, Wulfmeier et al., 2020b], are now becoming targets for model-based research [Kang et al., 2021, Richard et al., 2021, Seo et al., 2022].

We expect to see increased focus on comparing the effectiveness of different modalities for transfer and hybrid solutions combining multiple perspectives. As an early step, Wołczyk et al. [2022] investigate the impact of transferring combinations of policy, value function, and data. Particular efforts have been made to connect perspectives between dynamics models and value functions [Chebotar et al., 2021, Pong et al., 2018]. The resulting goal-conditioned value functions can be relatively agnostic to task engineering. They effectively turn into multi-step probabilistic dynamics models predicting the probability of reaching a given state. By using broad distributions of source MDPs they can provide powerful foundations for transfer with minimal engineering effort. Combinations of model and policy transfer can combine the benefits of both [Salter et al., 2022, Walker et al., 2023]. Furthermore, they can enable adapting policies without access to rewards in the target MDP by sharing an embedding between model and policy, updating purely based on model accuracy during transfer [Ball et al., 2021b, Yao et al., 2018].

The relative ranking of computational costs between modalities less dependent of use in transfer or from scratch. The cost to learn dynamics and reward models is lower compared to value functions and policies as the learning targets can be directly accessed. Optimal value functions and policies have higher computational cost during learning, their targets cannot directly be observed from data but have to be computed over trajectories. Once trained, the computational requirements for obtaining optimal behaviour reverse. Dynamics and reward models are regularly used for planning and require rolling out trajectories, increasing computation and repeating model evaluation. Value functions still require an explicit maximisation process to evaluate which action has highest expected value. In particular in discrete, low-dimensional action spaces, we can cheaply determine all action's values to generate behaviour. In continuous action spaces, other mechanisms such as sampling-based maximisation are required. Finally, policies commonly provide us with the fastest way of obtaining action simply by performing model inference, with the potential of additional sampling from a parameterised distribution. In summary, the KMs trade-off the computational cost for learning with the cost for optimal behaviour generation.

Data, as unprocessed source of information, provides the most general KM for transfer but can also incur high costs. These include additional computation and a delayed impact on the distribution of additional target experience. For instance, hierarchical control using pre-trained policies can generate high performance faster while the transfer via data can lead to slower learning but higher asymptotic performance [Vezzani et al., 2022]. For this reason, both modalities can be effectively combined when data is generated by RL agents [Vezzani et al., 2022] or includes human demonstrations [Zhou et al., 2019a] for the same task as well as task-agnostic data [Kumar et al., 2022b]. Data transfer, due to the added time and computational requirement to extract behaviour, remains particularly relevant in domains without strong requirements on the time-effectiveness of learning [Smith et al., 2023].

While we focus on the main knowledge modalities for RL, which directly relate to components of the MDP and the RL agent, other forms of information can be transferred as well. In particular, information related to the optimisation procedure can accelerate learning. Examples are given by the application of evolution-based learning to optimise parameters of the loss function [Houthoofd et al., 2018] or meta learning the loss for Q-Learning [Bechtle et al., 2021, Xu et al., 2018].



(a) Approximate research publications aggregated over the years to the best of our knowledge. The plot visualises the focus on different KM in transfer with a clear focus on data and policy transfer but strong increase across modalities in the last decade.

(b) The plot shows the percentage of papers as a function of KM as presented in this taxonomy. These numbers to be seen as approximation due to the intractability of collecting all related work.

Figure 4 | Publication statistics for transfer in reinforcement learning.

6.1.2. Comparing Transfer Mechanisms

Improving our understanding of the techniques applied for transfer is critical as even the most commonly used approaches are not fully understood [Mahadevan, 1996, Pitis, 2019, White, 2017]. Intuitively, direct use of modalities can create higher initial performance (see Section 3) than their indirect use since it affects the initial behaviour in comparison to randomly initialised functions [Tirumala et al., 2020, Wulfmeier et al., 2020a]. At the same time, it can lead to a loss of flexibility of the training process [Igl et al., 2020, Nikishin et al., 2022] as we will discuss over the next paragraphs.

Fine-tuning remains one of the dominant forms of transfer, it simply starts training with a pre-trained model instead of a randomly initialised one. This approach has the benefit of not requiring additional change to existing algorithms other than different initial parameters. However, recent studies show that starting the optimisation of initial randomised models instead of pre-trained ones can lead to higher asymptotic performance given high distance between source and target domains both in supervised [Ash and Adams, 2020] and reinforcement learning [Igl et al., 2020, Nikishin et al., 2022] with neural networks. In reinforcement learning, this behaviour can have multiple reasons. Saturated non-linearities and higher parameter weights can become harder to adapt than the initial model and affect the straightforward applications of fine-tuning in supervised learning [Ash and Adams, 2020]. In RL the initial models can further affect exploration [Campos et al., 2021, Vezzani et al., 2022]. In the supervised case, recent work additionally shows that fine-tuning for out-of-distribution adaptation can lead to strong performance reduction in comparison to representation transfer via the addition of further linear layers [Kumar et al., 2022a]. Generally speaking, the performance of transfer in RL strongly depends on the models we use to represent knowledge. The recent focus on deep neural networks affects what type of transfer works well and further understanding and improvements regarding the general training of these models will in return improve and shape the landscape of transfer learning.

Direct mechanisms for transfer enable the agent to rely on the transferred knowledge from the start of the experiment and generally provide the best way for high initial performance. Therefore, direct mechanisms are the default methods when the key focus lies on generalisation. Indirect transfer both via auxiliary objectives or via data can provide additional flexibility by not constraining any aspects of the agent - such as model choice. In this case, auxiliary objectives will often bias final solution

which can be detrimental if the applied knowledge modality is highly sub-optimal. Solutions for annealing of additional objectives exist [Haarnoja et al., 2023] but introduce additional complexity and hyperparameters. Transfer via data generally relies on being able to generate a useful training signal from this data. For example, transferring data can introduce challenges if the reward signal in the used data is not rich enough [Singh et al., 2020b], but adds further flexibility in comparison to changing the objective [Vezzani et al., 2022].

6.2. Benchmarks for Transfer Learning

Supervised and unsupervised learning, particularly for vision and language, have familiar, standard benchmarks and datasets which have supported scientific communication and measurement of progress [Cordts et al., 2016, Lin et al., 2014, Merity et al., 2016, Russakovsky et al., 2015, Sun et al., 2020, Wang et al., 2018]. Moreover, efforts have been expanded to establish benchmarks for assessing transfer in the context of fixed datasets [Kornblith et al., 2019, Venkateswara et al., 2017].

When studying transfer learning in RL, we encounter a pivotal challenge: a comparably lower degree of standardisation of benchmarks, datasets, tasks and evaluation protocols. This situation has considerably improved but its core persists since the early days of transfer for reinforcement learning [Taylor and Stone, 2009]. Designing a benchmark for RL is of increased complexity with a breadth of possible evaluation criteria (see Section 3). In contrast to the fixed datasets employed in other learning paradigms, RL demands dynamic environment interaction for evaluation, introducing further difficulties. It poses particular challenges in the case of non-simulatable domains where platforms or their access have to be shared [Bauer et al., 2021]. Moreover, the requirement for environment interaction creates additional computational costs, particularly when given intricate simulations [Degraeve et al., 2022].

Correspondingly, in the reinforcement learning literature in comparison to computer vision, there are relatively fewer large-scale domains and widespread benchmarks. Notable exceptions predominantly manifest in smaller-scale tasks [Brockman et al., 2016, Tassa et al., 2018] that lend themselves to effective solutions without necessitating prior knowledge. Visual complexity is increased in a set of extensions towards more complex 3D vision-based environments [Beattie et al., 2016, Guss et al., 2019, Manolis Savva et al., 2019]. These benchmarks have the potential to be further expanded for transfer learning as tasks become intractable from scratch or require escalating computational resources. Physical benchmarks can separate us from the constraints of simulations but provide additional challenges [Bauer et al., 2021] and therefore represent a minority of existing benchmarks.

The reinforcement learning literature, in its current state, provides a collection of benchmarks related to specific facets of transfer learning. In the ensuing discussion, we aim to provide a succinct yet high-level overview with practical applications in mind. In addition to discussing existing benchmarks, our emphasis extends to RL environments suited for transformation into benchmarks in the coming years. In particular, the recent consensus on shared from-scratch RL benchmarks enabled the development of benchmarks explicitly targeting transfer in RL with stronger community support [Bellemare et al., 2013, Matthews et al., 2022, Muller-Brockhausen et al., 2021]. Two particular fields have gained notable attention: Research on meta learning [Cobbe et al., 2020, Yu et al., 2020a] and offline RL [Fu et al., 2020, Gulcehre et al., 2020]. These fields have attracted strong communities dedicated to benchmarking transfer, with a focal point on optimising adaptation efficiency as well as facilitating transfer from offline datasets.

For the robotics domain, several manipulation benchmarks enable transfer across tasks. Benchmarks such as Metaworld [Yu et al., 2020a], Robodesk [Kannan et al., 2021], RL Bench [James et al., 2020] and KitchenShift [Xing et al., 2021] maintain a consistent embodiment while introducing variations

in tasks. KitchenShift also tests for transfer with respect to the environment, including transformation in the state and observation spaces. Notably, KitchenShift goes a step further, evaluating transfer concerning the environment itself, including transformations in both state and observation spaces. In a parallel vein, Robosuite [Zhu et al., 2020b] and ManiSkill [Mu et al., 2021] extend their evaluations to assess transfer within different embodiments and environments. CausalWorld [Ahmed et al., 2021] takes a distinctive approach, benchmarking causal reasoning and providing a diverse array of procedurally generated experimental setups to facilitate testing for transfer to novel environments.

Beyond the domain of manipulation, various benchmarks cater to more general control tasks, often leveraging the DeepMind Control Suite (DMC) [Tassa et al., 2018]. These benchmarks, emphasising generalisation and transfer, frequently incorporate evaluations of transfer to disturbances in observations. Examples include the Distracting Control Suite [Stone et al., 2021], DMC-GB [Hansen et al., 2021a], and DMC Remastered [Grigsby and Qi, 2020], all examining transfer concerning alterations in sensory input, particularly changes in the backgrounds of control task environments. Benchmarks like Noisy MuJoCo [Zhao et al., 2019] and GenAsses [Packer et al., 2018] perturb the environment’s physics parameters to assess transfer capabilities in response to changing dynamics. Collectively, these benchmarks provide a robust setting for systematically exploring transfer learning and leave space for extension to fully integrated benchmarking across all axes.

The investigation of transfer for reinforcement learning transcends traditional domains like robotics and control, extending to encompass general reasoning problems and game scenarios. ProcGen [Cobbe et al., 2020] and Crafter [Hafner, 2021] are procedurally generated environments placing an agent in 2D game-like environments. Both of these benchmarks supply randomised content and allow for diverse variations in the environment. CARL [Benjamins et al., 2021] offers additional perspectives by facilitating extensions of multiple RL environments for transfer to distinct tasks. Construction [Bapst et al., 2019] represents a benchmark for testing the agent’s ability to tackle demanding physical construction tasks, constructing structures from blocks and assessing transfer to novel challenges. On the meta RL side, Alchemy [Wang et al., 2021] introduces a game-like environment that probes the agent’s high-level reasoning capacities within the benchmark’s environment. Complementary to these benchmarks are recent advancements in powerful simulators, including Habitat [Manolis Savva et al., 2019, Szot et al., 2021], Omniverse [Nvidia, 2023], and iGibson [Shen et al., 2021]. These simulators offer a foundation for generating varied simulated environments for transfer-related benchmarks. In Table 1, we provide a simplified overview of various benchmarks.

Benchmark Environment	Transfer Focus	Benchmark Environment	Transfer Focus
Metaworld	r_t adaptation	DMC-GB	o_t generalisation
Robodesk	r_t adaptation	Noisy Mujoco	o_t generalisation
RLBench	r_t adaptation	GenAsses	o_t, s_t generalisation
KitchenShift	o_t, r_t generalisation	Alchemy	o_t, r_t adaptation
RoboSuite	o_t, s_t, r_t generalisation	CARL	o_t, s_t, r_t generalisation
ManiSkill	o_t, r_t generalisation	Construction	r_t adaptation
CausalWorld	o_t, r_t, g adaptation	Procgen	o_t, r_t generalisation
Distracting DMC	o_t generalisation	Crafter	o_t, r_t generalisation

Table 1 | Comparison of different benchmarks with respect to their transfer requirements. Apart from the remainder of the taxonomy, here we explicitly discuss changes with respect to state space s and observation space o . While some of these benchmarks were not specifically designed for transfer they can be used to benchmark transfer. The second column shows the key changes for each benchmark.

6.3. Ongoing and New Trends

While transfer learning has shown remarkable successes over the past few years, there are still several challenges that limit broad applicability. Particularly, transfer still often focuses on individual tasks and domains or smaller sets thereof, limiting the scale of change that can effectively be targeted [Yu et al., 2020a]. In order to truly scale transfer via generalisation and adaptation, we are required to scale our foundations, i.e. the richness of our training distributions presented as datasets and environments. The 'bitter lesson' [Sutton, 2019] of research in artificial intelligence generalises to transfer learning. We are implored to investigate methods which will ultimately scale in their ability to transfer, to generalise and adapt, with the underlying data distributions.

We believe that several ongoing and new trends in the machine learning community can help to accelerate research along this path. They include: 1) modular and distributed learning to enable sharing and open collaborations, 2) in-context and meta learning to explicitly scale adaptation abilities with larger knowledge sources, 3) the related improvements in large pre-trained models as foundation for integrating various sources of knowledge about the world, tasks, and controlled agent embodiments, and 4) truly large-scale sources for datasets to support training these models. These aspects are discussed in further detail in the following section as we believe that they have the potential to critically shape the future of the research landscape.

6.3.1. Modularity & Distributed Learning

Similar to progress in computer science and software development, machine and reinforcement learning will benefit from improved sharing of progress across teams and building on collective work. Distributed updates and expansion of trained models and datasets has the potential to replicate the benefits of open collaborations to ML and RL. Initial examples for ML cover the collective generation of datasets [Scao et al., 2022], models [Team, 2023, Touvron et al., 2023] and benchmarks [Srivastava et al., 2022]. Increasing consensus on shared tasks and data formats enables this progress. Following this direction in RL presents additional challenges due to lower agreement on common platforms, tasks, and large-scale benchmarks and increasing complexity of evaluation as discussed in Section 6.2.

Initial efforts aiming at sharing knowledge across teams take place with focus on transferring complete, monolithic objects - sharing whole datasets [Fu et al., 2020, Gulcehre et al., 2020] or trained modalities [HuggingFace, 2022, Raffin, 2020]. Modularly transferring knowledge modalities for later combination opens up a range of opportunities and further challenges. While obtaining and combining data from different sources becomes more common in ML (with examples given in natural language processing by creating supersets combining individual datasets [Gao et al., 2020]), the process gains in complexity for merging trained models [Lawson and Qureshi, 2023, Tan et al., 2022]. Transferring learnt functions or models remains critical though as data generally requires additional computation and therefore financial cost [Chowdhery et al., 2022] as further discussed in Section 2

Developments in software engineering have led to version control and related tools for sharing and integrating functions represented as manually-written code. We require their equals for trained machine learning models. ML research with fixed datasets has already progressed in this direction and methods have been developed for distributed and federated forms of transfer learning with similarity to software development [Raffel, 2021]. Recent work enables small, distributed changes to massive neural networks including the adaptation of small subsets of all parameters [Guo et al., 2020], additional adapter modules [Houlsby et al., 2019, Sharma et al., 2023], changing representations with backwards compatibility on previous predictions [Shen et al., 2020] or the creation of knowledge bases for external retrieval [Guu et al., 2020]. Mechanisms have been developed for different

aspect of version control such as merging of combining multiple models [Matena and Raffel, 2021]. Investigating related mechanisms for RL agents provides fertile ground for future research in particular with respect to teams without access to the critical large-scale compute required to train massive policies [OpenAI et al., 2019a, Reed et al., 2022, Vinyals et al., 2019]. An early example is given by Gehring et al. [2021] who provide individual trained skills as policies for download and combination by other researchers.

