

SPEQ: Stabilization Phases for Efficient Q-Learning in High Update-To-Data Ratio Reinforcement Learning

Carlo Romeo*, Girolamo Macaluso*, Alessandro Sestini[†], Andrew D. Bagdanov
MICC – University of Florence,
{carlo.romeo, girolamo.macaluso, andrew.bagdanov}@unifi.it
[†]SEED – Electronic Arts,
asestini@ea.com

Abstract—A key challenge in Deep Reinforcement Learning is sample efficiency, especially in real-world applications where collecting environment interactions is expensive or risky. Recent off-policy algorithms improve sample efficiency by increasing the Update-To-Data (UTD) ratio and performing more gradient updates per environment interaction. While this improves sample efficiency, it significantly increases computational cost due to the higher number of gradient updates required. In this paper we propose a sample-efficient method to improve computational efficiency by separating training into distinct learning phases in order to exploit gradient updates more effectively. Our approach builds on top of the Dropout Q-Functions (DroQ) algorithm and alternates between an online, low UTD ratio training phase, and an offline stabilization phase. During the stabilization phase, we fine-tune the Q-functions without collecting new environment interactions. This process improves the effectiveness of the replay buffer and reduces computational overhead. Our experimental results on continuous control problems show that our method achieves results comparable to state-of-the-art, high UTD ratio algorithms while requiring 56% fewer gradient updates and 50% less training time than DroQ. Our approach offers an effective and computationally economical solution while maintaining the same sample efficiency as the more costly, high UTD ratio state-of-the-art.

Index Terms—Reinforcement Learning, Sample Efficiency, Computational Efficiency

I. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning [1], [2] has gained significant attention for its ability to solve complex decision-making tasks through interactions with environments [3], [4]. However, one of the primary challenges in RL is sample efficiency, which is the ability to learn effectively from a limited number of interactions. Typically, RL requires millions of interactions with the environment to achieve strong performance, which becomes impractical in real-world applications where such interactions are expensive, time-consuming, or risky [2].

RL methods fall into two major categories: on-policy and off-policy algorithms [2], [5], [6], each with a different impact on sample efficiency. On-policy algorithms, like Proximal




Fig. 1: Comparison of SPEQ with high UTD ratio reinforcement learning approaches. The plot shows the mean of the results on the MuJoCo Ant, Hopper, Humanoid, and Walker environments, averaged over 5 random seeds. We plot the reward obtained as a function of the number of gradient steps performed with the same environment steps (300,000). We observe that high UTD ratio algorithms require a huge number of gradient steps in order to converge. On the other end, our approach SPEQ achieves comparable performance with orders of magnitude fewer gradient steps.

Policy Optimization (PPO) [7], rely on data from the current policy, offering stable learning but low sample efficiency since past data can not be reused after updates [8]. In contrast, off-policy algorithms, such as Deep Q-Learning (DQN) [9] and Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) [10], can learn from data generated by any policy. This allows them to reuse experiences stored in a replay buffer, enabling multiple updates per interaction and improving sample efficiency. However, despite their improvements in sample efficiency, off-policy methods still face challenges in fully exploiting the data they collect.

Traditional off-policy algorithms perform a limited number of optimization updates per interaction stored in the

*Carlo Romeo and Girolamo Macaluso contributed equally as co-first authors.




Fig. 2: Overview of our proposed SPEQ approach. In (a) we illustrate the classical online RL training framework with high UTD ratios. For each environment interaction, the agent is trained UTD times on the replay buffer. In (b) we illustrate our SPEQ approach which separates the training of the agent into two distinct phases. In (b.1), during online interactions, we update the agent only once before moving to the next environment step (equivalent to $UTD = 1$). Every F environment steps, as shown in (b.2), we fine-tune the agent Q-functions in a periodic offline stabilization phase. In each stabilization phase, we perform N optimization steps to fine-tune the critic Q-functions using only data from the current replay buffer.

replay buffer, leaving much of the potential learning signal unused [11]. Recent studies have proposed increasing the Update-To-Data (UTD) ratio – the number of optimization steps performed per environment interaction – as a simple yet effective strategy to address this issue [12], [13]. By performing more updates for each experience sampled from the environment, this approach allows the agent to extract more value from each interaction, thereby improving sample efficiency.

