

# Sample-efficient Unsupervised Policy Cloning from Ensemble Self-supervised Labeled Videos

Xin Liu<sup>1,2</sup> and Yaran Chen<sup>1,2</sup>

**Abstract**—Current advanced policy learning methodologies have demonstrated the ability to develop expert-level strategies when provided enough information. However, their requirements, including task-specific rewards, expert-labeled trajectories, and huge environmental interactions, can be expensive or even unavailable in many scenarios. In contrast, humans can efficiently acquire skills within a few trials and errors by imitating easily accessible internet video, in the absence of any other supervision. In this paper, we try to let machines replicate this efficient watching-and-learning process through Unsupervised Policy from Ensemble Self-supervised labeled Videos (UPESV), a novel framework to efficiently learn policies from videos without any other expert supervision. UPESV trains a video labeling model to infer the expert actions in expert videos, through several organically combined self-supervised tasks. Each task performs its own duties, and they together enable the model to make full use of both expert videos and reward-free interactions for advanced dynamics understanding and robust prediction. Simultaneously, UPESV clones a policy from the labeled expert videos, in turn collecting environmental interactions for self-supervised tasks. After a sample-efficient and unsupervised (i.e., reward-free) training process, an advanced video-imitated policy is obtained. Extensive experiments in sixteen challenging procedurally-generated environments demonstrate that the proposed UPESV achieves state-of-the-art few-shot policy learning (outperforming five current advanced baselines on 12/16 tasks) without exposure to any other supervision except videos. Detailed analysis is also provided, verifying the necessity of each self-supervised task employed in UPESV.

## I. INTRODUCTION

With the advancement of reinforcement learning (RL), it's possible to train policies that reach expert levels for challenging tasks defined in complex environments [1], [2], [3], [4]. However, the demanding training conditions and low sample efficiency significantly constrain the applicability of RL. To this end, many advanced RL approaches, such as model-based RL [5], [6], [7] and self-supervised RL [8], [3], [9], are proposed for higher sample efficiency. At the same time, some other researchers are no longer limited to online agent experience but try to seek help from offline supervisions. Given enough expert-labeled demonstrations, ideal policies can be obtained through offline-RL [10], [11] or imitation learning [12], [13], without the need of reward-specific environmental interactions. However, similar to expert rewards, these offline supervisions are also not widely available and always require time-consuming collection at

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Multimodal Artificial Intelligence Systems, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China.

<sup>2</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China.




Fig. 1. UPESV achieves sample-efficient policy learning with only action-free videos and reward-free interactions. This is achieved by three organically combined self-supervised tasks, where each performs its own duties. For example, on *Fruitbot* task, UPESV is the only effective few-shot policy learning method, where each self-supervised task is necessary.

a high cost. Different from them, the image-only videos are easily accessible currently thanks to the development of video websites and social media. However, Learning From Videos (LFV) poses a big challenge due to the lack of action labels. Although some attempts, such as video-based RL pre-training [14], [15] and video-based intrinsic rewards [16], have made great progress on RL data efficiency, they still require more or less additional supervisory information, e.g., reward-based finetuning and expert-annotated actions. Inverse RL methods [17], [18], [19] provide effective solutions for completely unsupervised policy learning from videos by reward prediction. While they often fail to well balance policy performance and sample efficiency, requiring more interactions than RL with expert rewards [20], [12].

Can we derive a video-based policy with only a few interactions, without exposure to any other supervisions? Previous advanced methods [21], [22] have proven it possible and achieved considerable results in state-based control (with the state-based demonstrations) and style-unchanged easy video games. However, their performance is unsatisfactory when facing environments with complex visual input and dynamics, which may be attributed to the following two shortcomings: First, they don't make full use of available information, i.e., both the expert videos and reward-free interactions. For example, BCO [21] tries to label expert videos only based on non-expert environmental interactions, which means the highly qualified dynamics information contained in expert videos and the distribution difference are ignored. In contrast, ILPO [22] pays much more attention to the above dynamics contained in videos, but their world model is trained without considering the potential assistance provided by ground-truth interactions. Second, they don't provide their

model with enough vision-specific signals. These signals are crucial for the models to understand high-dimensional inputs [23], [24], thus well extracting extensive information (e.g., environmental dynamics) from both datasets.