6.3.2. *In-Context & Meta Learning*

The field of meta learning has significantly grown over the last decades. It originates in the context of learning to learn [Schmidhuber, 1987, Thrun, 1998] and computational demands led to initially slower growth [Taylor and Stone, 2009]. Recent years have seen in uptake in the field from learning representations that can quickly adapt [Finn et al., 2017, Gupta et al., 2018b, Mendonca et al., 2019] to learning the optimisation mechanism itself [Andrychowicz et al., 2016, Duan et al., 2016] to reward functions and objectives [Bechtle et al., 2021, Houthoofd et al., 2018, Sung et al., 2017, Xu et al., 2020].

In particular, sequence or model-based approaches to meta learning are gaining in importance by effectively leveraging truly massive datasets and models for improved generalisation. This development shifts the field towards more implicit forms of meta learning which do not require additional changes in the learning algorithm but rely on model architecture and data format. From the perspective of language modelling, this perspective is closely related to in-context learning where model parameters are not explicitly optimised. Instead adaptation builds on the model inference step itself [Brown et al., 2020, Radford et al., 2019]. Initial investigations in the space of large language models (LLMs) aim to increase our understanding of the types of optimisation possible via ICL and its connection to adaptation via gradient descent fine-tuning [Dai et al., 2022, Min et al., 2021]. In particular, connections have been drawn to linear functions, two-layer neural networks, and decision trees [Garg et al., 2022, Von Oswald et al., 2023]; and gradient descent, ridge and least-squares regression [Akyürek et al., 2022]. We are hopeful that these insights will inform further advances in RL.

As model architectures, transformers have gained increased relevance in the offline setting [Chen et al., 2021b, Laskin et al., 2022, Lee et al., 2022a, Nguyen and Grover, 2022], training on large offline datasets, as well as the online setting [Adaptive Agent Team et al., 2023, Parisotto et al., 2020, Zheng et al., 2022] training over distributions of MDPs. Training online strongly relies on improvement via RL mechanisms [Adaptive Agent Team et al., 2023, Parisotto et al., 2020]. In the offline setting, we can distinguish between training with offline RL [Chen et al., 2021b, Pong et al., 2022, Yuan and Lu, 2022] or pure imitation such as behavioural cloning [Bousmalis et al., 2023, Reed et al., 2022]. The additionally availability of rewards enables offline meta RL to disentangle the impact of reward and dynamics changes in order to improve transfer across tasks [Yuan and Lu, 2022]. This separation further allows to meta train for adaptation with additional unsupervised online data (i.e. without rewards) to bridge the distribution shift between the offline and online settings [Pong et al., 2022].

Recent theoretical work describes how generalisation capabilities to new tasks are strongly related to the distance between training and test distributions for gradient-based meta RL [Fallah et al., 2021]. This demonstrates that generalisation to tasks further away from the training distribution remains one of the key challenges of current meta learning and therefore transfer. Going forward, a critical role for meta learning will lie in the improved training and understanding of large pre-trained models also described as foundation models and analogous investigations for the sequence or model-based side of meta learning are highly valuable.

6.3.3. Large Pre-trained & Foundation Models

In line with the previous discussion of broader pre-training distributions, transfer (and specifically generalisation) via foundation models gains increased focus. This includes large language models or vision language models pre-trained in the self- or unsupervised setting via generative modelling of large data corpora [Bommasani et al., 2021]. Without further change in parameters, these models benefit from in-context learning in the inference step of the model with strong 0-shot generalisation performance to a wide range of tasks [Radford et al., 2019].

Partially inspired by this success in supervised learning, goals within the RL research community have extended towards more ambitious transfer settings. Interest in broader distributions over target tasks [Bousmalis et al., 2023] and transfer across agent embodiments [Brohan et al., 2022, 2023] are leading to an increasingly crucial role for foundation models. In RL, the use foundation models can take different shapes in relation to the discussed knowledge modalities [Bousmalis et al., 2023, Chen et al., 2021b, Di Palo et al., 2023, Driess et al., 2023, Lee et al., 2022a, Micheli et al., 2022, Reed et al., 2022, Schubert et al., 2023] and represent system dynamics, task or rewards, values and behaviour. This diversity opens a gamut of research questions along the discussed differences and relations between modalities. For a survey of FMs in general decision making we refer the interested reader to [Yang et al., 2023].

RL can benefit from FMs in two principal ways: 1. via the direct and indirect use of already pre-trained models, largely utilising the knowledge extracted from the original (mainly action-free) datasets; or 2. via the use of the underlying untrained models when training on large RL specific datasets (mainly including actions). The first path provides a way of injecting general-purpose world knowledge conveyed via language and vision at different levels of abstraction integrated with RL-specific data for grounding in the agents environment. We start seeing various applications of FMs integrated as pre-trained modules in this setting to strengthen generalisation with respect to semantic and visual shifts among others [Brohan et al., 2023]. Recent examples include the use of large language models as robot planners to decompose long-horizon tasks [Ahn et al., 2022, Di Palo et al., 2023, Huang et al., 2022b] into smaller, actionable steps additionally verified by robotics affordances. The application of foundation models for transfer go beyond planning, where they can be used as feedback mechanisms [Huang et al., 2022c] or where their language aspects can be used as a connecting medium between various separately pre-trained modalities [Alayrac et al., 2022, Zeng et al., 2022]. This ability of combining different foundation models provides an critical alternative to approaches fine-tuning a single multi-modal model as a way to improve transfer learning [Brohan et al., 2023, Driess et al., 2023].

Foundation models have also been used for imbuing general purpose object knowledge through the use of pre-trained representations [Radford et al., 2021] as well as for enabling understanding of the scene semantics (e.g. for visual navigation [Huang et al., 2022a, Shafiullah et al., 2022]). Oftentimes, these models are relatively embodiment and environment agnostic as they are trained on large corpora covering distributions of settings. Similarly, large models have been used for producing general purpose language-conditioned reward functions with similar benefits [Fan et al., 2022]. Finally, they can be applied for data augmentation in settings with small amounts of in-domain data [Xiao et al., 2022a, Yu et al., 2023]. The other path for FMs to accelerate progress in transfer learning uses the underlying models but trains completely with specific data including actions [Bousmalis et al., 2023, Brohan et al., 2022, Chen et al., 2021b, Lee et al., 2022a, Reed et al., 2022, Schubert et al., 2023]. Models with the ability to fully exploit massive RL-specific datasets cover a wide distribution over tasks, appearance, embodiments and domains to simplify transfer with respect to these factors. This perspective is currently less common due to the high cost of collection large demonstration datasets [Brohan et al., 2023] but further work towards automating data collection [Bousmalis et al., 2023]

and sharing data across teams [Padalkar et al., 2023] have the potential for fast growth.

Leveraging the knowledge compressed into foundation models, such as by direct and indirect transfer, can help to tackle a wide variety of transfer settings, overcoming the limitations of present transfer methods. But in order to train models of increasing scale, corresponding growth is also required on the data side. Due to their large parameter count, foundation models impose additional challenges and costs for transfer - in particular adaptation. Fine-tuning all parameters of the model often becomes too expensive. Therefore, computationally efficient adaptation gains critical importance. In particular for LLMs, research has led to advancements in optimising small subsets or additional sets of parameters rather than training the whole model [Hu et al., 2021]. LLMs commonly rely on prompts, i.e. text input, to describe tasks similar to additional conditioning information described in section 4. In addition to manual optimisation of prompts as conditioning [Kojima et al., 2022], a set of techniques has emerged for automatically optimising them [Lester et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2021]. Furthermore, new parameters and modules can be added to FMs to simplify adaptation [Alayrac et al., 2022, Hounsby et al., 2019, Hu et al., 2021, Li and Liang, 2021] and trained models can be effectively merged to reduce inference and memory costs [Ainsworth et al., 2022, Stoica et al., 2023].

6.3.4. Large-Scale Data Sources

Current work in reinforcement learning often builds on transferring from a small set of tasks or experiments in contrast to recent research in natural language and computer vision. Transfer across more distant tasks and domains is often limited, both for artificial [Yu et al., 2020a] and natural intelligence [Sala and Gobet, 2017]. Therefore, a broad source training distribution over relevant dimensions for transfer is critical. Online training and interaction in parallel with a very wide set of environments brings substantial challenges. However, these can be at least partially mitigated by focusing on integrating information into large datasets and on training models offline. When sufficiently related datasets are given, and do not require additional effort for their creation, our metrics shift further towards pure measurement of target data instead of combined target and source [Taylor and Stone, 2009].

As our ability grows to train larger and more capable models, sufficient domain-specific data is not often the standard setting. Here, transfer from additional, unsupervised datasets can further affect scaling laws [Hernandez et al., 2021]. Continued investigation is needed for RL because of elementary differences to learning from fixed datasets caused by entangling data generation and learning. Initial examples analyse transfer from broad, unstructured datasets to improve learning in RL [Levine, 2021, Reed et al., 2022, Xiao et al., 2022a]. While there are few current cases, the question of how to transfer from existing, potentially domain-agnostic datasets and more effective sharing of data and other modalities across projects invariably increases in relevance [Padalkar et al., 2023].

Unlike language and vision, decision making data is highly limited [Bommasani et al., 2021]. In this context, the wider availability of large non RL-specific data sources could render them a precondition for future advancements in transfer. Image and video datasets present such a source, both to directly shape RL training via objectives to optimise policies [Bahl et al., 2022] and create reward functions [Aytar et al., 2018, Peng et al., 2018b] and for general representation pre-training [Radosavovic et al., 2023]. For example, datasets created from YouTube videos have been applied for highly effective pre-training, leading to stronger results than the more common use of ImageNet data [Radosavovic et al., 2023, Sivakumar et al., 2022, Xiao et al., 2022b]. Similarly, the use of unlabelled massive datasets such as video datasets to shape reward functions [Peng et al., 2018b] and the augmentation of existing offline data [Lambert et al., 2022] is increasing. Another current, principal data source is text, which can be integrated in various ways. Examples of direct transfer from this different, and intuitively less-related domain are given by pre-training RL agents [Reid et al., 2022] or co-training

agents with text to improve generalisation [Brohan et al., 2023, Reed et al., 2022]. Even when intuitively we cannot see shared structure between these domains, it might for example help by improving the initialisation of neural networks similar to manual improvements in initialisation methods [Glorot and Bengio, 2010]. Another form of leveraging knowledge extracted from text data is exemplified by modularly combining a pre-trained language model with low-level motor skills to produce robot behaviour that is semantically grounded by the language model [Ahn et al., 2022, Singh et al., 2023]. Here, the language models take over the role of a high-level controller or planner which connects to the underlying controller via manually defined interfaces.

In tandem with external sources of datasets, the process of data generation assumes a pivotal role within. This facet offers further avenues to generate large RL-based datasets to bootstrap new experiments [Agarwal et al., 2022]. While data generation on physical hardware can incur substantial costs, RL-generated data from related domains [Ebert et al., 2022, Levine, 2021], particularly in large-scale simulated environments, has gained prominence [Degraeve et al., 2022, Haarnoja et al., 2023, Hofer et al., 2020, Zhao et al., 2020]. The recent strides in research on robotic legged locomotion, particularly with quadrupedal robots, exemplify progress harnessing rapid simulations to generate intricate reactive behaviors [Hwangbo et al., 2019, Lee et al., 2020a]. Likewise, contemporary work leverages simulated visual environments to showcase impressive sim2real transfer across various manipulation tasks [Chen et al., 2022, Lee et al., 2021a] including complex, long-horizon pick-and-place [Gervet et al., 2023, Yokoyama et al., 2023]. The application domain extends to high-frequency control for agile quadrotor flight, as demonstrated by recent work largely transferring from simulation [Kaufmann et al., 2023]. These multifaceted examples underscore the role of data generation in advancing RL research.

6.4. Concluding Remarks

Transfer in reinforcement learning has seen critical advancements over the last decade. With increasing interest in general, large-scale agents, it has only grown in importance, propelling it to the forefront of research endeavors. A paradigm shift is evident in the transition from relatively confined source domains to more expansive foundations, extracting knowledge from massive datasets and wide-ranging pre-training distributions. This development naturally aligns with the recent emergence of foundation models and further trends facilitating efficient learning in modular and distributed settings.

Our taxonomy provides a systematic framework for comprehending knowledge transfer via its modalities and mechanisms. By discussing the trade-offs and interconnections inherent in this taxonomy, we aim to forge a stronger foundation for future insights and advancements. As we look ahead to the coming decade, the landscape of reinforcement learning research is poised to grapple with new challenges propelled by increasingly ambitious goals and the corresponding required resources. We believe that transfer learning will assume a pivotal role in tackling these challenges.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the colleagues and friends whose invaluable contributions have enriched this work (in alphabetical order) Andre Barreto, Michael Bloesch, Yevgen Chebothar, Todor Davchev, Jessica Hamrick, Leonard Hasenclever, Dushyant Rao, Karl Tuyls, and Theophane Weber. Their engaging discussions, meticulous reviews, and constructive feedback during the earlier drafts have significantly shaped its current version.

Additionally, our appreciation extends to colleagues who have been instrumental in our long-standing

pursuit of improving transfer for reinforcement learning (in alphabetical order) Abbas Abdolmaleki, Steven Bohez, Philemon Brakel, Roland Hafner, Martin Riedmiller, Tobias Springenberg, Oleg Sushkov, Dhruva Tirumala, and Giulia Vezzani. Their collaborative spirit and dedication have been pivotal to the progress of our work over the years.

References

- P. Abbeel and A. Ng. Apprenticeship learning via inverse reinforcement learning. *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, 2004.
- Abbas Abdolmaleki, Sandy H Huang, Giulia Vezzani, Bobak Shahriari, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Shruti Mishra, Dhruva TB, Arunkumar Byravan, Konstantinos Bousmalis, Andras Gyorgy, et al. On multi-objective policy optimization as a tool for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08199*, 2021.
- Adaptive Agent Team, Jakob Bauer, Kate Baumli, Satinder Baveja, Feryal M. P. Behbahani, Avishkar Bhoopchand, Nathalie Bradley-Schmieg, Michael B. Chang, Natalie Clay, Adrian Collister, Vibhavari Dasagi, Lucy Gonzalez, Karol Gregor, Edward Hughes, Sheleem Kashem, Maria Loks-Thompson, Hannah Openshaw, Jack Parker-Holder, Shreyaan Pathak, Nicolas Perez Nieves, Nemanja Rakicevic, Tim Rocktäschel, Yannick Schroecker, Jakub Sygnowski, Karl Tuyls, Sarah York, Alexander Zacherl, and Lei M. Zhang. Human-timescale adaptation in an open-ended task space. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.07608, 2023.
- Rishabh Agarwal, Chen Liang, Dale Schuurmans, and Mohammad Norouzi. Learning to generalize from sparse and underspecified rewards. *ArXiv*, abs/1902.07198, 2019.
- Rishabh Agarwal, Max Schwarzer, Pablo Samuel Castro, Aaron C Courville, and Marc Bellemare. Reincarnating reinforcement learning: Reusing prior computation to accelerate progress. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:28955–28971, 2022.
- Ossama Ahmed, Frederik Träuble, Anirudh Goyal, Alexander Neitz, Manuel Wüthrich, Yoshua Bengio, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Stefan Bauer. Causalworld: A robotic manipulation benchmark for causal structure and transfer learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Michael Ahn, Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Yevgen Chebotar, Omar Cortes, Byron David, Chelsea Finn, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Alex Herzog, et al. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*, 2022.
- Samuel K Ainsworth, Jonathan Hayase, and Siddhartha Srinivasa. Git re-basin: Merging models modulo permutation symmetries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.04836*, 2022.
- Ekin Akyürek, Dale Schuurmans, Jacob Andreas, Tengyu Ma, and Denny Zhou. What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15661*, 2022.
- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andy Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.14198, 2022.
- Jacob Andreas, Dan Klein, and Sergey Levine. Modular multitask reinforcement learning with policy sketches. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 166–175. PMLR, 2017.
- Marcin Andrychowicz, Misha Denil, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Matthew W. Hoffman, David Pfau,

Tom Schaul, and Nando de Freitas. Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. In *NeurIPS*, pages 3981–3989, 2016.

