

Reinforcement Learning for Generative AI: A Survey

YUANJIANG CAO, Macquarie University, Australia

QUAN Z. SHENG, Macquarie University, Australia

JULIAN MCAULEY, University of California San Diego, USA

LINA YAO, CSIRO's Data61, University of New South Wales, and Macquarie University, Australia

Deep Generative AI has been a long-standing essential topic in the machine learning community, which can impact a number of application areas like text generation and computer vision. The major paradigm to train a generative model is maximum likelihood estimation. This formulation successfully establishes the objective of generative tasks, while it is incapable of satisfying all the requirements that a user might expect from a generative model. Reinforcement learning has demonstrated its power and flexibility to inject new training signals such as human inductive bias to build a performant model. Thereby, reinforcement learning has become a trending research field and has stretched the limits of generative AI in both model design and application. It is reasonable to summarize advances in recent years with a comprehensive review. Although there are surveys in different application areas recently, this survey aims to shed light on a high-level review that spans a range of application areas. We provide a rigorous taxonomy and make sufficient coverage on various models and applications, including the fast-developing large language model area. We conclude this survey by showing the potential directions that might tackle the limit of current models and expand the frontiers for generative AI.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: reinforcement learning, generative AI

ACM Reference Format:

Yuanjiang Cao, Quan Z. Sheng, Julian McAuley, and Lina Yao. 2023. Reinforcement Learning for Generative AI: A Survey. 1, 1 (August 2023), 35 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed tremendous progress in generative AI, like variational autoencoders, autoregressive models, adversarial generative nets, energy-based models and normalizing flows. The advancement of these models has brought the development of a broad range of applications, from neural language processing to image generation and scientific research. Particularly, the emergence of Large Language Models (LLM), like ChatGPT[1], has changed the paradigm of industry and academia regarding how to develop the next generation of machine learning systems to bridge the gap toward general AI further. Another fast-developing area is Diffusion models [72], whose training requires large amounts of computing resources for performant image generation models. Generative models also power scientific research in molecular design and optimization. AlphaFold[81] shows that protein structure can be effectively modeled by machine learning systems [7, 103].

Authors' addresses: Yuanjiang Cao, Macquarie University, Australia, yuanjiang.cao@mq.edu.au; Quan Z. Sheng, Macquarie University, Australia, michael.sheng@mq.edu.au; Julian McAuley, University of California San Diego, USA, jmcauley@eng.ucsd.edu; Lina Yao, CSIRO's Data61, University of New South Wales, and Macquarie University, Australia, lina.yao@data61.csiro.au.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Training generative model is one of the cornerstones of generative AI research, which studies to design objective functions to guide the learning process. The major objective of generative models is Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE), in other words, decreasing the KL divergence between generated distribution and target data distribution. However, in some cases, human want more than what the MLE can provide. Taking conditional text generation as an example, for a text generator, we hope not only that it achieves good performance on texts that exist in the training dataset, but also that it can output texts that satisfy other desired properties like diversity, coherence, human-like, and moral considerations. The discrepancy between evaluation metrics and training objectives can decrease the quality of generated outputs. These desired properties for a text generator expose that the gap between distribution fitting and desired properties makes the maximum likelihood objective insufficient. The generalization of models connects to the limit of the NLL objective as well. In some applications of generative AI, we hope the model can cope with out-of-distribution inputs or explores out-of-distribution. For example, in novel molecule design, the goal of the learning process is to explore and generate unseen molecules instead of those in the dataset. A code summarizer or generator is expected to produce well-designed code for novel tasks instead of those in the dataset.

To address the aforementioned limits, reinforcement learning has been proposed as a useful optional training paradigm to improve the performance of generation models. Reinforcement learning is a training paradigm designed for learning from interaction [158]. It has flexible objectives in terms of the reward function, in contrast to the distribution modeling objective of supervised learning and unsupervised learning. Furthermore, many generation problems can be redefined as decision-making problems, creating the utility of RL methods on generation problems.

Why this survey There are numerous existing surveys and reviews of the application of reinforcement learning scattered in various models [115] and application areas, including neural language processing [21, 26, 119, 165], code generation [188], speech processing [101, 159], computer vision [75, 94], neural architecture search [78, 140], and drug discovery [11, 34, 56, 108, 160].

Our survey surpasses these previous surveys in terms of the selection criteria and the comprehensiveness of coverage in this area. We not only summarize lines of research across multiple areas but also organize theoretical works that aim to improve generative models by reinforcement learning techniques. For instance, we cover the recent advancement on how diffusion models can be viewed as policy gradient methods and can be enhanced by searching novel backward processes Section 3.2.3.

Scope and Paper selection criteria. This study offers a comprehensive analysis of the potential and obstacles associated with reinforcement learning, with a particular focus on deep reinforcement learning in the realm of generative AI. The analysis encompasses their intrinsic capabilities, such as addressing non-differentiable learning issues, infusing generative AI with innovative training signals, and advances in sampling and neural architecture search. It also sheds light on the prevailing challenges, including peaked distribution, the conundrum of exploration versus exploitation, sparse reward scenarios, challenges in long-term credit allocation, and issues of generalization. Furthermore, the research delves into their practical applications across various domains, including Natural Language Processing (NLP), Computer Vision (CV), code synthesis, speech decoding, information extraction, recommendations, robotics, and AI’s role in scientific endeavors. Emerging trends, such as the intricacies of reward function formulation, multi-objective optimization strategies, enhancing and controlling models, modeling human preferences, ensuring interoperability, and the integration of novel reinforcement learning techniques with Large Language Models (LLMs) and foundational models, are also meticulously explored.

In application areas, this survey mainly focuses on sequential generation, e.g. conditional text generation and code generation, but also contains less-mentioned vision tasks such as 3D point cloud completion. We select papers according

to three selection criteria, impact, venues, and time. For classic models, we focus on high-quality works that are present in well-appreciated conferences and journals. For recent papers that push the boundaries like large language models, we relaxed the criteria. For some small branches, we list all the papers we can find.

We propose this survey to systematically review the application of reinforcement learning in generative AI, including models and applications. Our contributions include

- We perform a systematic and thorough examination of various directions within the field of generative models and problems using Reinforcement Learning. Recognizing the multifaceted nature of these areas, we carefully organize and present an exhaustive review that encompasses different methods, structures, and applications.
- We developed a unified taxonomy, meticulously crafted to organize the extensive and varied literature in generative studies. This taxonomy not only classifies existing works according to common themes and methodologies but also draws attention to potential intersections and divergences within the field.
- With a specialized focus on Reinforcement Learning (RL) methodologies within generative AI, our research provides a detailed exploration of the contemporary challenges and avenues for development. We dissect the inherent complexities and hurdles in implementing RL methods and organize them in a manner that encapsulates the current state of the art. Furthermore, we identify several emerging directions that hold promise for innovative solutions.

2 PRELIMINARY AND BACKGROUND

In this section, we will provide preliminaries about the relevant concepts and models, in terms of generative models and reinforcement learning.

2.1 Generative Models

The topic of this survey is reinforcement learning applied in generative AI. Thus it is essential to provide a brief introduction to basic generative models, which lays the foundation for successive chapters. Before we dive into details, we list the most common notations throughout this survey in Table 1.