In response to the above two issues, we propose a novel, sample-efficient, and unsupervised video-based policy learning framework, named Unsupervised Policy from Ensemble Self-supervised labeled Videos (UPESV), as shown in Fig. 1. It organically employs several self-supervised tasks to well utilize both expert videos and reward-free interactions, training a robust dynamics-aware video labeling model to infer the expert actions for efficient policy cloning. For expert videos, we employed a latent reconstruction task, where another world model is set to recover the next observation based on current observation and predicted actions, in the latent space. This task forces the labeling model to understand the changes between neighboring observations and extract the high-quality dynamics information contained in expert videos, which is highly related to expert action prediction. For reward-free interactions, we let the labeling model predict the non-expert ground-truth actions. This task not only aligns the model to the real action space, but also serves as a generalization task by changing both the data distribution and optimization target, thereby improving the model robustness. In practice, we observe a performance drop when naively gathering the above tasks into one model because they can't learn a shared and qualified representation module by themselves. This motivates us to design a visual shift contrast task, where the model is required to associate a shifted image to its origin. This task let the model pay more attention to action-related visual changes, enhancing its representation ability in a target manner, which is proven necessary to well balance the above two tasks. The organically employed three self-supervised tasks together enable advanced labeling performance, where each performs its own duties. Along with the labeling model training, UPESV simultaneously clones a policy from the labeled expert video, and collects environmental interactions to enrich self-supervised task data in turn. After a sample-efficient, unsupervised, and iterative training process, UPESV obtains an advanced policy based on a robust video labeling model.

We conduct extensive experiments in sixteen challenging procedurally-generated environments containing complex visual inputs. The results demonstrate that the proposed UPESV achieves considerable few-shot policy learning, outperforming current advanced baselines on 12/16 tasks without exposure to any other supervisions except videos. We also provide detailed ablations and analyses to show the necessity of all three self-supervised tasks employed in our framework. We summarize the contributions as follows:

- We propose a novel, sample-efficient, and unsupervised framework to derive policies from videos, named Unsupervised Policy from Ensemble Self-supervised labeled Videos (UPESV). Given a small amount of environmental interactions, UPESV can derive an effective video-based strategy, without need of any other supervision.
- UPESV trains a video labeling model along with imitat-

ing a policy, through three organically combined self-supervised tasks where each performs its own duties. These tasks together provide the models with advanced representation learning and comprehensive dynamics understanding.

- Extensive experiments in sixteen challenging procedurally-generated environments demonstrate that UPESV exhibits state-of-the-art performance in few-shot policy learning. It outperforms five current advanced baselines on 12/16 tasks. Detailed analyses are also provided to verify the effectiveness and necessity of each module in our framework design.

## II. RELATED WORKS

### A. Sample-efficient Policy Learning

Interacting with the environment to collect data for policy learning is a time-consuming and expensive process. In some special scenarios, such as autonomous driving [25] and real robot learning [26], the interactions can even lead to danger. To this end, many advanced methods are proposed to improve the RL sample efficiency. Model-based RL methods [6], [7], [27], [28] train extra world models that augment the RL experience, thereby improving sampling efficiency[29]. Self-supervised RL, i.e., RL auxiliary tasks [30], [8], [31], [32] alleviate the lack of supervision signals for representation learning in DRL, accelerating policy learning by improving the upstream representation understanding capabilities. At the same time, many researchers try to completely avoid accessing environments, learning policies through imitation learning [12], [33] and offline RL [11], [10], [14]. However, the required expert supervision signals, including both expert reward and offline expert dataset, are also expensive and unavailable in many scenarios. Different from these expert supervisions, videos are easy to obtain from the internet currently. Our work aims to achieve completely unsupervised policy learning with the easily accessible videos, in the absence of any other expert supervision.

### B. Learning Policies From Videos

Thanks to the improvement of the internet, it's very easy to acquire massive and different kinds of videos currently. Many videos contain expert demonstrations in different fields, which provides extensive knowledge for both human beings and machines to utilize. However, due to the lack of action information, how to well utilize the videos poses a big challenge. One of the most direct ways is to improve existing strategy learning methods with the help of videos, such as video-based pre-training for RL [34], [35], [36], [37] and video-based intrinsic reward for RL [16]. They indeed improve the sample efficiency of policy learning under enough supervision but still require other expert supervision. Imitation Learning from only Observations (ILO) [17], [21], [22] is proposed to completely decouple expert supervisions from LfV. Most ILO methods try to extract expert rewards contained in the videos, employing RL to optimize the unsupervised reward expectation for policy imitation [17], [38], [39]. These inverse RL methods achieve considerable results




Fig. 2. UPESV framework. UPESV learns a video labeling model and a policy network jointly, through three organically combined self-supervised tasks where each is necessary and performs its own duties. The motivation and details of these three tasks: visual shift contrast, latent future reconstruction, and ground-truth action prediction, are provided separately in Sections III.A, III.B, and III.C. We simultaneously train the policy  $\pi(a|o)$  by behavior cloning labeled expert videos for self-supervised data enrichment, which we detail in Section III.D.

on imitation performance but can't take sample efficiency into account. At the same time, some researchers give up reward engineering for RL. By predicting expert actions from videos based on non-expert interactions [21], [40] or digging out expert dynamics hidden in the expert videos [22], [20], they achieve sample-efficiency unsupervised policy learning faced with simple inputs. Different from these methods, UPESV organically employs multiple different unsupervised tasks, benefiting from both non-expert interactions and expert videos with advanced representation learning.