However, the sample efficiency provided by high UTD algorithms comes at a significant computational cost (Figure 1). These approaches typically require a greater number of gradient updates, which increases the overall computational demand and training time [13]. The trade-off between sample efficiency and computational cost is a critical bottleneck in scaling RL to real-world applications. The challenge lies in striking a balance between leveraging the full potential of high UTD algorithms and maintaining practical compute costs.

In this paper, we propose a novel method to improve computational efficiency in RL (Figure 2) by redistributing UTD updates to maximize their effectiveness. Our approach, which we refer to as **Stabilization Phases for Efficient Q-Learning (SPEQ)**, builds upon the DroQ algorithm [13], aiming to enhance its computational efficiency while offering a new perspective on leveraging high UTD ratios. SPEQ alternates between low UTD update phases and high UTD stabilization phases. During the latter, we fine-tune the Q-functions using the replay buffer without updating the policy or collecting new environment interactions. These stabilization phases help reduce the bias of the Q-functions, allowing the agent to more effectively leverage the stored samples. Our experimental results show that our approach achieves performance comparable to or better than state-of-the-art high UTD algorithms, while

at the same time reducing the number of gradient steps.

In summary, the key contributions of this work are:

- We propose SPEQ, a method that enhances the computational efficiency of high UTD ratio algorithms in RL. SPEQ alternates between low UTD online learning phases with high UTD stabilization phases where only the Q-function is updated.
- We evaluate SPEQ on a set of tasks using the MuJoCo benchmark [14] against state-of-the-art high UTD ratio methods. Our approach reduces the number of gradient updates and training time while achieving competitive performance with fewer computational resources.
- We show through ablations that there is an optimal trade-off between low UTD iterations and stabilization phase length and frequency in SPEQ. This allows our approach to better distribute gradient updates and achieve – with the same sample complexity – performance comparable to high UTD ratio algorithms at a fraction of the computational cost.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we review work from the literature most related to our contributions, and in Section III describe the building blocks of SPEQ. In Section IV we compare our approach to the state-of-the-art in terms of computational efficiency, performance, and bias mitigation, and report on an extensive set of ablation studies. We conclude with Section V and Section VI with a discussion of limitations and future work, as well as of our contributions.

II. RELATED WORK

The potential of high UTD ratios has been gaining interest from the research community. Model-Based Policy Optimization (MBPO) is a model-based algorithm that uses a mix of real and synthetic data along with a large $UTD \gg 1$, achieving

higher sample efficiency compared to standard model-free algorithms [15].

Randomized Ensemble Double Q-Learning (RedQ) succeeds in enabling a high UTD ratio even for model-free approaches using a large ensemble of Q-functions [12]. Through careful selection of the size of the ensemble, as proposed in the work by [16], and using a random subset of the ensemble to estimate the target values, [12] showed that their approach is able to minimize the expected difference between the predicted Q-values and the target Q-values, defined as the Q-function *bias*. The authors showed that high UTD ratio algorithms reach sub-optimal performance because they are unable to cope with the bias. By minimizing it, RedQ avoids the over-estimation problem that hinders convergence. RedQ is independent of the underlying optimization algorithm and can be implemented on top of any other model-free approach, such as Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) [10], Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) [17], or Twin-Delayed DDPG (TD3) [18]. Despite its sample efficiency, the large ensemble renders the approach sub-optimal from a general computational efficiency perspective. In contrast, our method is able to alleviate the problem of increasing bias in high UTD ratio scenarios by using only two critics with their corresponding targets, as in classical Double Q-Learning [19], thus avoiding a large ensemble and consequently further increasing computational efficiency.

Through the combination of dropout regularization [20] and layer normalization [21], Dropout Q-Functions (DroQ) is able to leverage a smaller ensemble of Q-functions than RedQ to improve computational efficiency [13]. Nevertheless, the total number of gradient steps required for convergence is unchanged with respect to RedQ, thus leaving room for improvement in terms of computational efficiency.