We express generative models as specifying how to represent a distribution for a variable x or a sequence of variables x_1 to x_n , where n is the index of the last variable. The space of x or x_i is denoted as \mathcal{X} .

Variational Autoencoder (VAE) learns useful representations by reconstructing the input x with a latent variable z in consideration. Formally, We can decompose the distribution $p(x)$ by the latent variable:

$$p(x) = \int p(x|z)p(z)dz. \quad (1)$$

$$\ln p(x) \geq D_{KL}(q(z|x)|p(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)} \ln p(x|z) \quad (2)$$

But the integral in Equation 1 is intractable in real-world applications. Therefore, an optional way is to approximate this conditional distribution by a simpler distribution $q(x)$ with an evidence lower bound (ELBO) in Equation 2.

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) are comprised of a discriminator and a generator. The discriminator is trained to classify where samples come from, real datasets or generated. The generator aims to trick the discriminator. Therefore, the two networks form a zero-sum game which consequently pushes the output distribution of the generator




Fig. 1. The overview structure of this survey

to approximate the real distribution. Formally, the objective of GAN can be defined as:

$$\min_G \max_D \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{data}(x)} D(x) + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_g(z)} [1 - D(G(z))] \quad (3)$$

Energy-Based Models (EBM) represents any distribution density with an energy function by

$$p(x) = \frac{e^{-E(x)}}{\int_{x' \sim \mathcal{X}} e^{-E(x')}} \quad (4)$$

It can be seen from this formulation that the denominator is an integral over the space \mathcal{X} . If we want to evaluate the probability, we need to evaluate the energy function all x . If the space is too huge, computing the probability is intractable. This makes NLL objective infeasible. Instead, proxy objectives have been developed to optimize the EBM, a popular one is

$$\nabla \mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{x^+ \sim p_{data}} \nabla E(x^+) - \mathbb{E}_{x^- \sim p_{EBM}} \nabla E(x^-) \quad (5)$$

where a contrastive objective is constructed to minimize the discrepancy between expectations and the negative samples coming from a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method [17].

Autoregressive Models decompose the probability distribution of a variable x into a sequence of variables by the chain rule:

$$p(x) = p(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \prod_i^n p(x_i | x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) \quad (6)$$

Notation	Explanation
x ,	the input variable, in some applications, the target variable is the input variable
$x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n$	a sequence of variable, sometimes referring to dimensions of x
z	latent variable
t	the time step in a sequence, often serve as an index
s_t	the state at time step t in an MDP
a_t	the action at time step t in an MDP
r_t	the reward given by the environment at time step t in an MDP
τ	a trajectory, a.k.a. a sequence of states, actions, and rewards $(s_0, a_0, s_1, r_1, \dots, s_n, r_n)$
R_t	the discounted accumulative return over a trajectory
π	the policy of the RL agent
γ	is the discount factor that decreases the impact of future rewards at an exponential rate
$V_\pi(s_t)$	the value function of an agent given a state at time step t
$Q_\pi(s_t, a_t)$	the value function of an agent that takes a state and an action as input
$p(\cdot), q(\cdot)$	the probability distribution of a given variable
$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_x}[\cdot]$	the expectation of some variable on the distribution of x
$D_{KL}(q p)$	the Kullback-Leibler Divergence between two distribution p and q on the same variable.
$D(\cdot)$	the discriminator in GAN
$G(\cdot)$	the generator in GAN

Table 1. Taxonomy list for this survey.

It can be naturally applied to sequence generation tasks like text generation and molecule design, while is not so obvious how it should be used for image generation. The ordering of generation is fixed and cannot be changed during training and inference. The computational complexity of the sampling process is linear in the number of steps in the generation, and the sequential ordering makes parallel computation difficult which leads to less efficiency.

Normalizing Flows The sampling speed and poor scalability of ‘vanilla’ autoregressive models prevent the wider use of autoregressive models. Normalizing flows use the change of variable rule of distributions to combine multiple invertible transformations by

$$\ln p(x_n) = \ln p(x_1) - \sum_i \ln \left| \det \frac{f_i}{x_{i-1}} \right| \quad (7)$$

This formulation requires each transformation $x_i = f_i(x_{i-1})$ to efficiently compute Jacobian determinant as well as to be expressive and invertible.

2.2 Reinforcement Learning Methods

Reinforcement learning is a computational approach to automating goal-directed learning and decision-making [158]. In this section, we introduce the Markov Decision Process (MDP), a formulation that can be widely applied to reinforcement learning problems. After formally establishing the problem, we introduce the categorization of reinforcement learning methods and the key details of these methods.

2.2.1 Markov Decision Process. Markov Decision Process is a classical formalization of sequential decision making [158] where actions have impacts on subsequent states and rewards.

The complete formulation model of an MDP contains the following five elements:

- \mathcal{S} is a set of states of the environment

- \mathcal{A} is a set of actions of the agents
- $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is the transition probability distribution $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t)$
- $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the reward function that determines the goal of the agent
- $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor for cumulative reward computation

The learning model and decision-maker is the agent, and the remaining elements outside the agent comprise the environment. The experience of an agent is a sequence of interactions of discrete time steps $t = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. When an agent interacts with its environment, it observes a state s_t at time step t emitted by the environment, decides the action a_t based on the observation s_t and responds to the environment. Given the state of the last time step s_t and the action a_t , the environment transitions to the state of the next time step s_{t+1} and sends an immediate reward r_{t+1} back to the agent. Without further specification, s_t contains sufficient information for the agent to decide the best action. The agent learns by collecting new experience data and optimizing a policy π for action selection.

We consider the finite episodic MDP where the state space and action space are finite. An episodic MDP has finite length of sequence. A finite MDP has finite state space and action space. This is a realistic setting for generation tasks. For example, in de-novo molecular design, the state space is the set of all possible atom embeddings and the action space is the same set. Each molecule can be represented as a finite character sequence, therefore it is episodic. The atom space is finite. Another example is image generation. The common approach is generate RGB pixels that have discrete and finite spaces. Given the limited size of an image, the state space and action space of image generation is finite as well. In an episodic MDP, the environment resets itself after transitioning T steps. The T -step sequence is called an episode. The goal of an agent is to achieve the highest rewards from the environment in an episode. At each time step t , the agent should select an action that achieves the cumulative rewards. The agent maps a state to an action by a deterministic policy or a probability distribution $\pi(a_t|s_t)$. Note that the cumulative reward is termed as a return at time step t , $R_t = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1-k} \gamma^k r_{k+t+1}$. γ is the discount factor that decreases the impact of future rewards at an exponential rate. Then the objective of an agent is formalized as

$$\pi^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \mathbb{E}[R|\pi] \quad (8)$$

One critical assumption of an MDP compared to unconstrained RL tasks is the Markov Property, where

$$p(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}|s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, \dots, s_t, a_t) = p(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}|s_t, a_t).$$

It guarantees that state s_t and action a_t determine the next state s_{t+1} and r_{t+1} . This property is useful in the sense that the previous state step provides sufficient information, laying the foundation for the efficiency of the algorithms.