### III. METHODOLOGY

UPESV trains a policy network and a video labeling model jointly. The policy determines the action  $a$  based on current observation  $o$ , defined as  $\pi(a|o)$ . The video labeling model predicts the real expert action between two neighboring expert observations in videos, formulated as an inverse dynamics model  $V(a_i^v|o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$ , where  $a_i^v$  denotes the predicted action while  $o_i^v$  and  $o_{i+1}^v$  denote neighboring expert observations.  $V$  consists of three networks: a feature encoder  $f$ , a latent predictor  $g$ , and an action projector  $h$ .  $o_i^v$  and  $o_{i+1}^v$  are separately encoded by  $f$ , concatenated, and processed by  $g$  and  $h$  to obtain the  $a_i^v$ , formulated as:

$$a_i^v = h(g(f(o_i^v), f(o_{i+1}^v))). \quad (1)$$

In practice, we also include a few available historical observations  $o_h^v$  as additional input information. They are processed similar to  $o_i^v$  and we omit them in the remaining part for clarity. UPESV learns  $V$  through three different but related self-supervised tasks over both expert videos  $B^v$  and environmental interactions  $B^e$ , which we describe in the first three subsections. During the training of  $V$ , we simultaneously train the policy  $\pi(a|o)$  by behavior cloning  $V$ -labeled expert videos, which we describe in Section III.D. The policy  $\pi(a|o)$  collects self-supervised data for  $V$  while

the improved  $V$  further enhances the policy  $\pi(a|o)$ . After a sample-efficient and iterative training process, we obtain the well-trained video labeling model  $V$  and policy  $\pi$ .

We provide the framework diagram, as shown in Fig. 2.

#### A. Self-supervised Task: Visual Shift Contrast

1) *Motivation*: To infer actions from videos, the video labeling model  $V(a_i^v|o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$  should be able to capture the difference between neighboring images. In most visual control domains, the relative difference is more related to decision making than the absolute difference in visual inputs. Imagine two particles moving upward at different positions on the plane. They have different absolute positions, but the same relative position changes that corresponds to their same actions. To this end, we want the labeling model to focus on relative position difference, which is achieved by driving it to ignore the absolute position difference. Therefore, a shift matching task that forces the video labeling model to align a randomly shifted image to its origin in the semantic space, is employed. This task enhances the visual understanding of the  $V$  in a target manner, which is necessary to understand complex dynamics through another two tasks (detailed in the next two subsections) simultaneously.

2) *Implementation*: The visual shift contrast task forces the video labeling model  $V$  to align a randomly shifted image to its origin in the latent semantic space. Concretely, a batch of observations  $\{o_i^v\}_{i=1}^N$  are sampled from expert video dataset  $B^v$ . Each observation is randomly shifted (up to  $s$  units in any direction) twice to obtain two shifted images,  $\hat{o}_i^v$  and  $\check{o}_i^v$ , where the two different hats upon  $o_i^v$  denote two independent random shifting. They are further encoded by  $f$  to obtain two latent features,  $f(\hat{o}_i^v)$  and  $f(\check{o}_i^v)$ . Then, we define  $(f(\hat{o}_i^v), f(\check{o}_i^v))$  as positive pairs while  $(f(\hat{o}_i^v), f(\check{o}_j^v))$  as negative pairs. Contrastive learning [41] is conducted on the whole batch to bring the positive pair closer while pulling

the negative pair further away from each other. A contrastive model measuring distance is defined as follows:

$$M_c(f(\hat{o}_i^v), f(\hat{o}_i^v)) = W \frac{u(f(\hat{o}_i^v)) \cdot f(\hat{o}_i^v)}{\|u(f(\hat{o}_i^v))\| \cdot \|f(\hat{o}_i^v)\|}, \quad (2)$$

where  $W$  is a trainable matrix.  $u(\cdot)$  is a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), which doesn't change the dimension of the latent embedding. It is set to introduce asymmetry, thereby avoiding collapse to trivial solutions. Then, we define an InfoNCE loss [42] as the objective of visual shift contrast:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{VSC} = & \log M_c(f(\hat{o}_i^v), f(\hat{o}_i^v)) \\ & - \log \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N M_c(f(\hat{o}_i^v), f(\hat{o}_j^v)). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

### B. Self-supervised Task: Latent Future Reconstruction

1) *Motivation:* To predict expert actions accurately, the video labeling model  $V(a_i^v | o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$  should be able to capture and understand which relative differences (between neighboring images) are similar and close, which requires it to understand the expert-related dynamics hidden in the videos. To this end, we introduce a latent future reconstruction task into model training, where another world model is employed. The world model takes the latent feature of the current observation and  $V$ -predicted latent action as inputs, trying to reconstruct the latent feature of the next observation. By supporting the world model to reconstruct different future observations, the video labeling model is forced to understand dynamics, refining more action-like information into a small-dimension output.