Sample Multiple Reuse (SMR) is one of the latest state-of-the-art approaches proposed to increase sample efficiency in model-free, off-policy RL [22]. SMR applies multiple gradient steps using the same batch of transitions while avoiding overfitting thanks to the moving targets in Q-values estimation. Similarly to RedQ, SMR can be applied on top of different optimization algorithms, such as SAC and RedQ. However, the main drawback is the overall computational efficiency: in the RedQ algorithm the UTD ratio is set to 20, and in combination with SMR 5 more gradient steps are performed for each sampled batch. In addition, as we will see in Section IV, SMR is computationally less efficient than SPEQ due to the larger number of gradient updates needed.

While various regularization techniques have been proposed to mitigate the issue of Q-value overestimation, no single approach performs consistently across all benchmarks. To address this, [23] suggest combining multiple regularization methods and dynamically selecting the most effective one based on the specific scenario by training multiple agents in parallel. Although this strategy aims to be a general solution for using high UTD ratios, similarly to the aforementioned approaches it sacrifices computational efficiency in favor of slightly improved sample efficiency.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we begin by describing some preliminaries useful for understanding the following sections. We continue by examining the performance of DroQ at different UTD ratios in order to understand the trade-offs between computational efficiency and bias in Q-function estimation. We then introduce our approach, which aims to maintain low bias and strong performance while reducing computational overhead.

A. Preliminaries

When using high UTD ratios it is important to consider the overestimation bias problem during the prediction of Q-values. [12] measure the bias as:

$$\text{Bias}_{Q_\phi} = \frac{Q_\phi(s, a) - Q^\pi(s, a)}{|\mathbb{E}_{\bar{s}, \bar{a} \sim \pi}[Q^\pi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})]|}, \quad (1)$$

where $Q^\pi(s, a)$ represents the Q-value for policy π approximated using the Monte Carlo returns given state s and action a , and $Q_\phi(s, a)$ is the average of the current estimations of the Q-functions. The bias is normalized to take into account changing average return values during training.

Our algorithm is built on top of DroQ [13]. This algorithm leverages dropout [20] and layer normalization [21] to inject uncertainty into the prediction of target Q-values, thus reducing overestimation bias and allowing it to use a very high UTD ratio of 20 with only two Q-functions in contrast to the large ensembles used in RedQ [12]. In DroQ, the targets are calculated as:

$$y = r + \gamma \left(\min_{i=1,2} Q_{\text{Dr}, \bar{\phi}_i}(s', a') - \alpha \log \pi_\theta(a'|s') \right), \quad a' \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s'), \quad (2)$$

where π_θ is the policy we want to optimize and $Q_{\text{Dr}, \bar{\phi}_{1,2}}$ are the target Q-functions with dropout. Then, each Q-function is updated via gradient descent using:

$$\nabla_\phi \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{(s,a,r,s') \in \mathcal{B}} (Q_{\text{Dr}, \phi_i}(s, a) - y)^2. \quad (3)$$

where $Q_{\text{Dr}, \bar{\phi}_{1,2}}$ are the Q-functions we want to optimize. The target networks are updated with respect to the main Q-functions by using Polyak averaging, using a batch of experiences \mathcal{B} sampled from the replay buffer:

$$\bar{\phi}_i \leftarrow \rho \bar{\phi}_i + (1 - \rho) \phi_i, \quad (4)$$

where ρ is a hyperparameter. For each environment step, after updating the Q-functions, the policy is updated following:

$$\nabla_\theta \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 Q_{\text{Dr}, \phi_i}(s, a) - \alpha \log \pi_\theta(a|s) \right), \quad a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s). \quad (5)$$

B. Our Approach

High UTD ratio algorithms [15], [12], [13] offer improved sample efficiency by performing multiple gradient updates for each environment interaction (see Eq. 3). However, these approaches tend to be computationally expensive due to the large number of gradient steps required to increase performance [13]. This computational inefficiency becomes a bottleneck, especially in environments where time and resources




Fig. 3: Comparison of SPEQ with state-of-the-art algorithms in terms of (a) computational efficiency, (b) performance, and (c) bias in Q-values estimation. In (a) we show evaluation reward as a function of gradient updates (logarithmic scale). All methods use 300,000 environment steps. The black vertical line indicates the number of gradient updates where SPEQ achieves its best relative performance. In (b) we show reward averaged over 10 episodes, evaluated every 1000 environment steps. In (c) Normalized bias during training calculated as defined by Eq. 1.

are limited. Our goal is to mitigate this issue by reducing the computational cost without sacrificing performance.