We select research branches that are related to the generation literature. We go through classic models in the RL research, model-free RL and model-based RL.

2.2.2 Model-free Methods. We first describe Model-free RL. There are two main approaches: models based on value functions and models based on policy search. Value functions are variants of the objective in Equation 8. This objective is an expectation over a sequence of rewards while the interaction unfolds step by step. At time step t , the agent’s policy is to optimize the objective in the current time step R_t . Under a policy π , the expectation of R_t is the value function $V^\pi(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[R_t|s_t]$ and $Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[R_t|s_t, \pi(s_t)]$.

The value function is determined by both the agent and the environment. But for Model-free RL, the environment dynamics are unknown, so the value function is determined by the agent. The value functions have particular recursive properties: $V^\pi(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1}}[r_{t+1} + \gamma V^\pi(s_{t+1})]$ and $Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1}}[r_{t+1} + \gamma Q^\pi(s_{t+1}, \pi(s_{t+1}))]$ which are called the

RL Algorithms	Related Works
Value-based	Q-learning[158], DQN [42], Soft Q-learning [69]
Policy-based	Policy Gradient/REINFORCE [176], TRPO [143], PPO [144]
Actor-critic	DPG [149], DDPG [43], Actor-Critic [158], SAC [70], A3C [111]

Table 2. Model-free RL algorithms.

Bellman Equation [10] which makes it possible to train a model through one-step modeling. Bellman Equation leads to the classic Q-learning that has the following learning rules:

$$Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) + \alpha[r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q^\pi(s_{t+1}, \pi(s_{t+1})) - Q^\pi(s_t, a_t)] \quad (9)$$

Classic model-free RL algorithms are listed in the Table 2.

DQN [42] extends Q-learning with the neural approximation of Q values. It devises the experience replay method where an interaction history is collected, stored, and used to retrain the parameters of the Q function. This technique smooths the distribution of transitions, which can stabilize the training process by randomly sampling from memory instead of correlated episodes sampled from recent states of environments.

Policy gradient or REINFORCE[176] is a method that directly maximizes the objective by computing the gradient of the policy:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta \mathbb{E}[R|\pi] &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_\theta} [r(\tau) * \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(\tau)] \\ \theta_{t+1} &= \theta_t + \alpha r(\tau) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where τ is defined as a trajectory variable that includes states and actions.

REINFORCE with baseline [158, 176] is defined to subtract the value term with a baseline term. The baseline term can be any function, even a random term that takes the state as an input:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha(q(s, a) - b(s)) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s) \quad (11)$$

where $q(s, a)$ here is a value term that can be a reward function $r(\tau)$. $b(s)$ is the baseline. This results in an unbiased estimation of the policy with a reduced variance[158]. A natural choice for the baseline is the state value function $V^\pi(s)$ that can capture the value fluctuations of different states.

Another major advance in policy training is Trust Region Policy Optimization (TRPO) [143] and Proximal Policy Optimization [144]. TRPO [143] introduces a trust region for the policy to update itself, in which the policy improvement is monotonically guaranteed theoretically. The trust region is expressed as an expectation of KL divergence between the old policy and the new policy. It substitutes the sum over actions with importance sampling techniques. PPO[144] uses a clipped surrogate objective to form a lower bound of the objective of TRPO, which utilizes only first-order optimization to improve the data efficiency and performance.

DPG and DDPG Silver et al. [149] proposed the Deterministic Policy Gradient (DPG) method. It allows a more efficient estimation of policy compared to policy gradient. DPG does not estimate the value Q^π by the Monte Carlo method, it uses an actor-critic method to estimate the Q value and compute the gradient of actions directly by

$$\nabla J_\theta = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim d^\pi} \left[\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(s) \left. \nabla_a Q^\pi(s, a) \right|_{a=\pi_\theta(s)} \right] \quad (12)$$

Lillicrap et al. [43] extend DPG to Deep DPG (DDPG), which combines training techniques from DQN [42]. DDPG incorporates experience replay and a soft target that updates the model parameters with a control variable to slow down the parameter changes.

Actor Critic methods [158] have a similar form as variance-reduced REINFORCE algorithm does. The key difference is that the value function takes part in the value term of Equation 11, which can increase the bias of estimation and accelerate learning by decreasing the variance, which is formulated by

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha(r_{t+1} + \gamma\hat{V}^\pi(s_{t+1}) - \hat{V}^\pi(s_t))\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(s_t) \quad (13)$$

where the value term uses both a policy model $\pi_\theta(s)$ and an estimated value function $\hat{V}^\pi(s)$ for bootstrapping. They can benefit from both value-based methods and policy-based method. On the one hand, the selection of actions for value functions requires the maximum values of all actions. When there is an infinite number of actions, it can be intractable to compute all the values. Policy methods can remedy this by action selection instead of value evaluation in value-based methods. On the other hand, policy models suffer from the high variance that can be alleviated by bootstrapping to accelerate learning.

Soft Q-learning [69] derives an energy-based policy for continuous states and actions by modeling the policy distribution as a Boltzmann distribution. The reward function is modified to $R_t = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1-k} \gamma^k (r_{k+t+1} + \mathcal{H}(\pi(\cdot|s_{k+t+1})))$. Soft actor-critic (SAC) [70] integrates the Soft Q-learning into actor-critic methods and optimizes towards the direction of rewards plus entropy of policy distributions.


Another line of research in actor-critic models is to accelerate training through parallel computation. The asynchronous advantage is actor-critic (A3C) [111] is the representative example. The policy and value parameters are updated asynchronously. The model does not require a replay buffer because it runs multiple agents in parallel with different exploration policies that can stabilize training. It achieves good performance increases compared to DQN, Sarsa, and n-step Q.

2.2.3 Model-based Methods. In RL, models come from prior knowledge or learning. For example, for an agent playing Go, the rules of Go are fixed, thus it's possible to get a perfect environment model by programming. Influential works like AlphaGo [150] constructs a Monte-Carlo Tree for forward prediction. Sometimes it's not feasible to get a perfect model. In AlphaGo [150], policy learning is integrated with Monte-Carlo Tree search for the Go game. Generally, Monte-Carlo Tree search creates a tree whose nodes represent states in RL. The expansion of the tree is exploring actions and new states. Decision making is based on values on nodes. AlphaGo adds a policy network and a value network to the tree. During inference, nodes are explored and values are obtained along the tree structure. The parameters of the policy network and the value network are updated in training by policy gradient and mean squared error respectively. Actions are selected with three factors in consideration, a Q-value, a probability and a number of traversals. The Q-value is computed by mixing a state value and a reward collected from random fast rollouts. AlphaZero [151] focuses on self-replay to learn a policy from scratch using an adapted version of AlphaGo models.

Dyna Q-learning [157] employs the model with domain knowledge as a predictor and data augmentor for the model-free policy, combining trial-and-error, a domain knowledge model, planning, and reactive execution into one algorithm. The dynamics model generates pseudo-experiences that are incorporated into policy training.

3 BENEFITS OF RL-BASED GENERATIVE MODELS

We use Figure 2a to show how reinforcement learning agent acts as a generator in applications. Reinforcement learning is typically used as a sequential decision maker, therefore, we use the agent to generate a sequence $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$. Here the previously generated results take part in the environment and the task-specific context includes other inputs



and reward functions. For example, when the application is a visual question answering, not only should the generated sequence be considered as the input, but so should the image and the question that contain necessary information.