Marcin Andrychowicz, Filip Wolski, Alex Ray, Jonas Schneider, Rachel Fong, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Josh Tobin, Pieter Abbeel, and Wojciech Zaremba. Hindsight experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01495*, 2017.

Isac Arnekvist, Danica Kragic, and Johannes A Stork. Vpe: Variational policy embedding for transfer reinforcement learning. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 36–42. IEEE, 2019.

Minoru Asada, Shoichi Noda, Sukoya Tawaratsumida, and Koh Hosoda. Vision-based behavior acquisition for a shooting robot by using a reinforcement learning. In *Proc. of IAPR/IEEE Workshop on Visual Behaviors*, pages 112–118, 1994.

Jordan Ash and Ryan P Adams. On warm-starting neural network training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.

Yusuf Aytar, Tobias Pfaff, David Budden, Thomas Paine, Ziyu Wang, and Nando De Freitas. Playing hard exploration games by watching youtube. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

Pierre-Luc Bacon, Jean Harb, and Doina Precup. The option-critic architecture. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.

Dzmitry Bahdanau, Felix Hill, Jan Leike, Edward Hughes, Seyedarian Hosseini, Pushmeet Kohli, and Edward Grefenstette. Learning to understand goal specifications by modelling reward. In *ICLR*, 2019.

Shikhar Bahl, Abhinav Gupta, and Deepak Pathak. Human-to-robot imitation in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.09450*, 2022.

Philip J Ball, Cong Lu, Jack Parker-Holder, and Stephen Roberts. Augmented world models facilitate zero-shot dynamics generalization from a single offline environment. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 619–629. PMLR, 2021a.

Philip J. Ball, Cong Lu, Jack Parker-Holder, and Stephen J. Roberts. Augmented world models facilitate zero-shot dynamics generalization from a single offline environment. *ArXiv*, abs/2104.05632, 2021b.

Philip J Ball, Laura Smith, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Efficient online reinforcement learning with offline data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02948*, 2023.

Victor Bapst, Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Carl Doersch, Kimberly Stachenfeld, Pushmeet Kohli, Peter Battaglia, and Jessica Hamrick. Structured agents for physical construction. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 464–474. PMLR, 2019.

André Barreto, Will Dabney, Rémi Munos, Jonathan J Hunt, Tom Schaul, Hado Van Hasselt, and David Silver. Successor features for transfer in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05312*, 2016.

Andre Barreto, Diana Borsa, John Quan, Tom Schaul, David Silver, Matteo Hessel, Daniel Mankowitz, Augustin Zidek, and Remi Munos. Transfer in deep reinforcement learning using successor features and generalised policy improvement. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 501–510. PMLR, 2018.

André Barreto, Diana Borsa, Shaobo Hou, Gheorghe Comanici, Eser Aygün, Philippe Hamel, Daniel Toyama, Shibl Mourad, David Silver, Doina Precup, et al. The option keyboard: Combining skills in reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.

Stefan Bauer, Felix Widmaier, Manuel Wuthrich, Annika Buchholz, Sebastian Stark, Anirudh Goyal, Thomas Steinbrenner, Joel Bessekon Akpo, Shruti Joshi, Vincent Berenz, Vaibhav Agrawal, Niklas Funk, Julen Urain De Jesus, Jan Peters, Joe Watson, Claire Chen, Krishna Parasuram Srinivasan, Junwu

- Zhang, Jeffrey Zhang, Matthew Walter, Rishabh Madan, Charles B. Schaff, Takahiro Maeda, Takuma Yoneda, Denis Yarats, Arthur Allshire, Ethan K. Gordon, Tapomayukh Bhattacharjee, Siddhartha S. Srinivasa, Animesh Garg, Harshit S. Sikchi, Jilong Wang, Qingfeng Yao, Shuyu Yang, Robert McCarthy, Francisco Roldán Sánchez, Qiang Wang, David Cordova Bulens, Kevin McGuinness, Noel E. O’Connor, Stephen James Redmond, and Bernhard Scholkopf. Real robot challenge: A robotics competition in the cloud. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- Charlie Beattie, Joel Z. Leibo, Denis Teplyashin, Tom Ward, Marcus Wainwright, Heinrich Küttler, Andrew Lefrancq, Simon Green, Víctor Valdés, Amir Sadik, Julian Schrittwieser, Keith Anderson, Sarah York, Max Cant, Adam Cain, Adrian Bolton, Stephen Gaffney, Helen King, Demis Hassabis, Shane Legg, and Stig Petersen. Deepmind lab. *ArXiv*, abs/1612.03801, 2016.
- Sarah Bechtle, Artem Molchanov, Yevgen Chebotar, Edward Grefenstette, Ludovic Righetti, Gaurav Sukhatme, and Franziska Meier. Meta learning via learned loss. In *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 4161–4168. IEEE, 2021.
- Suneel Belkhale, Rachel Li, Gregory Kahn, Rowan McAllister, Roberto Calandra, and Sergey Levine. Model-based meta-reinforcement learning for flight with suspended payloads. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2):1471–1478, 2021.
- Marc G Bellemare, Yavar Naddaf, Joel Veness, and Michael Bowling. The arcade learning environment: An evaluation platform for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:253–279, 2013.
- Yoshua Bengio. Deep learning of representations for unsupervised and transfer learning. In *Proceedings of ICML workshop on unsupervised and transfer learning*, pages 17–36. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012.
- Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828, 2013.
- Carolin Benjamins, Theresa Eimer, Frederik Schubert, André Biedenkapp, Bodo Rosenhahn, Frank Hutter, and Marius Lindauer. Carl: A benchmark for contextual and adaptive reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Ecological Theory of Reinforcement Learning*, December 2021.
- Steven Bohez, Saran Tunyasuvunakool, Philemon Brakel, Fereshteh Sadeghi, Leonard Hasenclever, Yuval Tassa, Emilio Parisotto, Jan Humplik, Tuomas Haarnoja, Roland Hafner, Markus Wulfmeier, Michael Neunert, Ben Moran, Noah Siegel, Andrea Huber, Francesco Romano, Nathan Batchelor, Federico Casarini, Josh Merel, Raia Hadsell, and Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess. Imitate and repurpose: Learning reusable robot movement skills from human and animal behaviors. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.17138, 2022.
- Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- Diana Borsa, André Barreto, John Quan, Daniel Mankowitz, Rémi Munos, Hado van Hasselt, David Silver, and Tom Schaul. Universal successor features approximators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07626*, 2018.
- Konstantinos Bousmalis, Alex Irpan, Paul Wohlhart, Yunfei Bai, Matthew Kelcey, Mrinal Kalakrishnan, Laura Downs, Julian Ibarz, Peter Pastor, Kurt Konolige, et al. Using simulation and domain adaptation to improve efficiency of deep robotic grasping. In *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 4243–4250. IEEE, 2018.
- Konstantinos Bousmalis, Giulia Vezzani, Dushyant Rao, Coline Devin, Alex X. Lee, Maria Bauza, Todor Davchev, Yuxiang Zhou, Agrim Gupta, Akhil Raju, Antoine Laurens, Claudio Fantacci, Valentin Dalibard, Martina Zambelli, Murilo Martins, Rugile Pevceviute, Michiel Blokzijl, Misha Denil, Nathan

Batchelor, Thomas Lampe, Emilio Parisotto, Konrad Żoźna, Scott Reed, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Jon Scholz, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Oliver Groth, Jean-Baptiste Regli, Oleg Sushkov, Tom Rothörl, José Enrique Chen, Yusuf Aytar, Dave Barker, Joy Ortiz, Martin Riedmiller, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Raia Hadsell, Francesco Nori, and Nicolas Heess. Robocat: A self-improving foundation agent for robotic manipulation, 2023.

Greg Brockman, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. Openai gym, 2016.

Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Joseph Dabis, Chelsea Finn, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Alexander Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, Julian Ibarz, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Tomas Jackson, Sally Jesmonth, Nikhil J. Joshi, Ryan C. Julian, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Yuheng Kuang, Isabel Leal, Kuang-Huei Lee, Sergey Levine, Yao Lu, Utsav Malla, Deeksha Manjunath, Igor Mordatch, Ofir Nachum, Carolina Parada, Jodilyn Peralta, Emily Perez, Karl Pertsch, Jornell Quiambao, Kanishka Rao, Michael S. Ryoo, Grecia Salazar, Pannag R. Sanketi, Kevin Sayed, Jaspiar Singh, Sumedh Anand Sontakke, Austin Stone, Clayton Tan, Huong Tran, Vincent Vanhoucke, Steve Vega, Quan Ho Vuong, F. Xia, Ted Xiao, Peng Xu, Sichun Xu, Tianhe Yu, and Brianna Zitkovich. Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2212.06817, 2022.

Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Krzysztof Choromanski, Tianli Ding, Danny Driess, Chelsea Finn, Peter R. Florence, Chuyuan Fu, Montse Gonzalez Arenas, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Kehang Han, Karol Hausman, Alexander Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Nikhil J. Joshi, Ryan C. Julian, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Yuheng Kuang, Isabel Leal, Sergey Levine, Henryk Michalewski, Igor Mordatch, Karl Pertsch, Kanishka Rao, Krista Reymann, Michael S. Ryoo, Grecia Salazar, Pannag R. Sanketi, Pierre Sermanet, Jaspiar Singh, Anika Singh, Radu Soricut, Huong Tran, Vincent Vanhoucke, Quan Ho Vuong, Ayzaan Wahid, Stefan Welker, Paul Wohlhart, Ted Xiao, Tianhe Yu, and Brianna Zitkovich. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.15818, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:260293142>.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.

Emma Brunskill and Lihong Li. Pac-inspired option discovery in lifelong reinforcement learning. In Eric P. Xing and Tony Jebara, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 32 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 316–324, Beijing, China, 22–24 Jun 2014. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v32/brunskill14.html>.

T. Brys, A. Harutyunyan, Matthew E. Taylor, and A. Nowé. Policy transfer using reward shaping. In *AAMAS*, 2015.

Bernadette Bucher, Karl Schmeckpeper, Nikolai Matni, and Kostas Daniilidis. An adversarial objective for scalable exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06082*, 2020.

Arunkumar Byravan, Felix Leeb, Franziska Meier, and Dieter Fox. Se3-pose-nets: Structured deep dynamics models for visuomotor planning and control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.00489*, 2017.

Arunkumar Byravan, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Roland Hafner, Michael Neunert, Thomas Lampe, Noah Siegel, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Imagined value gradients: Model-based policy optimization with transferable latent dynamics models. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 566–589. PMLR, 2020.

Arunkumar Byravan, Leonard Hasenclever, Piotr Trochim, M. Berk Mirza, Alessandro Davide Ialongo, Yuval Tassa, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Josh Merel, and Martin A. Riedmiller. Evaluating model-based planning and planner amortization for continuous

control. *ArXiv*, abs/2110.03363, 2021.

Serkan Cabi, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Alexander Novikov, Ksenia Konyushkova, Scott Reed, Rae Jeong, Konrad Zolna, Yusuf Aytar, David Budden, Mel Vecerik, et al. Scaling data-driven robotics with reward sketching and batch reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12200*, 2019.

Víctor Campos, Pablo Sprechmann, Steven Hansen, Andre Barreto, Steven Kapturowski, Alex Vitvitskyi, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, and Charles Blundell. Beyond fine-tuning: Transferring behavior in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.13515*, 2021.

Rich Caruana. Multitask learning. *Machine learning*, 28(1):41–75, 1997.

David Chapman and Leslie Pack Kaelbling. Input generalization in delayed reinforcement learning: An algorithm and performance comparisons. In *Ijcai*, volume 91, pages 726–731, 1991.

Kelly Chapman. *Complexity and Creative Capacity: Rethinking knowledge transfer, adaptive management and wicked environmental problems*. Routledge, 2015.

Yevgen Chebotar, Karol Hausman, Yao Lu, Ted Xiao, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Jake Varley, Alex Irpan, Benjamin Eysenbach, Ryan Julian, Chelsea Finn, et al. Actionable models: Unsupervised offline reinforcement learning of robotic skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07749*, 2021.

Annie S Chen, Suraj Nair, and Chelsea Finn. Learning generalizable robotic reward functions from "in-the-wild" human videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.16817*, 2021a.

Lili Chen, Kevin Lu, Aravind Rajeswaran, Kimin Lee, Aditya Grover, Michael Laskin, P. Abbeel, A. Srinivas, and Igor Mordatch. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021b.

Tao Chen, Jie Xu, and Pulkit Agrawal. A system for general in-hand object re-orientation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 297–307. PMLR, 2022.

Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam M. Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Benton C. Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier García, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Díaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathleen S. Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.02311, 2022.

Paul Christiano, Zain Shah, Igor Mordatch, Jonas Schneider, Trevor Blackwell, Joshua Tobin, Pieter Abbeel, and Wojciech Zaremba. Transfer from simulation to real world through learning deep inverse dynamics model, 2016.

Ignasi Clavera, Jonas Rothfuss, John Schulman, Yasuhiro Fujita, Tamim Asfour, and Pieter Abbeel. Model-based reinforcement learning via meta-policy optimization. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 617–629. PMLR, 2018.

Karl Cobbe, Christopher Hesse, Jacob Hilton, and John Schulman. Leveraging procedural generation to benchmark reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1912.01588, 2020.

Marius Cordts, Mohamed Omran, Sebastian Ramos, Timo Rehfeld, Markus Enzweiler, Rodrigo Benenson, Uwe Franke, Stefan Roth, and Bernt Schiele. The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages

3213–3223, 2016.

Michael Crawshaw. Multi-task learning with deep neural networks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09796*, 2020.

Gabriel V Cruz Jr, Yunshu Du, and Matthew E Taylor. Pre-training neural networks with human demonstrations for deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.04083*, 2017.

Yuchen Cui, Scott Niekum, Abhinav Gupta, Vikash Kumar, and Aravind Rajeswaran. Can foundation models perform zero-shot task specification for robot manipulation? In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 893–905. PMLR, 2022.

Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Razvan Pascanu, Simon Osindero, Siddhant M. Jayakumar, Grzegorz Swirszcz, and Max Jaderberg. Distilling policy distillation. *ArXiv*, abs/1902.02186, 2019.

Damai Dai, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. Why can gpt learn in-context? language models secretly perform gradient descent as meta optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10559*, 2022.

Christian Daniel, Gerhard Neumann, and Jan Peters. Hierarchical relative entropy policy search. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 273–281. PMLR, 2012.

Christian Daniel, Oliver Kroemer, Malte Viering, Jan Metz, and Jan Peters. Active reward learning with a novel acquisition function. *Autonomous Robots*, 39(3):389 – 405, October 2015.

Sudeep Dasari, Frederik Ebert, Stephen Tian, Suraj Nair, Bernadette Bucher, Karl Schmeckpeper, Siddharth Singh, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Robonet: Large-scale multi-robot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11215*, 2019.

Todor Davchev, Oleg O. Sushkov, Jean-Baptiste Regli, Stefan Schaal, Yusuf Aytar, Markus Wulfmeier, and Jonathan Scholz. Wish you were here: Hindsight goal selection for long-horizon dexterous manipulation. *ArXiv*, abs/2112.00597, 2021.

Todor Davchev, Kevin Sebastian Luck, Michael Burke, Franziska Meier, Stefan Schaal, and Subramanian Ramamoorthy. Residual learning from demonstration: Adapting dmps for contact-rich manipulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):4488–4495, 2022.