The DroQ algorithm [13] achieves state-of-the-art performance using a UTD ratio of 20. This high ratio, in combination with dropout regularization, helps mitigate bias in Q-function estimation, but at the cost of significant computational overhead. To understand how the performance and the bias vary with lower UTD ratios, we experimented with reducing the UTD ratio to 9, 3, and 2. Figure 4(a) shows a considerable drop

in performance with respect to DroQ with UTD = 20, originally proposed by [13]. By analyzing the bias in Figure 4(b) we see that decreasing the UTD ratio increases the bias. For low UTD ratios such as 2 and 3, the bias starts notably low, due to the fewer gradient steps performed at the beginning of training with a noisy Q-function. But then they converge to a value much higher than standard DroQ since they fail to fully exploit the data collected from the environment. This drop in performance, caused by an increase in the bias, is likely due

Algorithm 1 SPEQ

```
1: Initialize policy parameters  $\theta$ , Q-function parameters  $\phi_i$  with  $i =$   
   1, 2, and empty replay buffer  $\mathcal{D}$ .  
2: Set target parameters  $\bar{\phi}_i \leftarrow \phi_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ .  
3: Set stabilization frequency  $F$ , number of stabilization iterations  
    $N$   
4: for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do  
5:   Take action  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot|s_t)$ . Observe reward  $r_t$ , next state  $s_{t+1}$ .  
  
6:    $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup (s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$   
7:   if  $(n \bmod F) = 0$  then  $M \leftarrow N$  else  $M \leftarrow 1$ .  
8:   for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  do  
9:     Sample a mini-batch  $\mathcal{B} = \{(s, a, r, s')\}$  from  $\mathcal{D}$ .  
10:    Compute  $y$  using Eq 2.  
11:    for  $i = 1, 2$  do  
12:      Update  $\phi_i$  with gradient descent using Eq 3.  
13:      Update target networks with Eq. 4.  
14:      Update policy parameters  $\theta$  with gradient ascent using Eq. 5.
```

to the underfitting of the Q-functions on the replay buffer, as fewer gradient updates fail to keep the Q-functions aligned with the policy updates.

However, decreasing the UTD ratio improves computational efficiency, as fewer updates are performed. This highlights a trade-off between performance, which increases with more update steps, and computational cost. This raises an important question: Can we redistribute the gradient updates to achieve the same performance as DroQ while requiring fewer optimization steps?

The goal of SPEQ is to fully exploit the data collected without using a constant UTD ratio throughout training. We start by setting $\text{UTD} = 1$, in order to keep the bias low and relatively stable even during the initial part of the training [24], [25], [26] Then, we alternate between a standard training phase with $\text{UTD} = 1$, during which we buffer a high number of gradient updates N for the Q-functions, and a *stabilization phase*, in which we apply all the buffered gradient steps all together after a fixed number of environment interactions F . During the stabilization phase we only update the Q-functions and do not without update the policy network. This adjustment allows the Q-values to stabilize and align more effectively with the current policy, reducing the bias introduced by the Q-functions using a UTD ratio of 1. By concentrating the updates in stabilization phases, we can improve performance while simultaneously reducing the computational overhead.

Algorithm 1 gives the pseudo-code for our approach, highlighting in red the elements that differ from the standard DroQ implementation. First, to mitigate overfitting to early-stage transitions [27], [28], [11], we initially set the UTD ratio as 1. Next, after every F environment steps, we perform N gradient updates to improve the Q-function estimates using the frozen replay buffer. During this periodic stabilization training phase, the policy is not updated. As demonstrated in Section IV, this approach achieves the same level of performance and at the same time improves the computational efficiency. In practice, we set $F = 10,000$ and $N = 75,000$. With these settings, our method achieves performance comparable to DroQ with

a UTD ratio of 20 at a fraction of the computational cost (approximately equivalent to a DroQ with a UTD ratio of 9).

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We evaluate our approach on the OpenAI MuJoCo suite [14] – which represents a standard benchmark for continuous control RL solutions – on the following locomotion environments: Ant, Hopper, Humanoid, and Walker2d. For all environments, each algorithm was trained for a total of 300,000 environment steps. For each run, we measure the average over 5 seeds.