3.1 Solving the non-differentiable learning problems

One major use of reinforcement learning is that it can propagate gradients through non-differential modules. This extends the capability of neural networks because it allows the model to be trained when discrete modules exist in the computation pipeline. This characteristic is supplementary to supervised learning and unsupervised learning objectives, which both require a differentiable training pipeline. In this section, we introduce two classes of non-differentiable problems.

3.1.1 The generated variable is non-differentiable. Discrete values are prevalent in various generative applications such as computer vision, neural language processing, and molecule generation. In language applications and molecular design, elements of text and molecules are tokenized and embedded into high-dimensional space in order to capture a better representation. The tokens are discrete values or one-hot vectors. In computer vision, a common format of images is the RGB format which comprises discrete values of three color channels. Although it is feasible and easy to normalize the discrete values that are fed into a continuous generative model, transforming discrete values into continuous values leads to adverse effects such as weaker robustness [41].

Reinforcement learning is a suitable tool for such problems. The policy gradient method is a widely adopted approach in the field of machine learning. The formulation lacks any explicit constraint governing the relationship between the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \pi_{\theta}(s)$ and the reward $r(\tau)$. The utilization of a reward signal for policy training has been explored in previous works such as [28, 51, 118], circumventing the differentiable requirement of supervised learning. For example, BGAN [28] aims to tackle the inherent limitation of GANs in handling discrete data due to the absence of differentiable conditions. This is achieved by establishing a connection between policy gradient and the GAN objective. The data distribution is optimized by Monte-Carlo estimation, thereby mitigating variance in the policy gradient. In language modeling, [51] borrows the SeqGAN [187] model into a visual dialog system. The generative agent outputs non-differentiable word sequences. Hence, policy gradient is leveraged as a means of facilitating knowledge transfer.




Fig. 3. RL can introduce new signals by flexible reward functions

Methods	Related Works
Discriminator	[19, 54, 64, 102, 141, 145, 146, 171, 178, 187, 202],
Hand-designed Rules	[96, 112, 134, 168, 197]
Divergence	[38, 49, 53, 79, 82, 92, 120, 132, 205]
Data-driven model	[8, 9, 46, 46, 59, 88, 123, 153, 204]

Table 3. Methods to introduce new training signal.

Moreover, the reinforcement learning agent can control the training instead of being the generator. In this context, the control values can be discrete. For instance, in InfoNCF [118], the policy gradient is adopted to optimize the number of evaluation functions for normalizing flows in the latent space.

3.1.2 The training objective is non-differentiable. Apart from the generative variable, the training objective can be non-differentiable. Take policy gradient as an example, it allows directly injecting a non-differentiable objective as reward without further constraints. Widespread evaluation metrics for machine translation and text summarization are good examples. One line of research in NLP is a typical example [16, 29, 134, 136]. MIXER [134] proposes to address the exposure bias between the training and testing phase in sequence generation. Consequently, it uses test metrics, BLEU and ROUGE, to directly optimize the model. Like MIXER, SCST [136] defines the reward by the performance of the current model under the inference algorithm, including CIDEr, BLEU4, ROUGEL, and METEOR. TAG [16] incorporates type auxiliary guiding for code comment generation by reinforcement learning. The model takes BLUE and ROUGE as rewards. ReGen [29] proposes to use reinforcement learning for non-differentiable evaluations like BLEU, METEOR, and chrF++ to guide text generation.

3.2 Introducing new training signal

As described in the last section, reinforcement learning methods can be employed for non-differentiable problems that exist in generation applications. While the major benefit of reinforcement learning is the flexibility. As mentioned in Section 3.1.1, policy gradient has no requirements between reward and policy. This flexibility exists in most reinforcement learning methods in Section 2.2. Thus it is straightforward to design useful reward functions as additional training objectives, which can incorporate various training signals into the generation process, making RL an influential approach in generation model and application. We demonstrate four major approaches in this section, as shown in Figure 3.

3.2.1 Reward by Discriminator. From the standpoint of training signal, the discriminator component within the Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) architecture fulfills a role akin to that of a reward in the context of reinforcement learning. SeqGAN [187] first proposes to exploit this similarity by introducing a GAN to generate the sequence tokens. The reward signal is derived from the output probability, which serves as a discriminative measure between real and generated samples. Subsequent studies have expanded upon or altered the aforementioned framework through the utilization of a meticulously crafted discriminator [64], the development of novel reward formulations [171], the implementation of actor-critic techniques [54], the incorporation of rank formulations [102], the utilization of multiple discriminators [202], and other related modifications.

Objective-reinforced GAN [64] extends SeqGAN with domain-specific objectives to the reward to adapt the generated samples towards the domain-specific direction. Adversarial rewards are also employed in GRL [171] that takes the difference between two probabilities $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{data}} D(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi_{\theta}} D(x)$. MaskGAN [54] replaces the baseline in REINFORCE by a critic, forming an actor-critic algorithm for text generation instead of a policy gradient in SeqGAN. It uses an in-filling task to train the agent and uses the probability of real words in the discriminator as the reward. SAL [202] changes the reward function with comparison discriminators. The discriminators take a pair of samples (x_1, x_2) as input, which is collected from the current generated sample and previous ones. Three types of discriminators $D(>)$, $D(<)$, and $D(\approx)$ are defined to describe the relationship between the quality samples. Using coefficients for a better balance between exploration and exploitation has been taken into consideration. RankGAN [102] follows the combination of GAN and RL, which substitutes the discriminator with a ranker and the reward is provided by a rank score estimated by the ranker given a sentence and a reference set and a comparison set. The ranker is trained to work as a discriminator by increasing the score of sentences from the dataset and decreasing the score from the generator. Li et al. [97] introduce adversarial learning into the RL-based dialogue generation framework, where the reward is defined as the score produced by a discriminator on the dataset consisting of a human-generated response or auto-generated response. This method uses the RL framework to guide the generated texts by human text distribution. To prevent deteriorating the model quality, a teacher-forcing method that includes human supervision in discrimination training is adopted. ColdGAN [145] explores the exposure bias problem on the GAN-based model in the text generation tasks. It analyzes the impact of randomness on discriminators and finds that bad discriminators might mislead the generators to low-quality areas of the parameter space. Therefore, it integrates the constraints of old policies as an important sampling strategy to balance the impact of the discriminator. It also proposes a policy merge method for a cautious generative process. MaliGAN [19] combines maximum likelihood with gradient descent. It hypothesizes that the discriminator is easy to learn and can get optimal results. Under this assumption, the following equation holds,

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_d}[\log p_{\theta}(x)] = \frac{1}{Z(\theta')} \mathbb{E}_{p'}[r(D) \log p_{\theta}(x)]$$

where $Z(\theta') = \mathbb{E}_{p'}[r(D)] = 1$. When the discriminator is not sufficiently trained, the gradient of KL divergence almost surely is larger than 0. Based on this, an importance sampling is designed with baseline as reward $\frac{r_D(x)}{\sum r_D(x)} - b$. MCTS is introduced to cope with high variance. SelfGAN [146] incorporates MCTS to cooperative decoding to tackle the instabilities of training the discrete sequential decision-making problems such as summarization and question answering. Cooperative decoding means that discriminators are employed in the decoding phase to rerank the generated sequences as value functions. As in MCTS, action is selected based on a Q-value, policy probability, and counts of traversals. Therefore, the discriminator is integrated into the MCTS decoding procedure to improve the performance. RL-GAN-Net

[141] proposes to use an RL agent to generate latent code for the GAN model on point cloud generation. The reward comprises discriminator loss, point cloud reconstruction loss, and Chamfer distance-based loss.