2) *Implementation:* The latent future reconstruction task updates the video labeling model and an extra world model jointly. First, a batch of observation pairs  $\{(o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)\}_{i=1}^N$  are sampled from expert video dataset  $B^v$ . Each current observation  $o_i^v$  is encoded by the  $f$  to obtain  $f(o_i^v)$  while each next observation  $o_{i+1}^v$  is encoded by the  $f$  to obtain  $f(o_{i+1}^v)$ . Then, they are concatenated and further processed by latent predictor  $g$  to produce the predicted latent action  $z_i^v$ . Then, the  $f(o_i^v)$  and  $z_i^v$  are concatenated as the input to the world model  $M_e(\cdot | z_i^v, o_i^v)$  and we can obtain a predicted observation  $p_{i+1}^v$  in the latent space. Then we minimize the difference between the latent embeddings of predicted observation  $p_{i+1}^v$  and ground-truth next observation  $f(o_{i+1}^v)$ , jointly updating the parameters of our video labeling model  $V$  and world model  $E_w$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{LFR} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|f(o_{i+1}^v) - p_{i+1}^v\|^2. \quad (4)$$

### C. Self-supervised Task: Ground-truth Action Prediction

1) *Motivation:* If the video labeling model  $V(a_i^v | o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$  can understand the expert video well, it should also generalize well to demonstrations sampled by other policies. To this end, we train our policy  $\pi(a|o)$  to imitate the  $V$ -labeled videos through behavior cloning and utilize it to interact with environments for real transitions collection. Then  $V$  is

updated by achieving a real action prediction task on the collected real transitions. With the  $V$  improved by all three tasks (visual shift contrast, latent future reconstruction, and ground-truth action prediction), the derived policy  $\pi$  is also improved and in turn collects more action-labeled data of higher quality for the ground-truth action prediction. This task is not only set to provide the  $V$  with the information of real action spaces, but also serves as a generalization task to improve both the robustness and performance of  $V$  by different data distribution and optimization targets.

2) *Implementation:* First, a batch of transitions  $\{(o_i^e, a_i^e, o_{i+1}^e)\}_{i=1}^N$  are sampled from environmental transitions  $B^e$ . We feed each observation pair into our video labeling model  $V$  and obtain the  $V$ -predicted action  $a_i^{e,v}$ . The difference between predicted action vector  $a_i^{e,v}$  and ground-truth action  $a_i^e$  is minimized. The objective is formulated as the following:

$$\mathcal{L}_{GAP} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C (a_{i,c}^{e,v} \log a_{i,c}^e). \quad (5)$$

where the subscript  $(c)$  denotes the  $c$ -th dimension of a vector.

### D. Unsupervised Policy Cloning

As mentioned in Section III.C, our policy  $\pi(a|o)$  and video labeling model  $V(a_i^v | o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$  are trained and improved jointly.  $\pi(a|o)$  imitates the  $V$ -labeled expert videos through behavior cloning and interacts with environments for self-supervised data collection, while  $V$  is improved for a better  $\pi(a|o)$  through three self-supervised tasks ( $\mathcal{L}_{sm}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{lfr}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{sc}$ ) conducted over the expert videos and collected transitions. After a sample-efficient iterative training process, an effective  $\pi(a|o)$  and an advanced labeling model  $V$  are both obtained.

The behavior cloning process of  $\pi(a|o)$  is described here. For every observation pairs  $(o_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$  from  $B^v$ , we use the video labeling model  $V$  to obtain a action vector  $a_i^v$ . Then the action-free observation pairs are labeled with  $a_i^v$ , denoted as  $(o_i^v, a_i^v, o_{i+1}^v)$ . Based on the current observation  $o_i^v$  and the policy  $\pi(a|o)$ , we obtain the policy-based action vector  $a_i^{v,\pi}$  and then minimize its difference from label  $a_i^v$  for policy learning:

$$\mathcal{L}_{UPC} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|a_i^{v,\pi} - a_i^v\|^2. \quad (6)$$

## IV. EXPERIMENTS & ANALYSIS

### A. Experimental Settings

We evaluated our method on all sixteen environments introduced by the Procgen benchmark [46]. Procgen provides a diverse set of procedurally-generated video game environments, each with unique challenges, multiple dynamics, and changing visual style. For example, in *Maze* task, the screen color, map size, and maze content are all changing drastically, which places high demands on both representation learning and dynamics understanding of methods.