Peter Dayan. Improving generalization for temporal difference learning: The successor representation. *Neural Computation*, 5(4):613–624, 1993.

Peter Dayan and Geoffrey E Hinton. Feudal reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1993.

Jonas Degraeve, Federico Felici, Jonas Buchli, Michael Neunert, Brendan Tracey, Francesco Carpanese, Timo Ewalds, Roland Hafner, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Diego de Las Casas, et al. Magnetic control of tokamak plasmas through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 602(7897):414–419, 2022.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

Norman Di Palo, Arunkumar Byravan, Leonard Hasenclever, Markus Wulfmeier, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Towards a unified agent with foundation models. In *Workshop on Reincarnating Reinforcement Learning at ICLR 2023*, 2023.

Andrea Dittadi, Frederik Träuble, Manuel Wüthrich, Felix Widmaier, Peter Gehler, Ole Winther, Francesco Locatello, Olivier Bachem, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Stefan Bauer. The role of pre-trained representations for the ood generalization of reinforcement learning agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.05686*, 2021.

Ron Dorfman and Aviv Tamar. Offline meta reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2008.02598, 2020.

Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan

- Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378*, 2023.
- Maximilian Du, Suraj Nair, Dorsa Sadigh, and Chelsea Finn. Behavior retrieval: Few-shot imitation learning by querying unlabeled datasets. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.08742, 2023.
- Yan Duan, John Schulman, Xi Chen, Peter L. Bartlett, Ilya Sutskever, and Pieter Abbeel. RL²: Fast reinforcement learning via slow reinforcement learning, 2016.
- Yan Duan, Marcin Andrychowicz, Bradly C Stadie, Jonathan Ho, Jonas Schneider, Ilya Sutskever, Pieter Abbeel, and Wojciech Zaremba. One-shot imitation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.07326*, 2017.
- Frederik Ebert, Chelsea Finn, Sudeep Dasari, Annie Xie, Alex Lee, and Sergey Levine. Visual foresight: Model-based deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00568*, 2018.
- Frederik Ebert, Yanlai Yang, Karl Schmeckpeper, Bernadette Bucher, Georgios Georgakis, Kostas Daniilidis, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Bridge data: Boosting generalization of robotic skills with cross-domain datasets. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.13396, 2022.
- Alejandro Escontrela, Ademi Adeniji, Wilson Yan, Ajay Jain, Xue Bin Peng, Ken Goldberg, Youngwoon Lee, Danijar Hafner, and Pieter Abbeel. Video prediction models as rewards for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14343*, 2023.
- Ben Evans, Abitha Thankaraj, and Lerrel Pinto. Context is everything: Implicit identification for dynamics adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05549*, 2022.
- Ben Eysenbach, Xinyang Geng, Sergey Levine, and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Rewriting history with inverse rl: Hindsight inference for policy improvement. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:14783–14795, 2020.
- Benjamin Eysenbach, Abhishek Gupta, Julian Ibarz, and Sergey Levine. Diversity is all you need: Learning skills without a reward function. *ArXiv*, abs/1802.06070, 2019.
- Rasool Fakoor, Pratik Chaudhari, Stefano Soatto, and Alexander J Smola. Meta-q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00125*, 2019.
- Alireza Fallah, Aryan Mokhtari, and Asuman Ozdaglar. Generalization of model-agnostic meta-learning algorithms: Recurring and unseen tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:5469–5480, 2021.
- Linxi Fan, Guanzhi Wang, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Yuncong Yang, Haoyi Zhu, Andrew Tang, De-An Huang, Yuke Zhu, and Anima Anandkumar. Minedojo: Building open-ended embodied agents with internet-scale knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08853*, 2022.
- Samuel G Finlayson. *Learning Inductive Representations of Biomedical Data*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2020.
- Chelsea Finn and Sergey Levine. Deep visual foresight for planning robot motion. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2786–2793. IEEE, 2017.
- Chelsea Finn, Sergey Levine, and P. Abbeel. Guided cost learning: Deep inverse optimal control via policy optimization. *ArXiv*, abs/1603.00448, 2016.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 2017.
- Carlos Florensa, David Held, Markus Wulfmeier, Michael Zhang, and Pieter Abbeel. Reverse curriculum generation for reinforcement learning. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 482–495. PMLR, 2017.
- P W Fox, S L Hershberger, and T J Bouchard, Jr. Genetic and environmental contributions to the

acquisition of a motor skill. *Nature*, 384(6607):356–358, November 1996.

Justin Fu, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. One-shot learning of manipulation skills with online dynamics adaptation and neural network priors. In *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 4019–4026. IEEE, 2016.

Justin Fu, Katie Luo, and Sergey Levine. Learning robust rewards with adversarial inverse reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.11248*, 2017.

Justin Fu, Anoop Korattikara Balan, Sergey Levine, and Sergio Guadarrama. From language to goals: Inverse reinforcement learning for vision-based instruction following. *ArXiv*, abs/1902.07742, 2019.

Justin Fu, Aviral Kumar, Ofir Nachum, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. D4rl: Datasets for deep data-driven reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07219*, 2020.

Scott Fujimoto, David Meger, and Doina Precup. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration, 2018.

Alexandre Galashov, Siddhant M Jayakumar, Leonard Hasenclever, Dhruva Tirumala, Jonathan Schwarz, Guillaume Desjardins, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Yee Whye Teh, Razvan Pascanu, and Nicolas Heess. Information asymmetry in kl-regularized rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.01240*, 2019a.

Alexandre Galashov, Jonathan Schwarz, Hyunjik Kim, Marta Garnelo, David Saxton, Pushmeet Kohli, SM Eslami, and Yee Whye Teh. Meta-learning surrogate models for sequential decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11907*, 2019b.

Alexandre Galashov, Jakub Sygnowski, Guillaume Desjardins, Jan Humplik, Leonard Hasenclever, Rae Jeong, Yee Whye Teh, and Nicolas Heess. Importance weighted policy learning and adaption. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.04875*, 2020.

Leo Gao, Stella Rose Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *ArXiv*, abs/2101.00027, 2020.

Carlos E Garcia, David M Prett, and Manfred Morari. Model predictive control: Theory and practice—a survey. *Automatica*, 25(3):335–348, 1989.

Shivam Garg, Dimitris Tsipras, Percy S Liang, and Gregory Valiant. What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30583–30598, 2022.

Jonas Gehring, Gabriel Synnaeve, Andreas Krause, and Nicolas Usunier. Hierarchical skills for efficient exploration. *ArXiv*, abs/2110.10809, 2021.

Theophile Gervet, Soumith Chintala, Dhruv Batra, Jitendra Malik, and Devendra Singh Chaplot. Navigating to objects in the real world. *Science Robotics*, 8(79):eadf6991, 2023.

Dibya Ghosh, Jad Rahme, Aviral Kumar, Amy Zhang, Ryan P. Adams, and Sergey Levine. Why generalization in rl is difficult: Epistemic pomdps and implicit partial observability. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.06277, 2021.

Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010.

Ian J Goodfellow, Mehdi Mirza, Da Xiao, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. An empirical investigation of catastrophic forgetting in gradient-based neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6211*, 2013.

Anirudh Goyal, Shagun Sodhani, Jonathan Binas, Xue Bin Peng, Sergey Levine, and Yoshua Bengio. Reinforcement learning with competitive ensembles of information-constrained primitives. *ArXiv*,

abs/1906.10667, 2019.

Anirudh Goyal, Abram Friesen, Andrea Banino, Theophane Weber, Nan Rosemary Ke, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Peter C Humphreys, Ksenia Konyushova, et al. Retrieval-augmented reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7740–7765. PMLR, 2022.

Karol Gregor, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, and Daan Wierstra. Variational intrinsic control. *ArXiv*, abs/1611.07507, 2017.

Sam Greydanus, Misko Dzamba, and Jason Yosinski. Hamiltonian neural networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.01563, 2019.

Jake Grigsby and Yanjun Qi. Measuring visual generalization in continuous control from pixels, 2020.

Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. Bootstrap your own latent—a new approach to self-supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:21271–21284, 2020.

Christopher Grimm, Irina Higgins, Andre Barreto, Denis Teplyashin, Markus Wulfmeier, Tim Hertweck, Raia Hadsell, and Satinder Singh. Disentangled cumulants help successor representations transfer to new tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.10866*, 2019.

Oliver Groth, Markus Wulfmeier, Giulia Vezzani, Vibhavari Dasagi, Tim Hertweck, Roland Hafner, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, and Martin A. Riedmiller. Is curiosity all you need? on the utility of emergent behaviours from curious exploration. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.08603, 2021.

Caglar Gulcehre, Ziyu Wang, Alexander Novikov, Thomas Paine, Sergio Gómez, Konrad Zolna, Rishabh Agarwal, Josh S Merel, Daniel J Mankowitz, Cosmin Paduraru, Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, Jerry Li, Mohammad Norouzi, Matthew Hoffman, Nicolas Heess, and Nando de Freitas. Rl unplugged: A suite of benchmarks for offline reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

Demi Guo, Alexander M Rush, and Yoon Kim. Parameter-efficient transfer learning with diff pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.07463*, 2020.

Abhishek Gupta, Coline Devin, Yuxuan Liu, P. Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Learning invariant feature spaces to transfer skills with reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1703.02949, 2017.

Abhishek Gupta, Benjamin Eysenbach, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Unsupervised meta-learning for reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1806.04640, 2018a.

Abhishek Gupta, Russell Mendonca, Yuxuan Liu, P. Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Meta-reinforcement learning of structured exploration strategies. In *NeurIPS*, 2018b.

Abhishek Gupta, Vikash Kumar, Corey Lynch, Sergey Levine, and Karol Hausman. Relay policy learning: Solving long-horizon tasks via imitation and reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11956*, 2019.

Abhishek Gupta, Justin Yu, Tony Z Zhao, Vikash Kumar, Aaron Rovinsky, Kelvin Xu, Thomas Devlin, and Sergey Levine. Reset-free reinforcement learning via multi-task learning: Learning dexterous manipulation behaviors without human intervention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.11203*, 2021.

William H. Guss, Brandon Houghton, Nicholay Topin, Phillip Wang, Cayden Codel, Manuela M. Veloso, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Minerl: A large-scale dataset of minecraft demonstrations. *ArXiv*, abs/1907.13440, 2019.

Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. Realm: Retrieval-augmented language model pre-training. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.08909, 2020.

- David Ha and Jürgen Schmidhuber. World models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.10122*, 2018.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Haoran Tang, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1352–1361. PMLR, 2017.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Kristian Hartikainen, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Latent space policies for hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1851–1860. PMLR, 2018a.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Vitchyr Pong, Aurick Zhou, Murtaza Dalal, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Composable deep reinforcement learning for robotic manipulation. In *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 6244–6251. IEEE, 2018b.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1861–1870. PMLR, 2018c.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Ben Moran, Guy Lever, Sandy H. Huang, Dhruva Tirumala, Markus Wulfmeier, Jan Humplik, Saran Tunyasuvunakool, Noah Siegel, Roland Hafner, Michael Bloesch, Kristian Hartikainen, Arunkumar Byravan, Leonard Hasenclever, Yuval Tassa, Fereshteh Sadeghi, Nathan Batchelor, Federico Casarini, Stefano Saliceti, Charles Game, Neil Sreendra, Kushal Patel, Marlon Gwira, Andrea Huber, Nicole Hurley, Francesco Nori, Raia Hadsell, and Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess. Learning agile soccer skills for a bipedal robot with deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.13653, 2023.
- Danijar Hafner. Benchmarking the spectrum of agent capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06780*, 2021.
- Danijar Hafner, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Jimmy Ba, and Mohammad Norouzi. Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination. *CoRR*, abs/1912.01603, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.01603>.
- Nicklas Hansen, Hao Su, and Xiaolong Wang. Stabilizing deep q-learning with convnets and vision transformers under data augmentation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:3680–3693, 2021a.
- Nicklas Hansen, Yu Sun, P. Abbeel, Alexei A. Efros, Lerrel Pinto, and Xiaolong Wang. Self-supervised policy adaptation during deployment. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.04309, 2021b.
- Steven Hansen, Will Dabney, Andre Barreto, Tom Van de Wiele, David Warde-Farley, and Volodymyr Mnih. Fast task inference with variational intrinsic successor features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05030*, 2019.
- Leonard Hasenclever, Fabio Pardo, Raia Hadsell, Nicolas Heess, and Josh Merel. CoMic: Complementary task learning & mimicry for reusable skills. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2020.
- Karol Hausman, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Ziyu Wang, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Learning an embedding space for transferable robot skills. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Piotr Dollár. Rethinking imagenet pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4918–4927, 2019.
- Nicolas Heess, Greg Wayne, Yuval Tassa, Timothy Lillicrap, Martin Riedmiller, and David Silver. Learning and transfer of modulated locomotor controllers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05182*, 2016.
- David Held, Zoe McCarthy, Michael Zhang, Fred Shentu, and Pieter Abbeel. Probabilistically safe policy transfer. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5798–5805. IEEE, 2017.

- Danny Hernandez, Jared Kaplan, T. J. Henighan, and Sam McCandlish. Scaling laws for transfer. *ArXiv*, abs/2102.01293, 2021.
- Todd Hester, Matej Vecerik, Olivier Pietquin, Marc Lanctot, Tom Schaul, Bilal Piot, Dan Horgan, John Quan, Andrew Sendonaris, Ian Osband, et al. Deep q-learning from demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Felix Hill, Sona Mokra, Nathaniel Wong, and Tim Harley. Human instruction-following with deep reinforcement learning via transfer-learning from text. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.09382, 2020.
- Geoffrey E Hinton and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *science*, 313(5786):504–507, 2006.
- Jonathan Ho and Stefano Ermon. Generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29:4565–4573, 2016.
- Sebastian Hofer, Kostas E. Bekris, Ankur Handa, Juan Camilo Gamboa, Florian Golemo, Melissa Mozifian, C. Atkeson, D. Fox, Ken Goldberg, John Leonard, C. Liu, Jan Peters, Shuran Song, P. Welinder, and M. White. Perspectives on sim2real transfer for robotics: A summary of the r: Ss 2020 workshop. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.03806, 2020.
- Ryan Hoque, Daniel Seita, Ashwin Balakrishna, Aditya Ganapathi, Ajay Kumar Tanwani, Nawid Jamali, Katsu Yamane, Soshi Iba, and Ken Goldberg. Visuospatial foresight for multi-step, multi-task fabric manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09044*, 2020.
- Ryan Hoque, Daniel Seita, Ashwin Balakrishna, Aditya Ganapathi, Ajay Kumar Tanwani, Nawid Jamali, Katsu Yamane, Soshi Iba, and Ken Goldberg. Visuospatial foresight for physical sequential fabric manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09754*, 2021.
- Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- Rein Houthoofd, Yuhua Chen, Phillip Isola, Bradly Stadie, Filip Wolski, OpenAI Jonathan Ho, and Pieter Abbeel. Evolved policy gradients. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- J. Edward Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2106.09685, 2021.
- Chenguang Huang, Oier Mees, Andy Zeng, and Wolfram Burgard. Visual language maps for robot navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05714*, 2022a.
- Wenlong Huang, Pieter Abbeel, Deepak Pathak, and Igor Mordatch. Language models as zero-shot planners: Extracting actionable knowledge for embodied agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07207*, 2022b.
- Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, et al. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*, 2022c.
- HuggingFace. Decision transformer, 2022. URL https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/decision_transformer.
- Minyoung Huh, Pulkit Agrawal, and Alexei A Efros. What makes imagenet good for transfer learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08614*, 2016.
- Peter Humphreys, Arthur Guez, Olivier Tieleman, Laurent Sifre, Théophane Weber, and Timothy Lillicrap. Large-scale retrieval for reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:20092–20104, 2022.
- Jan Humplik, Alexandre Galashov, Leonard Hasenclever, Pedro A. Ortega, Yee Whye Teh, and Nicolas