TextGAIL [178] incorporates a contrastive discriminator where the input includes the previous sequence as well as real data or generated data. The discriminator is required to evaluate the relative realness between sequences. It also employs a PPO [144] to decrease the variance of the RL training.

3.2.2 Reward by Hand-designed rules. Novel metrics or heuristic functions are intended to provide incentives for training, and as far as we can tell, the majority of RL algorithm implementations fall within this branch.

One line of research is incorporating testing-time metrics as a reward. This line overlaps the branch of non-differentiable objective when the evaluation metric is non-differentiable, such as ROUGE [4, 23, 116, 134] and BLEU [134, 168]. The utilization of testing-time metrics also enhances models to combat the discrepancy between the training objective and testing objective. MIXER [134] proposes to address this problem in sequence generation by reinforcement learning. It applies REINFORCE to train an agent whose actions are next words given the current time step context. The reward is the test metric for neural language processing models. Wan et al. [168] introduce an actor-critic algorithm to code summarization by leveraging the exploration feature in reinforcement learning.

Apart from testing-time metrics, task-specific reward functions are also popular. Li et al. [96] propose to use a policy gradient with three considerations in dialogue generation, ease of answering, information flow, and semantic coherence. The ease of answering is measured by the negative log-likelihood $-\frac{1}{N_S} \sum_b \log p(b|a)$ where b is a human constructed list of dull responses that contains sentences like “I don’t know what you are talking about”, and a is the generated sentence. The information flow is constructed by penalizing similarity between two consecutive turns of the same agent. The semantic coherence is measured by the mutual information between this turn action and actions from previous turns. PETAL [112] manages dialog systems by reinforcement learning. It studies dialog systems in real-world coffee order systems. The reward contains multiple items, representing personal reward and general reward. The personal reward reveals the interaction between the agent and the user, such as accepting or rejecting the agent’s suggestion. The global reward includes motivation for getting the user’s information, payment, and shortening the dialog. In modeling, it breaks down the value function into two parts, one standing for general value, and one for personal preference. This achieves a better transfer effect when a model is tested on new users. Zhao et al. [197] employs RL to interact with a database in a dialog state tracking and management task, which is beyond the capability of supervised learning on this task. The agent is not only asked to respond to users but also query from a database to better manage the dialog. Databases are used to generate synthetic data, which is like Dyna Q-learning [157].

3.2.3 Reward and Divergence. Divergence can be a useful signal to be integrated into rewards. CLARIFYDELPHI [132] uses RL to generate clarification questions to elicit moral judgment of models. The question is generated by a PPO network whose reward is the divergence between two different moral judgments of the questions. An answer simulation framework is designed to get the divergence between different answers. Fan and Lee [53] propose to optimize DDPM sampling with shortcut fine-tuning that is motivated by the policy gradient. The backward process of DDPM is replaced with a policy gradient-like optimization algorithm that explores new paths that can lead to improved data generation. The training objective is a generalized critic function that serves as a measure of discrepancy between distributions, namely a generalized divergence, which originated from the Integral Probability Metrics. The gradient of a DDPM sampler is formulated to a REINFORCE with baseline mentioned in Section 2.2.2 where the policy is a one-step generation and the critic function turns out to be the reward. Through this formulation, a surrogate objective of IPM is proposed and use Lipschitz regularization to regularize the critic function.

When applying reinforcement learning algorithms to generation models and applications, researchers tend to combine reinforcement learning with supervised learning to guarantee that the model is adjusted by the reward signals but does not drift away from the supervised training objective to prevent the model from generating highly rewarded but unrealistic results. The divergence between a generated distribution and the distribution defined in the dataset is explored [38, 49, 79, 205]. KL-control is a technique for non-Markovian systems to minimize deviation from a prior policy [79, 163]. Sequence Tutor [79] integrates a KL control method in order to maintain a policy generation that remains in proximity to the pre-trained language model. The reward function incorporates previous knowledge derived from a pre-trained recurrent neural network (RNN) model. Ziegler et al. [205] incorporate human preference learning into pre-trained language models. It involves KL-control for coherence and topicality. Jaques et al. [38] inject KL-control into discrete Q learning to impose an entropy regularization. GOLD [49] aims to address two problems in the MLE training paradigm in text generation: diverse but low-quality samples and exposure bias. Unlike the studies mentioned above, it adopts an offline reinforcement learning algorithm. It uses a weighted policy gradient where the weights come from the training set policy because, in offline reinforcement learning, the agent cannot sample trajectories to estimate the weight. The weight reveals the conservative method: keep the actions on the test dataset similar to the training dataset. For reward, it uses training trajectories to approximate the probability distribution of human preference. It combines three kinds of rewards that use a one-zero reward, the product of MLE probability, and the sum of MLE probability.

KL divergence can not only be a constraint for the generator but also a way to re-express the formulation of policy-gradient algorithm [82, 92, 120], where divergence for reward distribution and generated distribution is explored. RML [120] creates a link between the expected reward objective and log-likelihood by a KL divergence term that expresses the discrepancy between the reward objective (exponentiated payoff distribution) and the generated distribution. Through this, it generalizes the formulation between policy gradient and MLE objective by KL divergences. Then it exploits the asymmetry of the KL divergence and switches the reward distribution and generated distribution to construct a new way to optimize the distribution considering the rewards. This formulation can benefit from sampling a stable reward objective distribution and can decrease the variance of the training process. ARAML [82] applies RML on the adversarial text generation where an extra discriminator provides rewards and uses the sampling method to construct a stable distribution for faster training. Lamprier and Scialom et al. [92] combine RML to stabilize training of cooperative decoding [146]. From the RML perspective, the KL divergence between data distribution p and approximated distribution q should be computed. This work proposes to formulate $q_t \propto p_{t-1} D_t$ and give theoretical proof for convergence to optimum. Under this formulation, the gradient of KL divergence is defined as a policy gradient with discriminator prediction as a reward.

3.2.4 Reward by data-driven model. With the flexibility of the reward function, it is also a good way to incorporate models learned from the reward function. It is feasible to incorporate various guidance into reinforcement learning by training a reward model. This branch expresses a similar idea as Inverse Reinforcement Learning (IRL), which can be integrated in generative models in two ways.

One is directly embedding previously defined rewards such as BLEU into a model. Shi et al. [46] conduct experiments in text generation and empirically prove its effectiveness. They adopt the maximum entropy IRL to model an approximated reward function. The training process of the reward model increases the rewards of real texts and decreases the rewards of texts that are sampled from the approximated distribution by a generator with importance sampling. Furthermore,

an entropy term is added to the reward function for the agent to prevent premature mode collapse and increase the diversity of generated texts.