TABLE I

THE FEW-SHOT POLICY LEARNING PERFORMANCE COMPARISON BETWEEN UPESV AND ALL BASELINE METHODS. EACH METHOD ARE ONLY ALLOWED 100K STEPS ON EACH TASK, WHICH REQUIRE METHODS TO HAVE HIGH SAMPLE EFFICIENCY TO OBTAIN AN EFFECTIVE POLICY. THE PROPOSED UPESV EXHIBITS STATE-OF-THE-ART PERFORMANCE WHEN COMPARED WITH BOTH ADVANCED LFV METHODS AND RL METHODS.

Task	UPESV (ours)	BCO [21]	ILPO [22]	LAPO [43]	PPO [44]	TVL [45]
<i>Bigfish</i>	<b>30.5 ± 1.6</b>	3.6 ± 3.7	0.9 ± 0.0	20.6 ± 0.7	0.9 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.1
<i>Maze</i>	<b>9.7 ± 0.2</b>	7.4 ± 2.4	0.8 ± 1.5	9.6 ± 0.1	5.0 ± 0.7	4.6 ± 0.7
<i>Heist</i>	<b>9.4 ± 0.3</b>	7.6 ± 1.9	1.2 ± 1.2	<b>9.4 ± 0.3</b>	3.7 ± 0.2	3.4 ± 0.9
<i>Coinrun</i>	<b>7.4 ± 0.2</b>	6.7 ± 0.9	2.4 ± 0.2	6.2 ± 0.4	4.1 ± 0.5	3.6 ± 1.0
<i>Plunder</i>	3.5 ± 0.7	4.2 ± 0.3	4.0 ± 0.7	<b>4.8 ± 0.1</b>	4.4 ± 0.4	4.5 ± 0.4
<i>Dodgeball</i>	<b>9.1 ± 0.8</b>	5.4 ± 1.1	0.0 ± 0.1	5.9 ± 1.1	1.1 ± 0.2	0.6 ± 0.2
<i>Jumper</i>	6.6 ± 0.2	6.4 ± 0.3	0.6 ± 0.4	<b>7.3 ± 0.2</b>	3.5 ± 0.7	3.2 ± 0.5
<i>Climber</i>	<b>6.8 ± 0.6</b>	3.3 ± 0.2	0.1 ± 0.2	4.7 ± 0.3	2.2 ± 0.2	2.4 ± 0.5
<i>Fruitbot</i>	<b>20.6 ± 1.6</b>	3.6 ± 0.1	-1.4 ± 0.2	0.5 ± 0.3	-1.9 ± 1.0	-2.4 ± 0.9
<i>Starpilot</i>	15.0 ± 0.8	12.8 ± 13.9	2.1 ± 0.1	<b>20.3 ± 1.6</b>	2.6 ± 0.9	1.8 ± 0.6
<i>Ninja</i>	<b>6.3 ± 0.3</b>	4.2 ± 1.1	0.3 ± 0.5	5.2 ± 0.1	3.4 ± 0.3	3.0 ± 0.3
<i>Miner</i>	<b>9.3 ± 1.2</b>	5.8 ± 1.3	0.7 ± 0.3	6.7 ± 0.6	1.2 ± 0.2	1.2 ± 0.2
<i>Caveflyer</i>	3.5 ± 0.6	2.8 ± 1.1	2.7 ± 1.1	<b>3.9 ± 0.1</b>	3.0 ± 0.4	3.2 ± 0.6
<i>Leaper</i>	<b>2.9 ± 0.3</b>	2.5 ± 0.5	0.2 ± 0.8	2.7 ± 0.2	2.6 ± 0.3	2.5 ± 0.4
<i>Chaser</i>	<b>0.8 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	0.1 ± 0.1	<b>0.8 ± 0.0</b>	0.4 ± 0.2	0.6 ± 0.2
<i>Bossfight</i>	<b>2.0 ± 0.4</b>	0.4 ± 0.3	0.0 ± 0.0	0.3 ± 0.3	0.1 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.2
Mean score	<b>9.0</b>	4.8	0.9	6.8	2.3	2.1