We compare SPEQ against the following algorithms:

- **Soft Actor-Critic (SAC)** [10], a classical off-policy RL algorithm that does not use a high UTD ratio, which achieves stability and efficiency through the combinations of maximum entropy and actor-critic architecture.
- **RedQ** [12], which extends the SAC backbone with a large ensemble of Q-functions to address the increasing bias error in Q-values estimation to leverage high UTD ratios.
- **DroQ** [13], which is a variant of RedQ that uses a smaller ensemble of Q-functions and leverages dropout and layer normalization to address the mitigation of bias in Q-function estimation.
- **SMR** [22], which revises the concept of replay ratio by updating the agent multiple times on the same batch.

With the exception of SAC, the other three algorithms use a high UTD ratio. In addition, SMR can be implemented on top of other optimization algorithms, and in our experiments, we consider both SAC and RedQ. SMR-RedQ version performs an equivalent of $\text{UTD} = 100$ ratio updates, which makes this version especially computationally intensive. To ensure consistent reproduction of the results obtained, we use the original repositories of the DroQ¹, in which are also defined the SAC and RedQ algorithms, and SMR² algorithms. Our experiments aim to answer the following research questions:

- **Q1:** Can we enhance computational efficiency without sacrificing performance?
- **Q2:** How does our approach perform in relation to a lower UTD ratio version of DroQ?
- **Q3:** How do hyperparameters settings impact the performance of SPEQ, in particular N , F , and the update strategy?

A. Computational Efficiency

To answer **Q1** we evaluate the computational efficiency SPEQ compared to the algorithms listed above. Figure 3 shows the results. Our evaluation consists of three comparisons:

- Figure 3(a) compares SPEQ to state-of-the-art high UTD ratio algorithms in terms of computational efficiency. We report evaluation reward as a function of the number of gradient updates. All the approaches use the same number of environmental steps (300,000). This evaluation shows which algorithm achieves good results with the fewest

¹<https://github.com/TakuyaHiraoka/Dropout-Q-Functions-for-Doubly-Efficient-Reinforcement-Learning.git>

²<https://github.com/dmksjfl/SMR.git>




Fig. 4: Comparison of our approach to DroQ with varying UTD ratios. We plot the evaluation reward on the right and the bias of the Q-functions on the left. The plot shows the mean of the results on Ant, Hopper, Humanoid and Walker environments, averaged over 5 random seeds. We observe that increasing the UTD ratio leads to increased performance and that our approach. Setting UTD ratio of 9 performs approximately the same number of gradient updates as SPEQ, but results in significantly lower performance than our approach. These bias results show that decreasing the UTD ratio significantly impacts the bias reduction capability of DroQ, while SPEQ is capable of reducing both bias and gradient updates.

TABLE I: Comparison of our approach with the state-of-the-art in terms of total gradient steps (in millions) and training time (in minutes) required to train each agent. Compared to high UTD ratio baselines, our method significantly reduces the number of gradient steps and training time, highlighting its superior computational efficiency.

	SAC	SMR-SAC	DroQ	RedQ	SMR-RedQ	Ours
Gradient steps	0.9	9.3	12.3	120	600	5.4
Time	91	640	963	2100	1460	462

possible gradient updates. Gradient updates are plotted on a logarithmic scale due to the high number of gradient steps required by some methods. In these plots, the black vertical line shows the number of gradient steps required by SPEQ to achieve the best relative performance.

- Figure 3(b) summarizes the performance of SPEQ compared to the state-of-the-art. Performance is defined as the average cumulative episodic reward over 10 episodes during training. This evaluation is performed every 1000 environment steps.
- Figure 3(c) illustrates the normalized bias of SPEQ throughout the training process, compared to one of the state-of-the-art algorithms. The bias is defined in Eq. 1 in Section III-A.

As seen in the plots, SPEQ outperforms all the state-of-the-art approaches in terms of computational efficiency. Our approach reaches competitive performance across all environments in less than 10^7 gradient updates, lower by several orders of magnitude when compared to RedQ and SMR-RedQ while being trained for the same number of environmental steps. The most efficient state-of-the-art algorithm, DroQ,

matches SPEQ in only one of the four tested tasks, while our approach is more efficient in the other three. In terms of performance, SPEQ resembles that of DroQ despite using only half the number of gradient updates. The only exception is the Walker environment, in which the performance is slightly lower but our approach still offers better value in terms of reward per gradient update.