The other way is to learn a model for human preference [58, 117]. This path finally leads to the emergence of Reinforcement Learning Human Feedback (RLHF) [9, 46, 59, 88, 123, 153], which is integrated into the large language model research and harvest powerful models like ChatGPT. RELIS [58] proposes to learn a reward function from learning to rank objectives on a document summarization task. Human preferences of two summaries in the form of ranking are collected and train the reward model by three types of loss: cross entropy, marginal ranking, and an improved marginal ranking. It is theoretically proved that the agent converges to a near-optimal solution. Nguyen et al. [117] study the simulated human feedback in the form of ratings in neural machine translation. They are motivated by the fact that human feedback is not perfect. For example, expert ratings cannot perfectly match the goal. There are also granularity, variance, and skewness problems in the collected ratings. Therefore, they propose to simulate human feedback and address the problems mentioned above. They map the feedback to binned values, use a linear approximation to deal with large variances in middle ratings and employ a skew perturbation for harsh and motivational scores. The Open AI Reflection team [153] uses human preference to guide language models for summarization tasks. The training consists of three steps. First, trajectories from a trained policy with various baselines are collected and these trajectories are evaluated by humans to rank the best one. Then, they construct a model to learn the rewards that indicate whether the output is better. Last, they optimize a policy given the reward model. It is similar to the step in [46] while it combines datasets from human preferences, which dramatically outperforms existing methods at that time. The reward function is trained by the following function,

$$\text{loss}(r_\theta) = E_{(x, y_0, y_1, p)} [\log(\sigma(r_\theta(x, y_p) - r_\theta(x, y_{1-p})))]$$

where x is the text before summarization, y is summarized text, r_θ is the reward function, y_p is the human preferred text. The loss aims to maximize the distance between two rewards. Additionally, authors use KL-control [79] to prevent the mode collapse as well as constrain the policy to be conservative, not generating weird texts far from the original supervised pre-trained distribution. InstructGPT [123] follows the same procedure to fine-tune GPT-3 from human feedback. Results show that it improves the GPT-3 on truthfulness and generalization, and decreases the toxicity and performance regressions. Bai et al. [9] follow the [153] work to test RLHF on a helpful and harmless dataset. They use a PPO to train the model and use the same pipeline to learn a preference model and finetune the language model with reinforcement learning. It tests the model in an iterative online mode of training and shows that it improves the performance of the model. It also identifies a roughly linear trend between the preference reward and the square root of the KL divergence between the policy and its initialization. APRIL [59] combines preference learning with neural TD, an algorithm that replaces the linear approximation in Linear TD [156] with a neural network. Preference learning employs the cross-entropy between true preference and the model used to train a reward model. For the limits of human feedback collection, a pair-generation method is proposed to make the process efficient. The pair is generated on the metric of utility gap, diversity, density, and uncertainty. Given a human text y' , the utility gap is used to maximize the gap to get high-quality negative samples. Other three metrics aim to make the selected sample diverse, located in a dense part of the distribution, and uncertain. The neural TD is used instead of DQN because the action space is large and the maintenance of Q-value is expensive. Kreutzer et al. [88] discuss the necessity, challenges, and potential solutions of offline reinforcement learning from human feedback. The necessity of offline RL is that online adjustment of parameters is too risky and potentially out of control. The challenges include questionable counterfactual estimation




Fig. 4. RL can work as a sampler for models that are hard to sample such as Energy-based Models

for the lack of explicit exploration and degeneration problems where low-reward actions are still encouraged during training. Also, reliability and learnability are also discussed.

Moreover, the fast development of large language models inspires researchers to use them as a reward function by proper prompting. For example, Constitutional AI [8] proposes to train a harmless but non-evasive AI assistant that copes with harmful queries via expression of objection to these queries. Self-critiques and automatic revisions from an LLM are exploited to modify the dataset and retrain the LLM on it. Then, an agent is trained by preferences given by humans and models. Human provides helpfulness evaluations while the model provides harmfulness evaluation. The label is generated by an assistant model under the context that prompts contain human set principles as well as a set of few-shot examples.

Apart from peakiness, Zhu et al. [204] provide theoretical support for RLHF. They provide a sample complexity for the union problem of RLHF and max-entropy Inverse Reinforcement Learning. They frame the ranking-based reward model as a Plackett-Luce (PL) model or a Bradley-Terry-Luce (BTL) model, providing suboptimality bound for the reward learning process.

3.3 Sampling

Formulating the generator as a reinforcement agent encompasses new power that can integrate distribution matching into the training signal [39, 61, 84, 86, 126], in addition to introducing constraints other than MLE. For instance, Distributional Policy Gradient [126] is a common model that transforms an Energy-Based Model (EBM) training process into a policy gradient algorithm. The selection from the distribution that an EBM models represents the difficulty of learning an EBM. Using reinforcement learning (RL) as a sampling technique, [126] suggests addressing the distribution learning problem in Global Autoregressive Models (GAM), a subset of Energy-Based models. There are two phases to the training procedure. The MLE criteria are used to train the autoregressive factor on the dataset in the first step. One calculates the gradient as

$$\nabla_{\lambda} \log p_{\lambda}(D) = |D| \cdot [\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_D(x)} \phi(x) - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\lambda}(x)} \phi(x)] \quad (14)$$

where the λ is the scalar parameter computed by a network to control the feature impact in the probability. The sampling method is Monte-Carlo sampling.

Methods	Related Works
Sampling	[39, 61, 84, 86, 126],
NAS	[18, 22, 31, 36, 50, 67, 124, 127, 128, 162, 201]

Table 4. Methods in Sampling and NAS.

Next, in the second stage, a policy π is used to approximate a desired distribution p via the process of distillation, which facilitates the acquisition of the model parameters. The policy employs a distribution match as a reward and is trained using policy gradient via the process of deductive reasoning based on cross-entropy

$$\nabla_{\theta} \text{CE}(p, \pi_{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p(\cdot)} \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(x) = -\frac{1}{Z} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi_{\theta}(\cdot)} \frac{P(x)}{\pi_{\theta}(x)} \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(x) \quad (15)$$

where the importance sampling is used to form a gradient descent algorithm with the distribution match computation as the reward.

In their seminal work, Khalifa et al. [84] introduce a novel methodology that harnesses the power of distributional control in the context of conditional text generation using pre-trained language models (LLMs). In contrast to the approach proposed by Parshakova et al. [126], this approach leverages importance sampling while replacing the sampling distribution with an optimal distribution. The variable q is subject to updates exclusively when the condition $D_{KL}(p||\pi_{\theta}) < D_{KL}(p||q)$ holds true.

Korbak et al. [39] propose to discover and exploit similarities between DPG and policy gradient. Although the gradient of DPG cannot be reduced to a policy gradient, the variance reduction technique of policy gradients can be transferred to DPG. Korbak et al. [86] applies KL-adaptive distributional policy gradient (KL-DPG) [84] on code generation based on pretraining an auto-regressive model. Go et al. [61] proposes an f -DPG algorithm that allows using of any f -divergence as an objective to approximate any target distributions. This approach unifies the formulation of RLHF and DPG. The reward of optimization is defined as the negative gradient of f -divergence between two distributions $f'(\frac{\pi_{\theta}(x)}{p(x)})$.