We compare our UPESV with five current advanced online policy learning baselines, including both Learning From Video (LFV) methods and pure RL methods: BCO [21], ILPO [22], LAPO [43], PPO [44], and TVL [45]. Among them, the first two methods are current state-of-the-art Imitation Learning from only Observation (ILO) methods, requiring no other supervisions like UPESV. Our UPESV differs from these ILO baselines apparently. They either train a video labeling model for behavior cloning only on environmental transitions (BCO) or extract environmental dynamics from only expert videos (ILPO). By contrast, UPESV takes advantages from both kinds of methods, employing two different self-supervised tasks to utilize both datasets simultaneously for an advanced video labeling model. In addition, the additional visual self-supervised task further improves the representation ability and performance of UPESV. LAPO is a state-of-the-art video pre-training method. The pre-trained latent policy is finetuned by rewards and actions in environmental interactions. Inverse RL methods also provide solutions to learn video-based policy online without other supervisions, but their goal is to restore the expert reward as much as possible, which makes them difficult to surpass RL methods exposed to expert rewards [38], [39], in terms of sample efficiency [20]. Considering that they are generally not evaluated on Procgen, we directly employ TVL and PPO, two state-of-the-art RL methods on Procgen provided with expert rewards in comparison. Note that our UPESV doesn't access these expert rewards and any extra supervisions.

We choose *full* distributions of levels and *easy* mode in Procgen throughout this paper. For each method, 100K steps of environmental interactions are allowed. For methods requiring expert videos, 60K update times (during 100K environmental steps) are allowed for the training of each model (including policy) in their frameworks. The expert videos containing 8M steps are generated by a well-trained

RL-based policy, which is provided by previous work [43]. For methods requiring rewards, we allow them to access the expert reward provided by Procgen environments. The architectures of UPESV follow previous works [44], [43], [45] that are currently advanced on Procgen. Adam [47] is chosen as the optimizer throughout the paper, with the batch size set to 128. The learning rate is set to  $3e-5$  for the visual shift contrast task,  $3e-4$  for the latent future reconstruction task,  $1e-3$  for the ground-truth action prediction task, and  $2e-4$  for unsupervised policy cloning. The maximum shift distance  $s$  in visual shift contrast task is set to 1, which performs better than others in experiments. The results of UPESV are over average 5 random seeds.

### B. Sample Efficiency Comparison

We test the policy learning abilities of all the methods when interaction is limited, which directly reflects their sample efficiency. Each method is allowed to interact with environments for only 100K steps. 100K steps are much less than the 25M employed in previous works [46], [45], requiring extremely high sample efficiency. The results across all 16 tasks are shown in Table 1. Compared with three video-based baselines, UPESV performs better on 12/16 tasks and not worse on the others except *Starpilot*. These advantages demonstrate the UPESV video labeling model has a better understanding of both visual inputs and environmental dynamics, which can be attributed to the employed three self-supervised tasks. We observe trivial solutions that lead to huge performance drops in ILPO. This is due to its mode collapse in complex environments, which is also observed by [20], [43]. Compared with two advanced RL methods, UPESV's performance advantages are very obvious. In addition, video-based methods BCO and LAPO also overall perform better than pure RL methods. Note that both UPESV and BCO are reward-free. These phenomena demonstrate that the videos may serve as a more efficient teacher than




Fig. 3. Ablation study on all three self-supervised tasks. Each task is employed with reasonable motivation necessary in UPESV.




Fig. 4. Hyper-parameter analysis of visual shift contrast.

expert rewards, especially when interactions are limited. In summary, the huge efficiency advantages enable UPESV to have state-of-the-art few-shot policy learning ability.

### C. Ablations: Necessity of Each Self-supervised Task

In UPESV, we employ three different self-supervised tasks to jointly learn the video labeling model and policy. These three tasks are organically combined, where each one performs its own duties. To demonstrate that they are all indispensable in our framework, we sequentially ablate the latent future reconstruction task (UPESV w/o LFR), ground-truth action prediction task (UPESV w/o GAP), and visual shift contrast task (UPESV w/o VSC), observing the performance changes. In UPESV w/o GAP, we have to train the video labeling model without accessing true action space, so we train a policy decoder to remap the latent actions to real actions based on interactions after the policy learning process, which follows previous works [22]. The results are shown in Fig. 3, demonstrating that (i) every employed self-supervised task is necessary in UPESV, and (ii) the visual shift contrast task is crucial for the model to benefit from the other two tasks for advanced environment dynamics understanding.

### D. Hyper-parameter Sensitivity Analysis

In this section, we test different shift distance  $s$  values in the visual shift contrast (VSC) task, as shown in Fig. 4. When  $s = 0$ , VSC degenerated into an image discrimination task. It is also effective (much better than UPESV v/o VSC) but worse than adding a few shifts (worse than  $s = 1, 2, 4$ ). It means that forcing the model to ignore the global observation

TABLE II

THE PREDICTION ACCURACY OF TWO VIDEO LABELING MODELS ON UNSEEN EXPERT DATASET.