- Manfred Otto Heess. Meta reinforcement learning as task inference. *ArXiv*, abs/1905.06424, 2019.
- Jonathan Hunt, Andre Barreto, Timothy Lillicrap, and Nicolas Heess. Composing entropic policies using divergence correction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2911–2920. PMLR, 2019.
- Jemin Hwangbo, Joonho Lee, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Dario Bellicoso, Vassilios Tsounis, Vladlen Koltun, and Marco Hutter. Learning agile and dynamic motor skills for legged robots. *Science Robotics*, 4(26), 2019. doi: 10.1126/scirobotics.aau5872. URL <https://robotics.sciencemag.org/content/4/26/eaau5872>.
- Maximilian Igl, Gregory Farquhar, Jelena Luketina, Wendelin Böhmer, and Shimon Whiteson. Transient non-stationarity and generalisation in deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05826*, 2020.
- Max Jaderberg, Volodymyr Mnih, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Tom Schaul, Joel Z. Leibo, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Reinforcement learning with unsupervised auxiliary tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/1611.05397, 2017.
- Stephen James, Zicong Ma, David Rovick Arrojo, and Andrew J. Davison. Rlbench: The robot learning benchmark & learning environment. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2020.
- Michael Janner, Igor Mordatch, and Sergey Levine. Generative temporal difference learning for infinite-horizon prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14496*, 2020.
- Rae Jeong, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Jackie Kay, Daniel Zheng, Yuxiang Zhou, Alexandre Galashov, Nicolas Heess, and Francesco Nori. Learning dexterous manipulation from suboptimal experts. *CoRR*, abs/2010.08587, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08587>.
- Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021.
- Yiding Jiang, Shixiang Shane Gu, Kevin P Murphy, and Chelsea Finn. Language as an abstraction for hierarchical deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Tobias Johannink, Shikhar Bahl, Ashvin Nair, Jianlan Luo, Avinash Kumar, Matthias Loskyll, Juan Aparicio Ojea, Eugen Solowjow, and Sergey Levine. Residual reinforcement learning for robot control. *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6023–6029, 2019.
- Ryan Julian, Benjamin Swanson, Gaurav S Sukhatme, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Karol Hausman. Never stop learning: The effectiveness of fine-tuning in robotic reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10190*, 2020.
- Leslie Pack Kaelbling. Learning to achieve goals. In *IJCAI*, volume 2, pages 1094–8. Citeseer, 1993.
- Dmitry Kalashnikov, Jacob Varley, Yevgen Chebotar, Benjamin Swanson, Rico Jonschkowski, Chelsea Finn, Sergey Levine, and Karol Hausman. Mt-opt: Continuous multi-task robotic reinforcement learning at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08212*, 2021.
- Katie Kang, Gregory Kahn, and Sergey Levine. Hierarchically integrated models: Learning to navigate from heterogeneous robots. In *5th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2021.
- Harini Kannan, Danijar Hafner, Chelsea Finn, and Dumitru Erhan. Robodesk: A multi-task reinforcement learning benchmark. <https://github.com/google-research/robodesk>, 2021.
- Elia Kaufmann, Leonard Bauersfeld, Antonio Loquercio, Matthias Müller, Vladlen Koltun, and Davide Scaramuzza. Champion-level drone racing using deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 620(7976): 982–987, 2023.

- Rituraj Kaushik, Timothée Anne, and Jean-Baptiste Mouret. Fast online adaptation in robotics through meta-learning embeddings of simulated priors. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5269–5276. IEEE, 2020.
- Apoorv Khandelwal, Luca Weihs, Roozbeh Mottaghi, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Simple but effective: Clip embeddings for embodied ai. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14829–14838, 2022.
- Taylor W Killian, Samuel Daulton, George Konidaris, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Robust and efficient transfer learning with hidden parameter markov decision processes. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Kee-Eung Kim and Hyun Soo Park. Imitation learning via kernel mean embedding. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- Robert Kirk, Amy Zhang, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. A survey of generalisation in deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.09794*, 2021.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13): 3521–3526, 2017.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *ArXiv*, abs/2205.11916, 2022.
- G. Konidaris and A. Barto. Autonomous shaping: knowledge transfer in reinforcement learning. *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006.
- George Konidaris and Andrew Barto. Building portable options: Skill transfer in reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’07*, page 895–900, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2007. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- Simon Kornblith, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V. Le. Do better imagenet models transfer better? *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2656–2666, 2019.
- Ilya Kostrikov, Ofir Nachum, and Jonathan Tompson. Imitation learning via off-policy distribution matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.05032*, 2019.
- Ilya Kostrikov, Ashvin Nair, and Sergey Levine. Offline reinforcement learning with implicit q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06169*, 2021.
- Tejas D Kulkarni, Ardavan Saeedi, Simanta Gautam, and Samuel J Gershman. Deep successor reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02396*, 2016.
- Ananya Kumar, Aditi Raghunathan, Robbie Jones, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. Fine-tuning can distort pretrained features and underperform out-of-distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10054*, 2022a.
- Ashish Kumar, Zipeng Fu, Deepak Pathak, and Jitendra Malik. Rma: Rapid motor adaptation for legged robots. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.04034, 2021.
- Aviral Kumar, Aurick Zhou, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04779*, 2020a.
- Aviral Kumar, Anikait Singh, Frederik Ebert, Yanlai Yang, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Pre-training for robots: Offline rl enables learning new tasks from a handful of trials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05178*, 2022b.
- Saurabh Kumar, Aviral Kumar, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. One solution is not all you need: Few-shot extrapolation via structured maxent rl. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:8198–8210, 2020b.

Andras Kupcsik, Marc Peter Deisenroth, Jan Peters, Ai Poh Loh, Prahlad Vadakkepat, and Gerhard Neumann. Model-based contextual policy search for data-efficient generalization of robot skills. *Artificial Intelligence*, 247:415–439, 2017.

Andrey Kurenkov, Ajay Mandlekar, Roberto Martin Martin, Silvio Savarese, and Animesh Garg. Ac-teach: A bayesian actor-critic method for policy learning with an ensemble of suboptimal teachers. *ArXiv*, abs/1909.04121, 2019.

Nathan Lambert, Markus Wulfmeier, William F. Whitney, Arunkumar Byravan, Michael Bloesch, Vibhavari Dasagi, Tim Hertweck, and Martin A. Riedmiller. The challenges of exploration for offline reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.11861, 2022.

Sascha Lange and Martin Riedmiller. Deep auto-encoder neural networks in reinforcement learning. In *The 2010 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2010.

Romain Laroché and Merwan Barlier. Transfer reinforcement learning with shared dynamics. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.

Michael Laskin, Luyu Wang, Junhyuk Oh, Emilio Parisotto, Stephen Spencer, Richie Steigerwald, DJ Strouse, Steven Hansen, Angelos Filos, Ethan Brooks, et al. In-context reinforcement learning with algorithm distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14215*, 2022.

Daniel Lawson and Ahmed Hussain Qureshi. Merging decision transformers: Weight averaging for forming multi-task policies. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.07551, 2023.

Alessandro Lazaric. Transfer in reinforcement learning: A framework and a survey. In Marco Wiering and Martijn van Otterlo, editors, *Reinforcement Learning: State-of-the-Art*, pages 143–173. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.

Alex X Lee, Coline Manon Devin, Yuxiang Zhou, Thomas Lampe, Konstantinos Bousmalis, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Arunkumar Byravan, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Nimrod Gileadi, David Khosid, et al. Beyond pick-and-place: Tackling robotic stacking of diverse shapes. In *5th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2021a.

Joonho Lee, Jemin Hwangbo, Lorenz Wellhausen, Vladlen Koltun, and Marco Hutter. Learning quadrupedal locomotion over challenging terrain. *Science robotics*, 5(47):eabc5986, 2020a.

Kimin Lee, Younggyo Seo, Seunghyun Lee, Honglak Lee, and Jinwoo Shin. Context-aware dynamics model for generalization in model-based reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5757–5766. PMLR, 2020b.

Kimin Lee, Laura Smith, and Pieter Abbeel. Pebble: Feedback-efficient interactive reinforcement learning via relabeling experience and unsupervised pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05091*, 2021b.

Kuang-Huei Lee, Ofir Nachum, Mengjiao Yang, Lisa Lee, Daniel Freeman, Winnie Xu, Sergio Guadarrama, Ian Fischer, Eric Jang, Henryk Michalewski, et al. Multi-game decision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15241*, 2022a.

Lisa Lee, Benjamin Eysenbach, Emilio Parisotto, Eric P. Xing, Sergey Levine, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Efficient exploration via state marginal matching. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.05274, 2019.

Seunghyun Lee, Younggyo Seo, Kimin Lee, Pieter Abbeel, and Jinwoo Shin. Offline-to-online reinforcement learning via balanced replay and pessimistic q-ensemble. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1702–1712. PMLR, 2022b.

Suyoung Lee and Sae-Young Chung. Improving generalization in meta-rl with imaginary tasks from latent dynamics mixture. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27222–27235, 2021.

Youngwoon Lee, Shao-Hua Sun, Sriram Somasundaram, Edward S. Hu, and Joseph J. Lim. Composing complex skills by learning transition policies. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*,

2018.

Youngwoon Lee, Joseph J. Lim, Anima Anandkumar, and Yuke Zhu. Adversarial skill chaining for long-horizon robot manipulation via terminal state regularization. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2021c.

Máté Lengyel and Peter Dayan. Hippocampal contributions to control: The third way. In *NIPS*, 2007.

Ian Lenz, Ross A Knepper, and Ashutosh Saxena. Deepmpc: Learning deep latent features for model predictive control. In *Robotics: Science and Systems*. Rome, Italy, 2015.

Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:233296808>.

Sergey Levine. Understanding the world through action. *ArXiv*, abs/2110.12543, 2021.

Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Darrell, and Pieter Abbeel. End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1334–1373, 2016.

Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.

Andrew Levy, Robert Platt Jr., and Kate Saenko. Hierarchical actor-critic. *CoRR*, abs/1712.00948, 2017a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1712.00948>.

Andrew Levy, George Konidaris, Robert Platt, and Kate Saenko. Learning multi-level hierarchies with hindsight. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00948*, 2017b.

Alexander Li, Carlos Florensa, Ignasi Clavera, and P. Abbeel. Sub-policy adaptation for hierarchical reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.05862, 2020a.

Alexander Li, Lerrel Pinto, and Pieter Abbeel. Generalized hindsight for reinforcement learning. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 7754–7767. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020b. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/57e5cb96e22546001f1d6520ff11d9ba-Paper.pdf>.

Kevin Li, Abhishek Gupta, Ashwin Reddy, Vitchyr H. Pong, Aurick Zhou, Justin Yu, and Sergey Levine. Mural: Meta-learning uncertainty-aware rewards for outcome-driven reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.07184, 2021.

Siyuan Li and Chongjie Zhang. An optimal online method of selecting source policies for reinforcement learning. In *AAAI*, 2018.

Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.

Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. *ArXiv*, abs/1405.0312, 2014.

Siqi Liu, Guy Lever, Zhe Wang, Josh Merel, SM Ali Eslami, Daniel Hennes, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Yuval Tassa, Shayegan Omidshafiei, Abbas Abdolmaleki, et al. From motor control to team play in simulated humanoid football. *Science Robotics*, 7(69):eabo0235, 2022.

Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gpt understands, too. *ArXiv*, abs/2103.10385, 2021. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:232269696>.

Lennart Ljung. System identification. In *Signal analysis and prediction*, pages 163–173. Springer, 1998.

Yao Lu, Karol Hausman, Yevgen Chebotar, Mengyuan Yan, Eric Jang, Alexander Herzog, Ted Xiao, Alex Irpan, Mohi Khansari, Dmitry Kalashnikov, et al. Aw-opt: Learning robotic skills with imitation and reinforcement at scale. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1078–1088. PMLR, 2022.

Jelena Luketina, Nantas Nardelli, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob Foerster, Jacob Andreas, Edward Grefenstette, Shimon Whiteson, and Tim Rocktäschel. A survey of reinforcement learning informed by natural language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03926*, 2019.

Corey Lynch and Pierre Sermanet. Language conditioned imitation learning over unstructured data. *Robotics: Science and Systems XVII*, 2020.

Corey Lynch, Mohi Khansari, Ted Xiao, Vikash Kumar, Jonathan Tompson, Sergey Levine, and Pierre Sermanet. Learning latent plans from play. In *CoRL*, 2019.

Corey Lynch, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Tianli Ding, James Betker, Robert Baruch, Travis Armstrong, and Pete Florence. Interactive language: Talking to robots in real time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06407*, 2022.

Yecheng Jason Ma, Shagun Sodhani, Dinesh Jayaraman, Osbert Bastani, Vikash Kumar, and Amy Zhang. Vip: Towards universal visual reward and representation via value-implicit pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00030*, 2022.

Yecheng Jason Ma, William Liang, Vaidehi Som, Vikash Kumar, Amy Zhang, Osbert Bastani, and Dinesh Jayaraman. Liv: Language-image representations and rewards for robotic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00958*, 2023.

Marlos C Machado, Marc G Bellemare, and Michael Bowling. Count-based exploration with the successor representation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 5125–5133, 2020.

Sridhar Mahadevan. Average reward reinforcement learning: Foundations, algorithms, and empirical results. *Machine learning*, 22:159–195, 1996.

Parsa Mahmoudieh, Deepak Pathak, and Trevor Darrell. Zero-shot reward specification via grounded natural language. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 14743–14752. PMLR, 2022.

Manolis Savva, Abhishek Kadian, Oleksandr Maksymets, Yili Zhao, Erik Wijmans, Bhavana Jain, Julian Straub, Jia Liu, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat: A Platform for Embodied AI Research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019.

Michael Matena and Colin Raffel. Merging models with fisher-weighted averaging. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.09832, 2021.

Michael Matthews, Mikayel Samvelyan, Jack Parker-Holder, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. Skillhack: A benchmark for skill transfer in open-ended reinforcement learning. In *ICLR Workshop on Agent Learning in Open-Endedness*, 2022.

David Q Mayne. Model predictive control: Recent developments and future promise. *Automatica*, 50(12):2967–2986, 2014.

Russell Mendonca, Abhishek Gupta, Rosen Kralev, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Guided meta-policy search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.00956*, 2019.

Josh Merel, Yuval Tassa, Dhruva TB, Sriram Srinivasan, Jay Lemmon, Ziyu Wang, Greg Wayne, and Nicolas Heess. Learning human behaviors from motion capture by adversarial imitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02201*, 2017.

Josh Merel, Leonard Hasenclever, Alexandre Galashov, Arun Ahuja, Vu Pham, Greg Wayne, Yee Whye Teh, and Nicolas Heess. Neural probabilistic motor primitives for humanoid control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.11711*, 2018.

- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models, 2016.
- Grégoire Mesnil, Yann Dauphin, Xavier Glorot, Salah Rifai, Yoshua Bengio, Ian Goodfellow, Erick Lavoie, Xavier Muller, Guillaume Desjardins, David Warde-Farley, et al. Unsupervised and transfer learning challenge: a deep learning approach. In *Proceedings of ICML Workshop on Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*, pages 97–110. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012.
- Vincent Micheli, Eloi Alonso, and Francois Fleuret. Transformers are sample efficient world models. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.00588, 2022.
- Donald Michie and Roger A Chambers. Boxes: An experiment in adaptive control. *Machine intelligence*, 2(2):137–152, 1968.
- Richard E Michod. *Darwinian dynamics: evolutionary transitions in fitness and individuality*. Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Metaicl: Learning to learn in context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.15943*, 2021.
- Azalia Mirhoseini, Anna Goldie, M. Yazgan, J. Jiang, Ebrahim M. Songhori, S. Wang, Young-Joon Lee, Eric Johnson, Omkar Pathak, Sungmin Bae, Azade Nazi, Jiwoo Pak, Andy Tong, Kavya Srinivasa, W. Hang, Emre Tuncer, Anand Babu, Quoc V. Le, J. Laudon, Richard Ho, Roger Carpenter, and J. Dean. Chip placement with deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2004.10746, 2020.
- Nikhil Mishra, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Xi Chen, and Pieter Abbeel. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.03141*, 2017.
- Eric Mitchell, Rafael Rafailov, Xue Bin Peng, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Offline meta-reinforcement learning with advantage weighting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7780–7791. PMLR, 2021.
- A. Molchanov, Tao Chen, Wolfgang Hönig, James A. Preiss, Nora Ayanian, and G. Sukhatme. Sim-to-(multi)-real: Transfer of low-level robust control policies to multiple quadrotors. *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 59–66, 2019.
- Manfred Morari and Jay H Lee. Model predictive control: past, present and future. *Computers & chemical engineering*, 23(4-5):667–682, 1999.
- Tongzhou Mu, Zhan Ling, Fanbo Xiang, Derek Cathera Yang, Xuanlin Li, Stone Tao, Zhiao Huang, Zhiwei Jia, and Hao Su. Maniskill: Generalizable manipulation skill benchmark with large-scale demonstrations. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- Matthias Müller, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Bernard Ghanem, and Vladlen Koltun. Driving policy transfer via modularity and abstraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09364*, 2018.
- Matthias Muller-Brockhausen, Mike Preuss, and Aske Plaat. Procedural content generation: Better benchmarks for transfer reinforcement learning. In *2021 IEEE Conference on games (CoG)*, pages 01–08. IEEE, 2021.
- Mirco Mutti, Lorenzo Pratissoli, and Marcello Restelli. A policy gradient method for task-agnostic exploration. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.04640, 2020.
- Ofir Nachum, Shixiang Gu, Honglak Lee, and Sergey Levine. Data-efficient hierarchical reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08296*, 2018.
- Ofir Nachum, Michael Ahn, Hugo Ponte, Shixiang Gu, and Vikash Kumar. Multi-agent manipulation via locomotion using hierarchical sim2real. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05224*, 2019a.
- Ofir Nachum, Haoran Tang, Xingyu Lu, Shixiang Gu, Honglak Lee, and Sergey Levine. Why does

hierarchy (sometimes) work so well in reinforcement learning? *CoRR*, abs/1909.10618, 2019b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.10618>.

Anusha Nagabandi, Ignasi Clavera, Simin Liu, Ronald S Fearing, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Learning to adapt in dynamic, real-world environments through meta-reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.11347*, 2018a.

Anusha Nagabandi, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Deep online learning via meta-learning: Continual adaptation for model-based rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.07671*, 2018b.

Anusha Nagabandi, Gregory Kahn, Ronald S Fearing, and Sergey Levine. Neural network dynamics for model-based deep reinforcement learning with model-free fine-tuning. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 7559–7566. IEEE, 2018c.

Ashvin Nair, Bob McGrew, Marcin Andrychowicz, Wojciech Zaremba, and Pieter Abbeel. Overcoming exploration in reinforcement learning with demonstrations. In *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 6292–6299. IEEE, 2018a.

Ashvin Nair, Murtaza Dalal, Abhishek Gupta, and Sergey Levine. Accelerating online reinforcement learning with offline datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09359*, 2020a.

Ashvin V Nair, Vitchyr Pong, Murtaza Dalal, Shikhar Bahl, Steven Lin, and Sergey Levine. Visual reinforcement learning with imagined goals. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018b.

Suraj Nair and Chelsea Finn. Hierarchical foresight: Self-supervised learning of long-horizon tasks via visual subgoal generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05829*, 2019.

Suraj Nair, Silvio Savarese, and Chelsea Finn. Goal-aware prediction: Learning to model what matters. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7207–7219. PMLR, 2020b.

Suraj Nair, Eric Mitchell, Kevin Chen, Brian Ichter, Silvio Savarese, and Chelsea Finn. Learning language-conditioned robot behavior from offline data and crowd-sourced annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01115*, 2021.

Suraj Nair, Aravind Rajeswaran, Vikash Kumar, Chelsea Finn, and Abhi Gupta. R3m: A universal visual representation for robot manipulation. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.12601, 2022.

Geraud Nangue Tasse, Steven James, and Benjamin Rosman. A boolean task algebra for reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9497–9507, 2020.

Sanmit Narvekar, Bei Peng, Matteo Leonetti, Jivko Sinapov, Matthew E Taylor, and Peter Stone. Curriculum learning for reinforcement learning domains: A framework and survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04960*, 2020.

Oliver Nelles. Nonlinear dynamic system identification. In *Nonlinear System Identification*, pages 547–577. Springer, 2001.

Iman Nematollahi, Oier Mees, Lukas Hermann, and Wolfram Burgard. Hindsight for foresight: Unsupervised structured dynamics models from physical interaction. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5319–5326. IEEE, 2020.

A. Ng, D. Harada, and Stuart J. Russell. Policy invariance under reward transformations: Theory and application to reward shaping. In *ICML*, 1999.

Andrew Y. Ng and Stuart J. Russell. Algorithms for inverse reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '00, page 663–670, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2000. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. ISBN 1558607072.

Tung Nguyen and Aditya Grover. Transformer neural processes: Uncertainty-aware meta learning via sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04179*, 2022.

Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.02999, 2018.

Evgenii Nikishin, Max Schwarzer, Pierluca D’Oro, Pierre-Luc Bacon, and Aaron Courville. The primacy bias in deep reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, 2022.

Nvidia, 2023. URL <https://docs.omniverse.nvidia.com/index.html>.

Junhyuk Oh, Satinder Singh, Honglak Lee, and P. Kohli. Zero-shot task generalization with multi-task deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1706.05064, 2017.

OpenAI, :, Christopher Berner, Greg Brockman, Brooke Chan, Vicki Cheung, Przemysław Dębniak, Christy Dennison, David Farhi, Quirin Fischer, Shariq Hashme, Chris Hesse, Rafal Józefowicz, Scott Gray, Catherine Olsson, Jakub Pachocki, Michael Petrov, Henrique Pondé de Oliveira Pinto, Jonathan Raiman, Tim Salimans, Jeremy Schlatter, Jonas Schneider, Szymon Sidor, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Filip Wolski, and Susan Zhang. Dota 2 with large scale deep reinforcement learning, 2019a.

OpenAI, Ilge Akkaya, Marcin Andrychowicz, Maciek Chociej, Mateusz Litwin, Bob McGrew, Arthur Petron, Alex Paino, Matthias Plappert, Glenn Powell, Raphael Ribas, Jonas Schneider, Nikolas Tezak, Jerry Tworek, Peter Welinder, Lilian Weng, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, and Lei Zhang. Solving Rubik’s cube with a robot hand. *CoRR*, abs/1910.07113, 2019b. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07113>.

Charles Packer, Katelyn Gao, Jernej Kos, Philipp Krähenbühl, Vladlen Koltun, and Dawn Song. Assessing generalization in deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12282*, 2018.

Abhishek Padalkar, Acorn Pooley, Ajinkya Jain, Alex Bewley, Alex Herzog, Alex Irpan, Alexander Khazatsky, Anant Rai, Anika Singh, Anthony Brohan, Antonin Raffin, Ayzaan Wahid, Ben Burgess-Limerick, Beomjoon Kim, Bernhard Schölkopf, Brian Ichter, Cewu Lu, Charles Xu, Chelsea Finn, Chenfeng Xu, Cheng Chi, Chenguang Huang, Christine Chan, Chuer Pan, Chuyuan Fu, Coline Devin, Danny Driess, Deepak Pathak, Dhruv Shah, Dieter Büchler, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Dorsa Sadigh, Edward Johns, Federico Ceola, Fei Xia, Freek Stulp, Gaoyue Zhou, Gaurav S. Sukhatme, Gautam Salhotra, Ge Yan, Giulio Schiavi, Hao Su, Haoshu Fang, Haochen Shi, Heni Ben Amor, Henrik I Christensen, Hiroki Furuta, Homer Walke, Hongjie Fang, Igor Mordatch, Ilija Radosavovic, Isabel Leal, Jacky Liang, Jaehyung Kim, Jan Schneider, Jasmine Hsu, Jeannette Bohg, Jeff Bingham, Jiajun Wu, Jialin Wu, Jianlan Luo, Jiayuan Gu, Jie Tan, Jihoon Oh, Jitendra Malik, Jonathan Tompson, Jonathan Yang, Joseph J. Lim, João Silvério, Junhyek Han, Kanishka Rao, Karl Pertsch, Karol Hausman, Keegan Go, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Ken Goldberg, Kendra Byrne, Kenneth Oslund, Kento Kawaharazuka, Kevin Zhang, Keyvan Majd, Krishan Rana, Krishna Parasuram Srinivasan, Lawrence Yunliang Chen, Lerrel Pinto, Liam Tan, Lionel Ott, Lisa Lee, Masayoshi Tomizuka, Maximilian Du, Michael Ahn, Mingtong Zhang, Mingyu Ding, Mohan Kumar Srirama, Mohit Sharma, Moo Jin Kim, Naoaki Kanazawa, Nicklas Hansen, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Nikhil J. Joshi, Niko Suenderhauf, Norman Di Palo, Nur Muhammad Mahi Shafiullah, Oier Mees, Oliver Kroemer, Pannag R. Sanketi, Paul Wohlhart, Peng Xu, Pierre Sermanet, Priya Sundareshan, Quan Ho Vuong, Rafael Rafailov, Ran Tian, Ria Doshi, Russell Mendonca, Rutav Shah, Ryan Hoque, Ryan C. Julian, Samuel Bustamante, Sean Kirmani, Sergey Levine, Sherry Moore, Shikhar Bahl, Shivin Dass, Shuran Song, Sichun Xu, Siddhant Haldar, S. O. Adebola, Simon Guist, Soroush Nasiriany, Stefan Schaal, Stefan Welker, Stephen Tian, Sudeep Dasari, Suneel Belkhale, Takayuki Osa, Tatsuya Harada, Tatsuya Matsushima, Ted Xiao, Tianhe Yu, Tianli Ding, Todor Davchev, Tony Zhao, Travis Armstrong, Trevor Darrell, Vidhi Jain, Vincent Vanhoucke, Wei Zhan, Wenxuan Zhou, Wolfram Burgard, Xi Chen, Xiaolong Wang, Xinghao Zhu, Xuanlin Li, Yao Lu, Yevgen Chebotar, Yifan Zhou, Yifeng Zhu, Ying Xu, Yixuan Wang, Yonatan Bisk, Yoonyoung Cho, Youngwoon Lee, Yuchen Cui, Yueh hua Wu, Yujin Tang, Yuke Zhu, Yunzhu Li, Yusuke Iwasawa, Yutaka Matsuo, Zhuo Xu, and Zichen Jeff Cui. Open x-embodiment: Robotic learning datasets and rt-x models. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.08864, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263626099>.

- Jyothish Pari, Nur Muhammad Shafiullah, Sridhar Pandian Arunachalam, and Lerrel Pinto. The surprising effectiveness of representation learning for visual imitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01511*, 2021.
- German I Parisi, Ronald Kemker, Jose L Part, Christopher Kanan, and Stefan Wermter. Continual lifelong learning with neural networks: A review. *Neural Networks*, 113:54–71, 2019.
- Emilio Parisotto, Jimmy Lei Ba, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Actor-mimic: Deep multitask and transfer reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06342*, 2015.
- Emilio Parisotto, Francis Song, Jack Rae, Razvan Pascanu, Caglar Gulcehre, Siddhant Jayakumar, Max Jaderberg, Raphael Lopez Kaufman, Aidan Clark, Seb Noury, et al. Stabilizing transformers for reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7487–7498. PMLR, 2020.
- Chris Paxton, Yotam Barnoy, Kapil Katyal, Raman Arora, and Gregory D Hager. Visual robot task planning. In *2019 international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 8832–8838. IEEE, 2019.
- Xue Bin Peng, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Michiel van de Panne. DeepMimic: Example-guided deep reinforcement learning of physics-based character skills. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 37(4):143, 2018a.
- Xue Bin Peng, Angjoo Kanazawa, Jitendra Malik, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Sfv: Reinforcement learning of physical skills from videos. *ACM Transactions On Graphics (TOG)*, 37(6):1–14, 2018b.
- Xue Bin Peng, Michael Chang, Grace Zhang, P. Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Mcp: Learning composable hierarchical control with multiplicative compositional policies. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- Xue Bin Peng, Erwin Coumans, Tingnan Zhang, Tsang-Wei Lee, Jie Tan, and Sergey Levine. Learning agile robotic locomotion skills by imitating animals, 2020.
- Xue Bin Peng, Ze Ma, P. Abbeel, Sergey Levine, and Angjoo Kanazawa. Amp: Adversarial motion priors for stylized physics-based character control. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 40:144:1–144:20, 2021.
- Karl Pertsch, Youngwoo Lee, and Joseph J. Lim. Accelerating reinforcement learning with learned skill priors. *ArXiv*, abs/2010.11944, 2020.
- Karl Pertsch, Youngwoon Lee, Yue Wu, and Joseph J. Lim. Demonstration-guided reinforcement learning with learned skills. In *CoRL*, 2021.
- Jan Peters and Stefan Schaal. Natural actor-critic. *Neurocomputing*, 71(7-9):1180–1190, 2008.
- Silviu Pitis. Rethinking the discount factor in reinforcement learning: A decision theoretic approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 7949–7956, 2019.
- Dean A Pomerleau. Alvin: An autonomous land vehicle in a neural network. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 1, 1988.
- Vitchyr H. Pong, Shixiang Shane Gu, Murtaza Dalal, and Sergey Levine. Temporal difference models: Model-free deep rl for model-based control. *ArXiv*, abs/1802.09081, 2018.
- Vitchyr H. Pong, Ashvin Nair, Laura Smith, Catherine Huang, and Sergey Levine. Offline meta-reinforcement learning with online self-supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- Vitchyr H Pong, Ashvin V Nair, Laura M Smith, Catherine Huang, and Sergey Levine. Offline meta-reinforcement learning with online self-supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17811–17829. PMLR, 2022.
- Ivaylo Popov, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Roland Hafner, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Matej Vecerík, Thomas Lampe, Yuval Tassa, Tom Erez, and Martin A. Riedmiller. Data-efficient deep

reinforcement learning for dexterous manipulation. *ArXiv*, abs/1704.03073, 2017.

Carl Qi, P. Abbeel, and Aditya Grover. Imitating, fast and slow: Robust learning from demonstrations via decision-time planning. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.03597, 2022.

Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.

Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.

Ilija Radosavovic, Tete Xiao, Stephen James, Pieter Abbeel, Jitendra Malik, and Trevor Darrell. Real-world robot learning with masked visual pre-training. In Karen Liu, Dana Kulic, and Jeff Ichnowski, editors, *Proceedings of The 6th Conference on Robot Learning*, volume 205 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 416–426. PMLR, 14–18 Dec 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v205/radosavovic23a.html>.

Colin Raffel. A call to build models like we build opensource software. *blog*, 2021. URL <https://colinraffel.com/blog/a-call-to-build-models-like-we-build-open-source-software.html>.

Antonin Raffin. RL baselines3 zoo. <https://github.com/DLR-RM/rl-baselines3-zoo>, 2020.

Kate Rakelly, Aurick Zhou, Chelsea Finn, Sergey Levine, and Deirdre Quillen. Efficient off-policy meta-reinforcement learning via probabilistic context variables. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5331–5340. PMLR, 2019.

Krishan Rana, Vibhavari Dasagi, Jesse Haviland, Ben Talbot, Michael Milford, and N. Sunderhauf. Bayesian controller fusion: Leveraging control priors in deep reinforcement learning for robotics. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.09822, 2021.

Dushyant Rao, Fereshteh Sadeghi, Leonard Hasenclever, Markus Wulfmeier, Martina Zambelli, Giulia Vezzani, Dhruva Tirumala, Yusuf Aytar, Josh Merel, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, and Raia Hadsell. Learning transferable motor skills with hierarchical latent mixture policies. *ArXiv*, abs/2112.05062, 2021.