The results of the bias analysis, shown in Figure 3(c), indicate that our approach effectively maintains a low and stable bias, comparable to that of DroQ, but with significantly less computation. This demonstrates that SPEQ offers good bias control while being more computationally efficient than the other algorithms.

In Table I we show the results of a comparison of our approach with the baselines on total gradient steps and training time. All training runs were performed sequentially on a machine equipped with an Intel i7-7800X CPU and an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080. The results indicate a strong correlation between the total number of gradient updates and the time required for training. In addition, architecture design significantly affects computational performance – although the DroQ and RedQ algorithms share the same UTD ratio, DroQ is 54% faster due to its smaller Q function ensemble. Differences in the sampling process are also important, as it can become a bottleneck: the RedQ and DroQ algorithms sample multiple times from the replay buffer, while the SMR algorithm needs to sample the batch from the replay buffer only one time for each environment step. Although the SMR-RedQ agent makes five times as many gradient steps as RedQ, it is 30% faster. On the other hand, our approach, due to the combination of a low UTD ratio during training and high UTD stabilization phases, is the fastest algorithm among those with $UTD \gg 1$.

B. Comparison at Lower UTD Ratios

To answer **Q2**, we compare the performance of SPEQ against DroQ with different UTD ratios. In particular, we test DroQ with UTD ratios of 2, 3, 9, and 20. The original DroQ paper used a UTD ratio of 20 [13]. Figure 4 shows the results of this comparison. This experiment demonstrates the impact of the UTD ratio on DroQ performance – in particular, DroQ with a UTD ratio of 9 requires approximately the same number of gradient updates as our SPEQ method.

The results reveal that the use of dropout, which is necessary to allow a high UTD ratio, renders the DroQ algorithm unable to effectively reduce bias when the UTD is lowered from the default value of 20. In fact, as seen in Figure 4, at lower UTD ratios the bias increases, leading to worse estimates of Q values. UTD ratio of 3 and 2 starts with a lower bias due to the fewer gradient steps taken at the start of the training, when the Q-function estimation is still noisy, but then the bias converges at a higher value due to the under-exploitation of the replay buffer.

Furthermore, the bias comparison between SPEQ and DroQ with UTD = 9 confirms our intuition about the effectiveness of offline stabilization steps to efficiently train Q functions. Our approach of delaying gradient updates to take advantage of larger distributions of experience during the early part of the training leads to a better reduction of bias of Q-value estimation. Then alternation of low UTD and stabilization phases helps to keep the bias low during the rest of the training. These results when compared to an equivalent UTD ratio of 9, show both better bias reduction capability and higher performance.

C. Ablations

To answer **Q3**, we consider several ablated versions of our approach.

Varying Number of Stabilization Iterations (N). This experiment aims to evaluate the impact of varying the number N of updates during the stabilization phase of SPEQ. We conduct the experiment using the Humanoid task, averaging the results over five random seeds. Figure 5 shows that increasing N results in noticeable performance improvements, as the Q-function has more opportunities to refine its estimates. However, this trend only continues up to a certain threshold ($N = 75,000$). Beyond this point, further updates lead to diminishing returns, where the performance gains plateau and eventually decline. This decline can be attributed to overfitting the Q-function on the transitions stored in the replay buffer. With very many updates, the model loses its ability to generalize to out-of-distribution states. As a result, instead of enhancing the policy’s robustness, excessive updates introduce instability in performance.

Varying Stabilization Frequency (F). This experiment aims to evaluate the optimal frequency F of the periodic stabilization phases. Figure 4 shows that increasing F is detrimental in terms of performance, therefore causing SPEQ at $F = 50,000$ and $F = 100,000$ to converge to sub-optimal




Fig. 5: Results of varying the number of gradient updates N during stabilization phases on the MuJoCo Humanoid task, averaged over 5 random seeds. The plot shows that the performance improves by increasing the number of updates up to about 75K iterations, beyond which further updates result in diminishing returns.