3.4 Neural Architecture Search

Previous subsections introduce different purposes of reinforcement learning, bridging the gap of non-differentiable learning systems, incorporating new training signals, and serving as a sampler. Interestingly, the neural network architecture itself can be viewed as a sequence of tokens, therefore being the subjective reinforced generator. Uniquely, the agent itself is a generator but can be applied to almost all feasible tasks which employ neural networks as learners. In this sense, we include Neural Architecture Search (NAS) in this survey even though most applications of NAS are classification tasks.

NAS is used for optimizing neural network architecture [18, 22, 31, 36, 50, 67, 124, 127, 128, 162, 201]. Therefore, the reward for NAS is usually the task metric. For example, when an agent is optimizing the architecture of a classifier, the accuracy of the classifier is usually used as reward [36, 50, 67, 128]. Zoph and Le [50] proposes to use reinforcement learning to guide neural architecture design. They employ an RNN network to generate the architecture description with REINFORCE [176] ENAS [127] improves the efficiency by parameter sharing. Instead of building a network from scratch, it constructs the network on pre-defined convolutional cells. This can reduce the search space. Similarly, MONAS [36] It removes states in the training and just considers actions and rewards. It takes power consumption into reward functions. Various optimization goals such as mixing, threshold, and surrogate metric are considered in the reward computation. IRLAS [67] incorporates inverse reinforcement learning into the NAS. It defines a feature count that maps an architecture into a trajectory of the agent, $\mu = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma^t \phi(s_t)$, where s_t is the architecture information, γ

Challenges	Related Works
Peaked Distribution	[30, 33, 73, 85, 133]
Exploitation-Exploration	[80, 150]
Sparse Rewards	[5, 65, 87, 184]
Long-term Credit Assignment	[66, 167]
Generalization	[199]

Table 5. Methods in Sampling and NAS.

is the discount factor, $\phi()$ is the embedding function. They use the μ to create a linear model for the mirror stimuli function that aims to use the topology of the expert model such as ResNet [71] as the guidance.

State space and action space are carefully designed in NAS in order to make the training tractable. Layer parameters that are composited as the element of state and action space is a common choice [31, 137, 201]. MetaQNN [31] constrains the space of states and actions to make the generation tractable. Rijdsdijk et al. [137] applies MetaQNN on the NAS for side-channel-analysis. The reward function is defined considering the guessing entropy with a different number of attack traces. BlockQNN [201] employs neural model generation for image classification tasks. It defines a Network Structure Code (NSC) which quantifies the architecture information such as layer index, operation type, kernel size, and other related nodes in the computational graph. The state of E2GAN [162] is the average value of each sub-module. The action will be how to extend the architecture,

The sampling efficiency is also explored. Meta-learning [22, 124] and one-shot learning [18] are two examples. CATCH [22] employs a meta-reinforcement learning framework to accelerate architecture design on meta-testing tasks. RL-DARTS [124] uses meta-learning as well. The meta-optimizer defines the gradient and a control hyperparameter as the state, the shift of the control hyperparameter as the action, and the performance on a valid dataset as the reward to meta-control the direction of the architecture searcher. DQNAS [18] combines RL-based NAS with one-shot training to get better performance. The key is using one-shot training to transfer weights from some layers that are common to quickly set up the training.

4 CHALLENGES

Despite benefits and performance increase brought by RL, challenges also exist. In this section, we introduce a range of challenges and the responses from the community, including peaked distribution, exploitation-exploration trade off, sparse rewards etc.

4.1 Peaked Distribution

Given the fact that reinforcement learning improves the performance of generation, it is natural to inquire about the reason behind the performance increase, exploring a potential factor that replaces RL. Choshen et al. [33] propose to investigate this question in neural machine translation. They propose that the peakiness of the distribution is the true factor for RL to improve performance instead of reward learning. The peakiness illustrates that RL fine-tuning tends to increase the probability of the best answer to make the distribution lower entropy and more discrete. Experiments reveal that the training indeed increases the probability of best answers. The following work [85] revisits this problem and conducts experiments on peakiness and its impact. Experiment results show that BLEU increase is not tied to the peakiness in RL training. It also explores a setting where negative rewards are allowed. In this setting, the performance significantly improves. The RL method also reduces the problem caused by the beam search.

MAD [30] introduces a multi-temperature sampling to address the peaked distribution of policy gradient. The reward is conditioned on source sentences to model the complexity in sources in the translation problem. The sampled trajectories are weighted by a median absolute deviation. Honda et al. [73] conduct experiments in image captioning to validate the worse long-tailed sampling distribution compared to ground truths and supervised learning. Peaked distribution also connects to popularity bias. They adopt two methods to counter the popularity bias in RL. One is funetuning decoder parameters on labeled data. The second method is biasing the selection of action towards low-frequency actions.

4.2 Exploitation and Exploration

In reinforcement learning, an agent must balance a trade-off between exploitation and exploration. To maximize the expected reward, the agent must exploit the best action of what it has experienced before. But to collect the potential best action for learning, it must explore broadly all possible situations to gather enough data in the learning process. This dilemma is not suited for offline settings such as classic supervised learning and unsupervised learning. One solution for exploration is Upper-Confidence-Bound (UCB) action selection. It injects the consideration of exploration by the times of selection for action. Specifically, in a multi-bandit problem, a simplified version of a decision-making problem, the UCB is formulated [158] as

$$a_t = \arg \max_a \left[Q_t(a) + c \sqrt{\frac{\ln t}{N_t(a)}} \right] \quad (16)$$

where t is the time step, $N_t(\cdot)$ is the number of times of an action a being selected. This formulation balances the exploration because when $N_t(a) = 0$ for an action a , its corresponding is set to infinity to explore. With the increases of experiences of a , its value converges to the true values of selection $Q_t(a)$.

For sequential generalization problems, action space is prohibitively large which makes the exploration difficult. Therefore, pretraining-finetuning architecture is widely exploited to alleviate this problem. Another way to tackle this problem is searching in the action space and composing meta-action to decrease the difficulty of exploration. Similar to AlphaGo [150], RationaleRL [80] proposes to employ an MCTS in searching a relatively small and important action space to improve the performance of the RL-based generator. The key idea is to extract essential parts of the data for drug discovery. It treats the molecule as a graph and does subtraction in the graph as actions of the agent. It uses an automatic property evaluation function to calculate the reward. Then the agent employs the MCTS to explore the high reward but subtracted sub-graphs that are the essential parts of the drugs. Then it uses a generation model to combine these essential parts to generate new drugs. The generation process uses MLE for pre-training and the policy gradient for fine-tuning.