Nathan D. Ratliff, J. Andrew Bagnell, and Martin A. Zinkevich. Maximum margin planning. *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006.

Harish Ravichandar, Athanasios S Polydoros, Sonia Chernova, and Aude Billard. Recent advances in robot learning from demonstration. *Annual review of control, robotics, and autonomous systems*, 3: 297–330, 2020.

Scott Reed, Konrad Zolna, Emilio Parisotto, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Alexander Novikov, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Mai Gimenez, Yury Sulsky, Jackie Kay, Jost Tobias Springenberg, et al. A generalist agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.06175*, 2022.

Machel Reid, Yutaro Yamada, and Shixiang Shane Gu. Can wikipedia help offline reinforcement learning? *ArXiv*, abs/2201.12122, 2022.

Antoine Richard, Stephanie ARAVECCHIA, Matthieu Geist, and Cédric Pradalier. Learning behaviors through physics-driven latent imagination. *CoRL*, 2021.

Martin Riedmiller, Roland Hafner, Thomas Lampe, Michael Neunert, Jonas Degraeve, Tom van de Wiele, Vlad Mnih, Nicolas Heess, and Jost Tobias Springenberg. Learning by playing - solving sparse reward tasks from scratch. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.

Mark Bishop Ring et al. *Continual learning in reinforcement environments*. Citeseer, 1994.

Stéphane Ross, Geoffrey Gordon, and Drew Bagnell. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 627–635. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.

Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael S. Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 115:211–252, 2015.

Andrei A Rusu, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Caglar Gulcehre, Guillaume Desjardins, James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Raia Hadsell. Policy distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06295*, 2015.

Andrei A Rusu, Neil C Rabinowitz, Guillaume Desjardins, Hubert Soyer, James Kirkpatrick, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Razvan Pascanu, and Raia Hadsell. Progressive neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*, 2016.

Fereshteh Sadeghi and Sergey Levine. Cad2rl: Real single-image flight without a single real image. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04201*, 2016.

Steindór Sæmundsson, Katja Hofmann, and Marc Peter Deisenroth. Meta reinforcement learning with latent variable gaussian processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07551*, 2018.

Giovanni Sala and Fernand Gobet. When the music’s over. does music skill transfer to children’s and young adolescents’ cognitive and academic skills? a meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 20:55–67, 2017. ISSN 1747-938X. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.11.005>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X16300641>.

Sasha Salter, Dushyant Rao, Markus Wulfmeier, Raia Hadsell, and Ingmar Posner. Attention-privileged reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08363*, 2019.

Sasha Salter, Markus Wulfmeier, Dhruva Tirumala, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, Martin A. Riedmiller, Raia Hadsell, and Dushyant Rao. Mo2: Model-based offline options. In *CoLLAs*, 2022. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:252089192>.

Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Nicolas Heess, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Josh Merel, Martin Riedmiller, Raia Hadsell, and Peter Battaglia. Graph networks as learnable physics engines for inference and control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4470–4479. PMLR, 2018.

Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Elizabeth-Jane Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagn’e, and et al. Bloom: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.05100, 2022.

Tom Schaul, Daniel Horgan, Karol Gregor, and David Silver. Universal value function approximators. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1312–1320. PMLR, 2015.

Tom Schaul, Diana Borsa, David Ding, David Szepesvari, Georg Ostrovski, Will Dabney, and Simon Osindero. Adapting behaviour for learning progress. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06910*, 2019.

Karl Schmeckpeper, Annie Xie, Oleh Rybkin, Stephen Tian, Kostas Daniilidis, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Learning predictive models from observation and interaction. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XX 16*, pages 708–725. Springer, 2020.

Juergen Schmidhuber. On learning how to learn learning strategies, 1994. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59806870>.

Jurgen Schmidhuber. Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning. on learning now to learn: The meta-meta-meta...-hook. Diploma thesis, Technische Universitat Munchen, Germany, 14 May 1987. URL <http://www.idsia.ch/~juergen/diploma.html>.

- Simon Schmitt, Jonathan J. Hudson, Augustin Zidek, Simon Osindero, Carl Doersch, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Joel Z. Leibo, Heinrich Küttler, Andrew Zisserman, Karen Simonyan, and S. M. Ali Eslami. Kickstarting deep reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1803.03835, 2018.
- Bernhard Schölkopf. Causality for machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1911.10500, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.10500>.
- Ingmar Schubert, Jingwei Zhang, Jake Bruce, Sarah Bechtle, Emilio Parisotto, Martin Riedmiller, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Arunkumar Byravan, Leonard Hasenclever, and Nicolas Heess. A generalist dynamics model for control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10912*, 2023.
- Max Schwarzer, Nitarshan Rajkumar, Michael Noukhovitch, Ankesh Anand, Laurent Charlin, Devon Hjelm, Philip Bachman, and Aaron C. Courville. Pretraining representations for data-efficient reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2106.04799, 2021.
- Ramanan Sekar, Oleh Rybkin, Kostas Daniilidis, Pieter Abbeel, Danijar Hafner, and Deepak Pathak. Planning to explore via self-supervised world models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8583–8592. PMLR, 2020.
- Oliver G. Selfridge, Richard S. Sutton, and Andrew G. Barto. Training and tracking in robotics. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 1, IJCAI’85*, page 670–672, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1985. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. ISBN 0934613028.
- Younggyo Seo, Kimin Lee, Ignasi Clavera, Thanard Kurutach, Jinwoo Shin, and Pieter Abbeel. Trajectory-wise multiple choice learning for dynamics generalization in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13303*, 2020.
- Younggyo Seo, Kimin Lee, Stephen L James, and Pieter Abbeel. Reinforcement learning with action-free pre-training from videos. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19561–19579. PMLR, 2022.
- Nur Muhammad Mahi Shafiullah, Chris Paxton, Lerrel Pinto, Soumith Chintala, and Arthur Szlam. Clip-fields: Weakly supervised semantic fields for robotic memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05663*, 2022.
- Archit Sharma, Abhishek Gupta, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and Chelsea Finn. Persistent reinforcement learning via subgoal curricula. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12931*, 2021.
- Mohit Sharma, Claudio Fantacci, Yuxiang Zhou, Skanda Koppula, Nicolas Heess, Jon Scholz, and Yusuf Aytar. Lossless adaptation of pretrained vision models for robotic manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06600*, 2023.
- Bokui Shen, Fei Xia, Chengshu Li, Roberto Martín-Martín, Linxi Fan, Guanzhi Wang, Claudia Pérez-D’Arpino, Shyamal Buch, Sanjana Srivastava, Lyne P. Tchapmi, Micael E. Tchapmi, Kent Vainio, Josiah Wong, Li Fei-Fei, and Silvio Savarese. igibson 1.0: a simulation environment for interactive tasks in large realistic scenes. In *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, page accepted. IEEE, 2021.
- Yantao Shen, Yuanjun Xiong, Wei Xia, and Stefano Soatto. Towards backward-compatible representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6368–6377, 2020.
- Kyriacos Shiarlis, Markus Wulfmeier, Sasha Salter, Shimon Whiteson, and Ingmar Posner. Taco: Learning task decomposition via temporal alignment for control. In *ICML*, 2018.
- Mohit Shridhar, Lucas Manuelli, and Dieter Fox. Cliport: What and where pathways for robotic manipulation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 894–906. PMLR, 2022.
- David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George van den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Vedavyas Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, Sander Dieleman,

Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484–489, 2016.

Tom Silver, Kelsey R. Allen, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Leslie Pack Kaelbling. Residual policy learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1812.06298, 2018.

Avi Singh, Larry Yang, Kristian Hartikainen, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. End-to-end robotic reinforcement learning without reward engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07854*, 2019.

Avi Singh, Huihan Liu, Gaoyue Zhou, Albert Yu, Nicholas Rhinehart, and Sergey Levine. Parrot: Data-driven behavioral priors for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10024*, 2020a.

Avi Singh, Albert Yu, Jonathan Yang, Jesse Zhang, Aviral Kumar, and Sergey Levine. Cog: Connecting new skills to past experience with offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14500*, 2020b.

Ishika Singh, Valts Blukis, Arsalan Mousavian, Ankit Goyal, Danfei Xu, Jonathan Tremblay, Dieter Fox, Jesse Thomason, and Animesh Garg. Progprompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 11523–11530. IEEE, 2023.

Satinder Singh, Richard L Lewis, and Andrew G Barto. Where do rewards come from. In *Proceedings of the annual conference of the cognitive science society*, pages 2601–2606. Cognitive Science Society, 2009.

Satinder Pal Singh. Transfer of learning by composing solutions of elemental sequential tasks. *Machine Learning*, 8(3):323–339, 1992.

Aravind Sivakumar, Kenneth Shaw, and Deepak Pathak. Robotic telekinesis: Learning a robotic hand imitator by watching humans on youtube. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10448*, 2022.

Burrhus F Skinner. Some contributions of an experimental analysis of behavior to psychology as a whole. *American Psychologist*, 8(2):69, 1953.

Laura Smith, Nikita Dhawan, Marvin Zhang, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Avid: Learning multi-stage tasks via pixel-level translation of human videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04443*, 2019.

Laura Smith, J. Chase Kew, Tianyu Li, Linda Luu, Xue Bin Peng, Sehoon Ha, Jie Tan, and Sergey Levine. Learning and adapting agile locomotion skills by transferring experience. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.09834, 2023.

Yuda Song, Yifei Zhou, Ayush Sekhari, J Andrew Bagnell, Akshay Krishnamurthy, and Wen Sun. Hybrid rl: Using both offline and online data can make rl efficient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06718*, 2022.

Elizabeth S Spelke, Karen Breinlinger, Janet Macomber, and Kristen Jacobson. Origins of knowledge. *Psychological review*, 99(4):605, 1992.

Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek B Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, and et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.04615, 2022.

Bradly C. Stadie, P. Abbeel, and Ilya Sutskever. Third-person imitation learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1703.01703, 2017.

George Stoica, Daniel Bolya, Jakob Bue Bjorner, Taylor N. Hearn, and Judy Hoffman. Zipit! merging models from different tasks without training. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.03053, 2023.

Austin Stone, Oscar Ramirez, Kurt Konolige, and Rico Jonschkowski. The distracting control suite – a challenging benchmark for reinforcement learning from pixels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02722*,

2021.

Pei Sun, Henrik Kretzschmar, Xerxes Dotiwalla, Aurelien Chouard, Vijaysai Patnaik, Paul Tsui, James Guo, Yin Zhou, Yuning Chai, Benjamin Caine, Vijay Vasudevan, Wei Han, Jiquan Ngiam, Hang Zhao, Aleksei Timofeev, Scott Ettinger, Maxim Krivokon, Amy Gao, Aditya Joshi, Yu Zhang, Jonathon Shlens, Zhifeng Chen, and Dragomir Anguelov. Scalability in perception for autonomous driving: Waymo open dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2020.

Flood Sung, Li Zhang, Tao Xiang, Timothy Hospedales, and Yongxin Yang. Learning to learn: Meta-critic networks for sample efficient learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.09529*, 2017.

Rich Sutton. The bitter lesson. *Incomplete Ideas (blog)*, 2019. URL <http://www.incompleteideas.net/IncIdeas/BitterLesson.html>.

Richard S Sutton. Dyna, an integrated architecture for learning, planning, and reacting. *ACM Sigart Bulletin*, 2(4):160–163, 1991.

Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Time-derivative models of pavlovian reinforcement*. The MIT Press, 1990.

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

Richard S. Sutton, Doina Precup, and Satinder Singh. Between MDPs and semi-MDPs: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artif. Intell.*, 112(1–2):181–211, August 1999. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: 10.1016/S0004-3702(99)00052-1. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702\(99\)00052-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(99)00052-1).

Richard S. Sutton, Joseph Modayil, Michael Delp, Thomas Degris, Patrick M. Pilarski, Adam White, and Doina Precup. Horde: A scalable real-time architecture for learning knowledge from unsupervised sensorimotor interaction. In *The 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems - Volume 2, AAMAS '11*, page 761–768. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2011. ISBN 0982657161.

Andrew Szot, Alex Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, Aaron Gokaslan, Vladimir Vondrus, Sameer Dharur, Franziska Meier, Wojciech Galuba, Angel Chang, Zsolt Kira, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.

Julia Tan, Ransalu Senanayake, and Fabio Ramos. Renaissance robot: Optimal transport policy fusion for learning diverse skills. In *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 7052–7059. IEEE, 2022.

Yunzhe Tao, Sahika Genc, Jonathan Chung, Tao Sun, and Sunil Mallya. Repaint: Knowledge transfer in deep reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10141–10152. PMLR, 2021.

Yuval Tassa, Yotam Doron, Alistair Muldal, Tom Erez, Yazhe Li, Diego de Las Casas, David Budden, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Josh Merel, Andrew Lefrancq, Timothy Lillicrap, and Martin Riedmiller. DeepMind control suite. Technical report, DeepMind, January 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.00690>.

Matthew E Taylor and Peter Stone. Representation transfer for reinforcement learning. In *AAAI Fall Symposium: Computational Approaches to Representation Change during Learning and Development*, pages 78–85, 2007.

Matthew E Taylor and Peter Stone. Transfer learning for reinforcement learning domains: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(7), 2009.

- DeepMind Interactive Agents Team, Josh Abramson, Arun Ahuja, Arthur Brussee, Federico Carnevale, Mary Cassin, Felix Fischer, Petko Georgiev, Alex Goldin, Tim Harley, et al. Creating multimodal interactive agents with imitation and self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03763*, 2021.
- MosaicML NLP Team. Introducing mpt-7b: A new standard for open-source, commercially usable llms, 2023. URL www.mosaicml.com/blog/mpt-7b. Accessed: 2023-05-05.
- Yee Whye Teh, Victor Bapst, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, John Quan, James Kirkpatrick, Raia Hadsell, Nicolas Heess, and Razvan Pascanu. Distral: Robust multitask reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.04175*, 2017.
- Sebastian Thrun. Lifelong learning algorithms. In *Learning to learn*, pages 181–209. Springer, 1998.
- Andrea Tirinzoni, Rafael Rodriguez Sanchez, and Marcello Restelli. Transfer of value functions via variational methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31:6179–6189, 2018a.
- Andrea Tirinzoni, Andrea Sessa, Matteo Pirota, and Marcello Restelli. Importance weighted transfer of samples in reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1805.10886, 2018b.
- Dhruva Tirumala, Alexandre Galashov, Hyeonwoo Noh, Leonard Hasenclever, Razvan Pascanu, Jonathan Schwarz, Guillaume Desjardins, Wojciech Marian Czarnecki, Arun Ahuja, Yee Whye Teh, et al. Behavior priors for efficient reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.14274*, 2020.
- Josh Tobin, Rachel Fong, Alex Ray, Jonas Schneider, Wojciech Zaremba, and Pieter Abbeel. Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world. In *2017 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems (IROS)*, pages 23–30. IEEE, 2017.
- Faraz Torabi, Garrett Warnell, and Peter Stone. Recent advances in imitation learning from observation. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- Lisa Torrey, Jude Shavlik, Trevor Walker, and Richard Maclin. Relational macros for transfer in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Inductive Logic Programming*, pages 254–268. Springer, 2007.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Daniel M. Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony S. Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel M. Kloumann, A. V. Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, R. Subramanian, Xia Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zhengxu Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kam-badur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259950998>.
- Joanne Truong, Denis Yarats, Tianyu Li, Franziska Meier, Sonia Chernova, Dhruv Batra, and Akshara Rai. Learning navigation skills for legged robots with learned robot embeddings. In *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 484–491. IEEE, 2021.
- Benjamin Van Niekerk, Steven James, Adam Earle, and Benjamin Rosman. Composing value functions in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6401–6409. PMLR, 2019.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam M. Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, 2017.