Task	UPESV (ours)	BCO [21]
Starpilot	<b>50.4%</b>	32.6%
Miner	<b>33.1%</b>	10.4%

difference is helpful for understanding dynamics. In addition, we also try to add some time information (usually useful in RL), using two neighboring images instead of two shifted images (having the same origin) to define positive pairs for contrastive learning [48] while finding no improvements. It fits our intuition because the time contrast reduces the model’s ability to perceive neighboring distinctions, which is critical for understanding complex environmental dynamics.

### E. Robustness: Prediction Accuracy on Unseen Expert Data

Considering both BCO and our UPESV train video labeling models to infer real actions contained in expert videos, we compare the two models’ prediction accuracy on unseen expert action-labeled datasets. The results in TABLE II show the superiority of UPESV. This is consistent with their policy performance in the few-shot learning task, demonstrating the influence of additional dynamics understanding and representation learning on models’ robustness.

## V. CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

In this work, we propose UPESV, a novel, sample-efficient, and completely unsupervised policy learning framework to imitate policy from videos. With three organically selected and combined self-supervised tasks, UESPV models well understand both visual representation and environmental dynamics, enabling state-of-the-art few-shot policy learning in challenging procedurally-generated environments. The ability of sample-efficient video-based policy learning is a perfect fit for current challenging tasks where interactions are expensive, supervision is difficult to acquire, but video demonstrations are plentiful, e.g., robot manipulation. Crossing the gap from video games to real robots is a big challenge, which we leave in future studies.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*, 2013.
- [2] Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- [3] Xin Liu, Yaran Chen, and Dongbin Zhao. Learning future representation with synthetic observations for sample-efficient reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11740*, 2024.
- [4] Haoran Li, Qichao Zhang, and Dongbin Zhao. Deep reinforcement learning-based automatic exploration for navigation in unknown environment. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(6):2064–2076, 2019.
- [5] Junjie Wang, Qichao Zhang, Yao Mu, Dong Li, Dongbin Zhao, Yuzheng Zhuang, Ping Luo, Bin Wang, and Jianye Hao. Prototypical context-aware dynamics for generalization in visual control with model-based reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2024.
- [6] Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Babaeizadeh, Piotr Milos, Blazej Osinski, Roy H Campbell, Konrad Czechowski, Dumitru Erhan, Chelsea Finn, Piotr Kozakowski, Sergey Levine, et al. Model-based reinforcement learning for atari. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00374*, 2019.
- [7] Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Jimmy Ba, and Mohammad Norouzi. Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01603*, 2019.
- [8] Ruijie Zheng, Xiyao Wang, Yanchao Sun, Shuang Ma, Jieyu Zhao, Huazhe Xu, Hal Daumé III, and Furong Huang. Taco: Temporal latent action-driven contrastive loss for visual reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [9] Young Jae Lee, Jaehoon Kim, Youngjoon Park, Min Gu Kwak, and Seoung Bum Kim. Mind: Masked and inverse dynamics modeling for data-efficient deep reinforcement learning. 2024.
- [10] Jinxin Liu, Hongyin Zhang, Zifeng Zhuang, Yachen Kang, Donglin Wang, and Bin Wang. Design from policies: Conservative test-time adaptation for offline policy optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [11] Seohong Park, Dibya Ghosh, Benjamin Eysenbach, and Sergey Levine. Hiql: Offline goal-conditioned rl with latent states as actions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [12] Maryam Zare, Parham M Kebria, Abbas Khosravi, and Saeid Nahavandi. A survey of imitation learning: Algorithms, recent developments, and challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 2024.
- [13] Jonathan Ho and Stefano Ermon. Generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [14] Chethan Bhatija, Derek Guo, Dibya Ghosh, Anikait Singh, Manan Tomar, Quan Vuong, Yevgen Chebotar, Sergey Levine, and Aviral Kumar. Robotic offline rl from internet videos via value-function learning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 16977–16984, 2024.
- [15] Dibya Ghosh, Chethan Anand Bhatija, and Sergey Levine. Reinforcement learning from passive data via latent intentions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11321–11339. PMLR, 2023.
- [16] Tao Huang, Guangqi Jiang, Yanjie Ze, and Huazhe Xu. Diffusion reward: Learning rewards via conditional video diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14134*, 2023.
- [17] Faraz Torabi, Garrett Warnell, and Peter Stone. Generative adversarial imitation from observation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06158*, 2018.