Fig. 6: Results of varying the frequency F of the stabilization phases on the MuJoCo Humanoid task averaged over 5 random seeds. The plot shows that performance decreases as the stabilization frequency decreases. On the other hand, performing twice the number of offline stabilization phases ($F = 5,000$) leads to the same performance, but reduces computational efficiency.

performance. Decreasing the frequency to $F = 5,000$, despite the similar performance to SPEQ at $F = 10,000$, doubles the number of gradient updates.

Different Stabilization Strategies. This ablation aims to evaluate the impact of different update strategies during the stabilization phase. In Figure 7 we compare three approaches: updating only the Q-functions, updating only the policy, and updating both the policy and Q-functions. These results




Fig. 7: Comparison of different update strategies during the stabilization phase on the MuJoCo Humanoid task averaged over 5 random seeds. The blue line shows SPEQ, which updates only the Q-functions. The orange line represents the case where only the policy is updated during the stabilization phases, whereas the green line represents the experiments where both the policy and the Q-functions are fine-tuned. These results indicate that updating only the policy causes a performance collapse while updating only the Q-functions outperforms updating both.

point out that (i) Q functions should not be left out of the stabilization process, as the “Policy Only” scenario leads to performance collapse; and (ii) focusing solely on updating the Q-functions during stabilization phases not only results in better performance but also reduces computational overhead.

Extended Training Runs. In the experimental results reported in Figure 3 we run all algorithms for exactly 300,000 environmental interactions, which is the common evaluation setting for high UTD approaches [12], [13], [22]. Here we analyze the convergence of SPEQ compared to DroQ and RedQ on longer training sequences of 1 million environment interactions. The results shown in Figure 8 on the MuJoCo Ant environment show that, despite the initially superior performance achieved by RedQ and DroQ, beyond about 500,000 environment interactions SPEQ arrives at performance comparable to these approaches. The crucial difference is again in the total number of gradient updates performed in this extended training run: RedQ requires more than 350 million gradient updates, while SPEQ achieves comparable results with only 15 million updates.

V. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Although SPEQ improves computational efficiency and shows solid performance in the evaluated tasks, it does not consistently outperform state-of-the-art high UTD ratio methods. The most significant gains are observed when computational resources are a limiting factor. Moreover, our experimental results show the effectiveness of stabilization phases,




Fig. 8: Comparison of SPEQ with that DroQ and RedQ on MuJoCo Humanoid on a training run of 1 million environment steps. The black vertical line indicates the 300,000 steps used previously as the default training length all other experiments. Beyond about 500,000 environment interactions, the performance of SPEQ is comparable to that of RedQ and DroQ, but at a fraction of the required gradient updates.

but the optimal frequency and number of gradient updates during these phases remain unclear. Ideally, SPEQ should automatically identify when to run a stabilization phase and dynamically adjust the number of gradient updates. Future work will focus on studying bias evolution during online learning to determine the optimal frequency and length of stabilization phases.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we introduced an efficient alternative to high update-to-data ratio reinforcement learning which we call **Stabilization Phases for Efficient Q-Learning (SPEQ)**. Our approach significantly improves computational efficiency by alternating between low UTD ratio training phases and offline stabilization phases during which Q-functions are fine-tuned with high UTD ratio without additional environment interactions. This strategy allows us to significantly reduce the computational overhead while maintaining or even improving performance compared to state-of-the-art high UTD ratio algorithms.