Mel Vecerik, Todd Hester, Jonathan Scholz, Fumin Wang, Olivier Pietquin, Bilal Piot, Nicolas Heess, Thomas Rothörl, Thomas Lampe, and Martin Riedmiller. Leveraging demonstrations for deep reinforcement learning on robotics problems with sparse rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.08817*, 2017.

Rishi Veerapaneni, John D Co-Reyes, Michael Chang, Michael Janner, Chelsea Finn, Jiajun Wu, Joshua Tenenbaum, and Sergey Levine. Entity abstraction in visual model-based reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1439–1456. PMLR, 2020.

Hemanth Venkateswara, Jose Eusebio, Shayok Chakraborty, and Sethuraman Panchanathan. Deep hashing network for unsupervised domain adaptation. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5385–5394, 2017.

Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets, Simon Osindero, Tom Schaul, Nicolas Heess, Max Jaderberg, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Feudal networks for hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3540–3549. PMLR, 2017.

Giulia Vezzani, Dhruva Tirumala, Markus Wulfmeier, Dushyant Rao, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Ben Moran, Tuomas Haarnoja, Jan Humplik, Roland Hafner, Michael Neunert, Claudio Fantacci, Tim Hertweck, Thomas Lampe, Fereshteh Sadeghi, Nicolas Manfred Otto Heess, and Martin A. Riedmiller. Skills: Adaptive skill sequencing for efficient temporally-extended exploration. *ArXiv*, abs/2211.13743, 2022.

Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, Junhyuk Oh, Dan Horgan, Manuel Kroiss, Ivo Danihelka, Aja Huang, Laurent Sifre, Trevor Cai, John P. Agapiou, Max Jaderberg, Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets, Rémi Leblond, Tobias Pohlen, Valentin Dalibard, David Budden, Yury Sulsky, James Molloy, Tom L. Paine, Çağlar Gülçehre, Ziyu Wang, Tobias Pfaff, Yuhuai Wu, Roman Ring, Dani Yogatama, Dario Wünsch, Katrina McKinney, Oliver Smith, Tom Schaul, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Demis Hassabis, Chris Apps, and David Silver. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575(7782):350–354, 2019. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1724-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1724-z>.

Johannes Von Oswald, Eyvind Niklasson, Ettore Randazzo, João Sacramento, Alexander Mordvintsev, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Max Vladymyrov. Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35151–35174. PMLR, 2023.

Homer Walke, Jonathan Yang, Albert Yu, Aviral Kumar, Jędrzej Orbik, Avi Singh, and Sergey Levine. Don’t start from scratch: Leveraging prior data to automate robotic reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2022.

Jacob Walker, Eszter V’ertes, Yazhe Li, Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, Ankesh Anand, Théophane Weber, and Jessica B. Hamrick. Investigating the role of model-based learning in exploration and transfer. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:256662382>.

Alex Wang, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.07461*, 2018.

Jane Wang, Michael King, Nicolas Porcel, Zeb Kurth-Nelson, Tina Zhu, Charlie Deck, Peter Choy, Mary Cassin, Malcolm Reynolds, Francis Song, Gavin Buttimore, David Reichert, Neil Rabinowitz, Loic Matthey, Demis Hassabis, Alex Lerchner, and Matthew Botvinick. Alchemy: A structured task distribution for meta-reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02926*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.02926>.

Jane X Wang, Zeb Kurth-Nelson, Dhruva Tirumala, Hubert Soyer, Joel Z Leibo, Remi Munos, Charles Blundell, Dharshan Kumaran, and Matt Botvinick. Learning to reinforcement learn, 2016.

- Qi Wang and Herke Van Hoof. Model-based meta reinforcement learning using graph structured surrogate models and amortized policy search. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 23055–23077. PMLR, 2022.
- Tingwu Wang and Jimmy Ba. Exploring model-based planning with policy networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08649*, 2019.
- Tingwu Wang, Xuchan Bao, Ignasi Clavera, Jerrick Hoang, Yeming Wen, Eric Langlois, Shunshi Zhang, Guodong Zhang, Pieter Abbeel, and Jimmy Ba. Benchmarking model-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02057*, 2019.
- Yue Wang, Yuting Liu, Wei Chen, Zhi-Ming Ma, and Tie-Yan Liu. Target transfer q-learning and its convergence analysis. *Neurocomputing*, 392:11–22, 2020a.
- Ziyu Wang, Josh Merel, Scott E. Reed, Greg Wayne, Nando de Freitas, and Nicolas Heess. Robust imitation of diverse behaviors. *CoRR*, abs/1707.02747, 2017.
- Ziyu Wang, Alexander Novikov, Konrad Zolna, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Scott Reed, Bobak Shahriari, Noah Siegel, Josh Merel, Caglar Gulcehre, Nicolas Heess, and Nando de Freitas. Critic regularized regression, 2020b.
- Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):279–292, 1992.
- Ari Weinstein and Matthew M Botvinick. Structure learning in motor control: A deep reinforcement learning model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06827*, 2017.
- Martha White. Unifying task specification in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3742–3750. PMLR, 2017.
- Grady Williams, Nolan Wagener, Brian Goldfain, Paul Drews, James M Rehg, Byron Boots, and Evangelos A Theodorou. Information theoretic mpc for model-based reinforcement learning. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 1714–1721. IEEE, 2017.
- Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):229–256, 1992.
- Ian H. Witten. An adaptive optimal controller for discrete-time markov environments. *Information and Control*, 34(4):286–295, 1977. ISSN 0019-9958. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(77\)90354-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(77)90354-0). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019995877903540>.
- Daniel M Wolpert, Zoubin Ghahramani, and J Randall Flanagan. Perspectives and problems in motor learning. *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, 5(11):487–494, November 2001.
- Robert S Woodworth and Edward Lee Thorndike. The influence of improvement in one mental function upon the efficiency of other functions.(i). *Psychological review*, 8(3):247, 1901.
- Maciej Wołczyk, Michal Zajkac, Razvan Pascanu, Lukasz Kuciński, and Piotr Milo’s. Disentangling transfer in continual reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.13900, 2022.
- Bohan Wu, Suraj Nair, Li Fei-Fei, and Chelsea Finn. Example-driven model-based reinforcement learning for solving long-horizon visuomotor tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10312*, 2021.
- Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- Markus Wulfmeier, Peter Ondruska, and Ingmar Posner. Maximum entropy deep inverse reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.04888*, 2015.
- Markus Wulfmeier, Alex Bewley, and Ingmar Posner. Addressing appearance change in outdoor robotics with adversarial domain adaptation. *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent*

Robots and Systems (IROS), pages 1551–1558, 2017a.

Markus Wulfmeier, Ingmar Posner, and P. Abbeel. Mutual alignment transfer learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1707.07907, 2017b.

Markus Wulfmeier, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Roland Hafner, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Michael Neunert, Noah Siegel, Tim Hertweck, Thomas Lampe, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Compositional transfer in hierarchical reinforcement learning. *Robotics: Science and Systems XVI*, Jul 2020a. doi: 10.15607/rss.2020.xvi.054. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.15607/rss.2020.xvi.054>.

Markus Wulfmeier, Dushyant Rao, Roland Hafner, Thomas Lampe, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Tim Hertweck, Michael Neunert, Dhruva Tirumala, Noah Siegel, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Data-efficient hindsight off-policy option learning, 2020b.

Markus Wulfmeier, Arunkumar Byravan, Tim Hertweck, Irina Higgins, Ankush Gupta, Tejas D. Kulkarni, Malcolm Reynolds, Denis Teplyashin, Roland Hafner, Thomas Lampe, and Martin A. Riedmiller. Representation matters: Improving perception and exploration for robotics. *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6512–6519, 2021.

Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Pierre Sermanet, Ayzan Wahid, Anthony Brohan, Karol Hausman, Sergey Levine, and Jonathan Tompson. Robotic skill acquisition via instruction augmentation with vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11736*, 2022a.

Tete Xiao, Ilija Radosavovic, Trevor Darrell, and Jitendra Malik. Masked visual pre-training for motor control. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.06173, 2022b.

Annie Xie, Frederik Ebert, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Improvisation through physical understanding: Using novel objects as tools with visual foresight. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05538*, 2019.

Annie Xie, James Harrison, and Chelsea Finn. Deep reinforcement learning amidst lifelong non-stationarity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10701*, 2020.

Linhai Xie, Sen Wang, Stefano Rosa, A. Markham, and Agathoniki Trigoni. Learning with training wheels: Speeding up training with a simple controller for deep reinforcement learning. *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6276–6283, 2018.

Eliot Xing, Abhinav Gupta, Sam Powers, and Victoria Dean. Kitchenshift: Evaluating zero-shot generalization of imitation-based policy learning under domain shifts. In *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=DdglKo8hBq0>.

Zhongwen Xu, H. V. Hasselt, and David Silver. Meta-gradient reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1805.09801, 2018.

Zhongwen Xu, Hado van Hasselt, Matteo Hessel, Junhyuk Oh, Satinder Singh, and David Silver. Meta-gradient reinforcement learning with an objective discovered online. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08433*, 2020.

Jiacheng Yang, Brenden K. Petersen, H. Zha, and D. Faissol. Single episode policy transfer in reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.07719, 2020.

Sherry Yang, Ofir Nachum, Yilun Du, Jason Wei, P. Abbeel, and Dale Schuurmans. Foundation models for decision making: Problems, methods, and opportunities. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.04129, 2023.

Jiayu Yao, Taylor Killian, George Konidaris, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Direct policy transfer via hidden parameter markov decision processes. In *LLARLA Workshop, FAIM*, volume 2018, 2018.

Denis Yarats, Rob Fergus, Alessandro Lazaric, and Lerrel Pinto. Mastering visual continuous control: Improved data-augmented reinforcement learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.09645, 2022.

- Lin Yen-Chen, Maria Bauza, and Phillip Isola. Experience-embedded visual foresight. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1015–1024. PMLR, 2020.
- Naoki Yokoyama, Alexander William Clegg, Eric Undersander, Sehoon Ha, Dhruv Batra, and Akshara Rai. Adaptive skill coordination for robotic mobile manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00410*, 2023.
- Se-Wook Yoo and Seung-Woo Seo. Learning multi-task transferable rewards via variational inverse reinforcement learning. *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 434–440, 2022.
- Tianhe Yu, Deirdre Quillen, Zhanpeng He, Ryan Julian, Karol Hausman, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Meta-world: A benchmark and evaluation for multi-task and meta reinforcement learning. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 1094–1100. PMLR, 2020a.
- Tianhe Yu, Aviral Kumar, Yevgen Chebotar, Karol Hausman, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Conservative data sharing for multi-task offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Tianhe Yu, Ted Xiao, Austin Stone, Jonathan Tompson, Anthony Brohan, Su Wang, Jaspiar Singh, Clayton Tan, Jodilyn Peralta, Brian Ichter, et al. Scaling robot learning with semantically imagined experience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11550*, 2023.
- Wenhao Yu, Jie Tan, C Karen Liu, and Greg Turk. Preparing for the unknown: Learning a universal policy with online system identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.02453*, 2017.
- Wenhao Yu, Visak CV Kumar, Greg Turk, and C Karen Liu. Sim-to-real transfer for biped locomotion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01390*, 2019a.
- Wenhao Yu, C. Karen Liu, and Greg Turk. Policy transfer with strategy optimization. *ArXiv*, abs/1810.05751, 2019b.
- Wenhao Yu, Jie Tan, Yunfei Bai, Erwin Coumans, and Sehoon Ha. Learning fast adaptation with meta strategy optimization. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(2):2950–2957, 2020b.
- Haoqi Yuan and Zongqing Lu. Robust task representations for offline meta-reinforcement learning via contrastive learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 25747–25759. PMLR, 2022.
- Kevin Zakka, Andy Zeng, Pete Florence, Jonathan Tompson, Jeannette Bohg, and Debidatta Dwibedi. Xirl: Cross-embodiment inverse reinforcement learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 537–546. PMLR, 2022.
- Andy Zeng, Adrian Wong, Stefan Welker, Krzysztof Choromanski, Federico Tombari, Aveek Purohit, Michael Ryoo, Vikas Sindhwani, Johnny Lee, Vincent Vanhoucke, et al. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598*, 2022.
- Marvin Zhang, Sharad Vikram, Laura Smith, Pieter Abbeel, Matthew Johnson, and Sergey Levine. Solar: Deep structured representations for model-based reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7444–7453. PMLR, 2019.
- Tianhao Zhang, Gregory Kahn, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. Learning deep control policies for autonomous aerial vehicles with mpc-guided policy search. In *2016 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, pages 528–535. IEEE, 2016.
- Xin Zhang, Yanhua Li, Ziming Zhang, and Zhi-Li Zhang. f-gail: Learning f-divergence for generative adversarial imitation learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2010.01207, 2020.
- Chenyang Zhao, Olivier Sigaud, Freek Stulp, and Timothy M Hospedales. Investigating generalisation in continuous deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07015*, 2019.

- Wenshuai Zhao, Jorge Peña Queralta, and Tomi Westerlund. Sim-to-real transfer in deep reinforcement learning for robotics: a survey. In *2020 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, pages 737–744. IEEE, 2020.
- Qinqing Zheng, Amy Zhang, and Aditya Grover. Online decision transformer. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 27042–27059. PMLR, 2022.
- Allan Zhou, Eric Jang, Daniel Kappler, Alex Herzog, Mohi Khansari, Paul Wohlhart, Yunfei Bai, Mrinal Kalakrishnan, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Watch, try, learn: Meta-learning from demonstrations and reward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03352*, 2019a.
- Allan Zhou, Vikash Kumar, Chelsea Finn, and Aravind Rajeswaran. Policy architectures for compositional generalization in control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05960*, 2022a.
- Wei Zhou, Yiyang Li, Yongxin Yang, Huaimin Wang, and Timothy Hospedales. Online meta-critic learning for off-policy actor-critic methods. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 17662–17673, 2020.
- Wenxuan Zhou, Lerrel Pinto, and Abhinav Gupta. Environment probing interaction policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11740*, 2019b.
- Wenxuan Zhou, Steven Bohez, Jan Humplik, Nicolas Heess, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Dushyant Rao, Markus Wulfmeier, and Tuomas Haarnoja. Forgetting and imbalance in robot lifelong learning with off-policy data. In *Conference on Lifelong Learning Agents*, pages 294–309. PMLR, 2022b.
- Henry Zhu, Justin Yu, Abhishek Gupta, Dhruv Shah, Kristian Hartikainen, Avi Singh, Vikash Kumar, and Sergey Levine. The ingredients of real-world robotic reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12570*, 2020a.
- Yuke Zhu, Ziyu Wang, Josh Merel, Andrei Rusu, Tom Erez, Serkan Cabi, Saran Tunyasuvunakool, János Kramár, Raia Hadsell, Nando de Freitas, et al. Reinforcement and imitation learning for diverse visuomotor skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09564*, 2018.
- Yuke Zhu, Josiah Wong, Ajay Mandlekar, Roberto Martín-Martín, Abhishek Joshi, Soroush Nasiriany, and Yifeng Zhu. robosuite: A modular simulation framework and benchmark for robot learning. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12293*, 2020b.
- Zhuangdi Zhu, Kaixiang Lin, and Jiayu Zhou. Transfer learning in deep reinforcement learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07888*, 2020c.
- Brian D Ziebart, Andrew L Maas, J Andrew Bagnell, Anind K Dey, et al. Maximum entropy inverse reinforcement learning. In *Aaai*, volume 8, pages 1433–1438. Chicago, IL, USA, 2008.
- Luisa M. Zintgraf, Kyriacos Shiarlis, Maximilian Igl, Sebastian Schulze, Yarin Gal, Katja Hofmann, and Shimon Whiteson. Varibad: A very good method for bayes-adaptive deep rl via meta-learning. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.08348, 2020.
- Luisa M. Zintgraf, Leo Feng, Cong Lu, Maximilian Igl, Kristian Hartikainen, Katja Hofmann, and Shimon Whiteson. Exploration in approximate hyper-state space for meta reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, 2021.