- [18] Bohan Zhou, Ke Li, Jiechuan Jiang, and Zongqing Lu. Learning from visual observation via offline pretrained state-to-go transformer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [19] 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. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [20] Oliver Struckmeier and Ville Kyrki. Ilpo-mp: Mode priors prevent mode collapse when imitating latent policies from observations. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [21] Faraz Torabi, Garrett Warnell, and Peter Stone. Behavioral cloning from observation. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4950–4957, 2018.
- [22] Ashley Edwards, Himanshu Sahni, Yannick Schroecker, and Charles Isbell. Imitating latent policies from observation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1755–1763. PMLR, 2019.
- [23] Denis Yarats, Rob Fergus, Alessandro Lazaric, and Lerrel Pinto. Reinforcement learning with prototypical representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11920–11931. PMLR, 2021.
- [24] Minsong Liu, Yuanheng Zhu, Yaran Chen, and Dongbin Zhao. Enhancing reinforcement learning via transformer-based state predictive representations. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- [25] B Ravi Kiran, Ibrahim Sobh, Victor Talpaert, Patrick Mannion, Ahmad A Al Sallab, Senthil Yogamani, and Patrick Pérez. Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):4909–4926, 2021.
- [26] Dmitry Kalashnikov, Alex Irpan, Peter Pastor, Julian Ibarz, Alexander Herzog, Eric Jang, Deirdre Quillen, Ethan Holly, Mrinal Kalakrishnan, Vincent Vanhoucke, et al. Scalable deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic manipulation. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 651–673. PMLR, 2018.
- [27] Danijar Hafner, Jurgis Pasukonis, Jimmy Ba, and Timothy Lillicrap. Mastering diverse domains through world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04104*, 2023.
- [28] Fei Deng, Ingook Jang, and Sungjin Ahn. Dreamerpro: Reconstruction-free model-based reinforcement learning with prototypical representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4956–4975. PMLR, 2022.
- [29] Fan-Ming Luo, Tian Xu, Hang Lai, Xiong-Hui Chen, Weinan Zhang, and Yang Yu. A survey on model-based reinforcement learning. *Science China Information Sciences*, 67(2):121101, 2024.
- [30] Michael Laskin, Aravind Srinivas, and Pieter Abbeel. Curl: Contrastive unsupervised representations for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5639–5650. PMLR, 2020.
- [31] Yang Yue, Bingyi Kang, Zhongwen Xu, Gao Huang, and Shuicheng Yan. Value-consistent representation learning for data-efficient reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 11069–11077, 2023.
- [32] Xin Liu, Yaran Chen, Haoran Li, Boyu Li, and Dongbin Zhao. Cross-domain random pre-training with prototypes for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05614*, 2023.
- [33] Ahmed Hussein, Mohamed Medhat Gaber, Eyad Elyan, and Chrisina Jayne. Imitation learning: A survey of learning methods. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 50(2):1–35, 2017.
- [34] 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.
- [35] Bowen Baker, Ilge Akkaya, Peter Zhokov, Joost Huizinga, Jie Tang, Adrien Ecoffet, Brandon Houghton, Raul Sampedro, and Jeff Clune. Video pretraining (vpt): Learning to act by watching unlabeled online videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24639–24654, 2022.
- [36] Younggyo Seo, Danijar Hafner, Hao Liu, Fangchen Liu, Stephen James, Kimin Lee, and Pieter Abbeel. Masked world models for visual control. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1332–1344. PMLR, 2023.
- [37] Younggyo Seo, Junsu Kim, Stephen James, Kimin Lee, Jinwoo Shin, and Pieter Abbeel. Multi-view masked world models for visual robotic manipulation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 30613–30632. PMLR, 2023.
- [38] Minghuan Liu, Tairan He, Weinan Zhang, Shuicheng YAN, and Zhongwen Xu. Visual imitation learning with patch rewards. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [39] Vittorio Giammarino, James Queeney, and Ioannis Paschalidis. Adversarial imitation learning from visual observations using latent information. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024.
- [40] Deepak Pathak, Parsa Mahmoudieh, Guanghao Luo, Pulkit Agrawal, Dian Chen, Yide Shentu, Evan Shelhamer, Jitendra Malik, Alexei A Efros, and Trevor Darrell. Zero-shot visual imitation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 2050–2053, 2018.
- [41] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.

- [42] Michael Tschannen, Josip Djolonga, Paul K. Rubenstein, Sylvain Gelly, and Mario Lucic. On mutual information maximization for representation learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [43] Dominik Schmidt and Minqi Jiang. Learning to act without actions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [44] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [45] Matthew Aitchison, Penny Sweetser, Gregoire Deletang, and Marcus Hutter. Policy gradient without bootstrapping via truncated value learning, 2024.
- [46] Karl Cobbe, Chris Hesse, Jacob Hilton, and John Schulman. Leveraging procedural generation to benchmark reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2048–2056. PMLR, 2020.
- [47] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [48] Adam Stooke, Kimin Lee, Pieter Abbeel, and Michael Laskin. Decoupling representation learning from reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9870–9879. PMLR, 2021.