Our experimental results demonstrate that SPEQ requires from 40% to 99% fewer gradient updates and from 27% to 78% less training time, maintains the same sample efficiency, and achieves competitive performance across various continuous control tasks as the other state-of-the-art high UTD approaches. Additionally, our solution effectively mitigates Q-function bias without relying on large ensembles, further improving computational efficiency. Therefore, SPEQ yields significant advantages in terms of both computational cost and learning effectiveness, making it a practical choice for real-world, resource-constrained applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [2] K. Arulkumaran, M. P. Deisenroth, M. Brundage, and A. A. Bharath, "Deep reinforcement learning: A brief survey," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 26–38, 2017.
- [3] OpenAI, M. Andrychowicz, B. Baker, M. Chociej, R. Józefowicz, B. McGrew, J. W. Pachocki, J. Pachocki, A. Petron, M. Plappert, G. Powell, A. Ray, J. Schneider, S. Sidor, J. Tobin, P. Welinder, L. Weng, and W. Zaremba, "Learning dexterous in-hand manipulation," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1808.00177, 2018.
- [4] M. Schwarzer, J. S. Obando-Ceron, A. C. Courville, M. G. Bellemare, R. Agarwal, and P. S. Castro, "Bigger, better, faster: Human-level atari with human-level efficiency," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258987895>
- [5] R. S. Sutton, D. McAllester, S. Singh, and Y. Mansour, "Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 12, 1999.
- [6] D. Precup, R. S. Sutton, and S. Dasgupta, "Off-policy temporal-difference learning with function approximation," in *ICML*, 2001, pp. 417–424.
- [7] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal policy optimization algorithms," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/1707.06347, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:28695052>
- [8] D. Silver, G. Lever, N. Heess, T. Degris, D. Wierstra, and M. Riedmiller, "Deterministic policy gradient algorithms," in *International conference on machine learning*. Pmlr, 2014, pp. 387–395.
- [9] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. Graves, I. Antonoglou, D. Wierstra, and M. A. Riedmiller, "Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1312.5602, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.5602>
- [10] T. Haarnoja, A. Zhou, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/1801.01290, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:28202810>
- [11] P. D'Oro, M. Schwarzer, E. Nikishin, P.-L. Bacon, M. G. Bellemare, and A. C. Courville, "Sample-efficient reinforcement learning by breaking the replay ratio barrier," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259298604>
- [12] X. Chen, C. Wang, Z. Zhou, and K. W. Ross, "Randomized ensembled double Q-learning: Learning fast without a model," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2021.
- [13] T. Hiraoka, T. Imagawa, T. Hashimoto, T. Onishi, and Y. Tsuruoka, "Dropout q-functions for doubly efficient reinforcement learning," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2110.02034, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:238353966>
- [14] E. Todorov, T. Erez, and Y. Tassa, "MuJoCo: A physics engine for model-based control," in *Proc. IROS*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 5026–5033.
- [15] M. Janner, J. Fu, M. Zhang, and S. Levine, "When to trust your model: Model-based policy optimization," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/1906.08253, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:195068981>
- [16] Q. Lan, Y. Pan, A. Fyshe, and M. White, "Maxmin q-learning: Controlling the estimation bias of q-learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06487*, 2020.
- [17] T. P. Lillicrap, J. J. Hunt, A. Pritzel, N. M. O. Heess, T. Erez, Y. Tassa, D. Silver, and D. Wierstra, "Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1509.02971, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:16326763>
- [18] S. Fujimoto, H. Hoof, and D. Meger, "Addressing function approximation error in actor-critic methods," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1587–1596.
- [19] H. Van Hasselt, A. Guez, and D. Silver, "Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2016.
- [20] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov, "Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 15, no. 56, pp. 1929–1958, 2014.
- [21] J. L. Ba, J. R. Kiros, and G. E. Hinton, "Layer normalization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- [22] J. Lyu, L. Wan, Z. Lu, and X. Li, "Off-policy rl algorithms can be sample-efficient for continuous control via sample multiple reuse," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 666, p. 120371, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258967871>
- [23] Q. Li, A. Kumar, I. Kostrikov, and S. Levine, "Efficient deep reinforcement learning requires regulating overfitting," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2304.10466, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258236460>
- [24] E. Nikishin, M. Schwarzer, P. D'Oro, P.-L. Bacon, and A. C. Courville, "The primacy bias in deep reinforcement learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248811264>
- [25] G. Sokar, R. Agarwal, P. S. Castro, and U. Evcı, "The dormant neuron phenomenon in deep reinforcement learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257219318>
- [26] M. Hussing, C. Voelcker, I. Gilitschenski, A.-m. Farahmand, and E. Eaton, "Dissecting deep rl with high update ratios: Combatting value overestimation and divergence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05996*, 2024.
- [27] J. Li, H. Shi, H. Wu, C. Zhao, and K.-S. Hwang, "Eliminating primacy bias in online reinforcement learning by self-distillation," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. PP, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:269837649>
- [28] E. Nikishin, J. Oh, G. Ostrovski, C. Lyle, R. Pascanu, W. Dabney, and A. Barreto, "Deep reinforcement learning with plasticity injection," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2305.15555, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:258887576>