4.3 Sparse Rewards

It is easy to see that rewards are training signals that shape the action pattern of agents. In an ideal environment, rewards are emitted at each action to provide sufficient guidance for models. If one reward is computed based on the generated sequence [5, 65], the environment must produce a reward at the end of each episode. Some reward evaluation such as BLEU [125] has this problem. Rewards become sparse and pose challenge for the learning model to tell which action has a higher impact on the last rewards. Guo et al. [65] proposes to address this problem by taking a sequence as a whole. The method is called multi-step path consistency learning that changes value regression in classic Q-learning. The consistency is computed over multiple steps instead of single step to tackle the sparse reward problem. SURF [5]

defines a new reward function. The new reward function emits a sequence of normalized rewards that are computed on incomplete sentences and the target sequence. This formulation provides a generalized reward function by a 'soft' upper bound. Korshunova et al. [87] explore sparse reward problems in three aspects. First, it fine-tunes the model with generated molecules for a generation. The fine-tuning increases the potential to generate new molecules. Second, it uses experience replay to avoid over-exploitation. The replay buffer contains generated molecules with high rewards. Last, it uses real-time reward shaping to change the reward dynamically. The reward is adapted with the distribution shift of the reward in a batch.

Another way to tackle the sparse reward issue is introducing new signals. The new signal in the Imitation learning is the label from human experts for a policy. DAgger [138] is an imitation learning method that takes distribution change into account. It works by collecting new data from experts and integrate them into the old dataset, which is used for training a new policy. The action selection policy is a mixture $\pi_i = \pi^* + \hat{\pi}_i$ where $\hat{\pi}_i$ is the policy trained at iteration i and π^* is the actions of a human expert. The π^* is the way how human knowledge is embedded into the policy training. Finally, the best policy is selected for validation. NEIL [184] incorporates a DAgger-like method into semantic parsers that interact with users by texts. To alleviate the burden of huge amount of labels, it set up a probability threshold to decrease the number of interactions required.

4.4 Long-term Credit Assignment

The credit assignment problem arises because the agent need to determines which previous actions have impact on current rewards. With the increase of time steps, it becomes more difficult for the increase of the number of previous actions. Hierarchical RL is introduced to cope with this problem[167]. It sets up two modules for learning, a manager and a worker. The manager takes the latent representation and produces a goal vector in a low-dimensional space. The worker fuses the latent vector and the goal to make the decision. The manager is trained by

$$\nabla_{\theta} g_t = (R_t - V_t^M) \nabla_{\theta} d(s_{t+c} - s_t, g_t(\theta)) \quad (17)$$

where g_t is the goal, M stands for manager, s_t is state. The worker is trained by

$$\nabla_{\theta} \pi = (R_t + R_t^I - V_t^W) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(s_t) \quad (18)$$

where $R_t^I = \frac{1}{c} \sum_i^c d(s_t - s_{t-i}, g_{t-i})$ is the intrinsic reward and V_t^W is the value function for worker. Experiments show that it can improve the reward dramatically in Montezuma's Revenge, a difficult task in Atari games and maze environments. LeakGAN [66] uses an agent with hierarchical structure for image captioning to deal with the long text generation problem. The hierarchical architecture is similar to [167]. The difference is that policy gradient algorithm is introduced into a GAN network, where reward comes from the discriminator in GAN .

4.5 Generalization

Classic reinforcement learning algorithms are often designed for specific tasks without considering task adaptation [74]. Classic RL models often perform worse on unseen tasks[35]. Meta reinforcement learning like MAML [55] is designed to adapt agents for meta-learning tasks. The meta-learning setting involves meta-training and meta-testing environments, mimicking the few-shot supervised learning setting where at test time, there are a few examples for the algorithm to adapt to the test tasks. In order to adapt to new tasks, MAML learns an adaptive initialization of neural network parameters. The policy learns initialization parameters θ by computing losses on adapted parameters θ' . When the meta-policy needs to make a decision, it first calculates $\theta' = \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}}(f_{\theta})$, then the adapted parameter θ' is used

Sub-areas	Related Works
Text Summarization	[23, 44, 63, 116, 170, 180]
Machine Translation	[5, 89, 91, 107, 128, 177, 195, 198]
Dialog System	[95, 98, 123, 147, 152, 155, 175, 182, 186]
Human Value Alignment and Constraints	[2, 105, 193]
Text, Queries, and Knowledge Graph	[29, 114, 171, 173]
Sequence Generation	[4, 99, 166, 179, 181]

Table 6. Methods in Sampling and NAS.

for decision making. During training, the initialization is updated by $\theta = \theta - \beta \nabla_{\theta} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i \sim p(\mathcal{T})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{T}}(f_{\theta'})$. The key idea here is computing the gradients of initialization parameters on the adapted parameters. This design is model-agnostic and can be applied in various machine learning tasks such as supervised learning and reinforcement learning. It can also be introduced in multi-scenario text generation for adaptation of different scenarios [199], where Zhao et al. combine MAML with discriminator-guided text generation.

5 APPLICATION

Reinforcement learning has been applied to abundant areas. In this section, we organize and classify the literature according to applications, aiming to provide readers a brief introduction of how RL is applied on different areas. The following sections include natural language processing, code generation, computer vision, speech generation, music generation, AI for science and other small areas.

5.1 Natural Language Processing

Natural Language Processing (NLP) is one of the largest application areas of generation models and reinforcement learning. Reinforcement learning is widely employed in various NLP tasks, like text summarization, machine translation, dialog, etc. We primarily introduce the application directions but may not cover all directions.

5.1.1 Text Summarization. Text summarization is the process of automatically generating or extracting summaries from a given input document without losing important information. RL has been widely applied in this task by generating the summary [44, 170] or extracting the summary [23, 63, 116, 180]. Paulus et al. [44] proposes to incorporate self-critical policy gradient [136] into text summarization. It uses ROUGE as a reward and trains the NLL objective and RL objective by a weighted sum operation. Wang et al. [170] change the model to a convolutional sequence-to-sequence model for automatically abstractive topic summarization. ROUGE is also utilized in extractive summarization like Wu and Hu [116, 180].

RL can be used as a means of hard attention mechanism. Chen et al. [23] propose to combine RL as hard attention on the sentence level in the text summarization task. In this work, an agent is a selector who chooses sentences that are valuable to do summarization. The state is the set of documents and the last selected sentence. The action is to choose the next document sentence for extraction. VTMRL [63] uses reinforcement learning as a hard attention mechanism to filter the less topic-coherent and background words in the task of topic modeling. The reward is defined as a sum of a coherence score and a topic overlapping value.

5.1.2 Machine Translation. Reinforcement learning is applied to neural machine translation to bridge the train and test metric gap [128, 177], to direct translation with sentiment preserved [89], to simplify sentences [195], to balance human efforts in the interactive system [91, 198], to change the sentiment [107], or to diversify the translation output

[5]. Wu et al. [177] uses BLEU as a reward in a systematic comparison of decision factors for RL-based NMT. Pham et al. [128] plus BLEU with a HIT reward that counts the coverage of translated results and the annotations into the guidance of training. Kumari et al. [89] applies RL in sentiment preserved review translation. The model adopts actor-critic algorithms. The reward is constructed on a content preservation SBLEU and a sentiment reward that is a dot product of the sentiment vector and output probability distribution. DRESS [195] proposes to employ the policy gradient on the sentence simplification tasks by introducing three desiderata simplicity, relevance, and fluency as rewards. BIP-NMT [91] adopts an actor-critic algorithm for translation model training, which uses a threshold of action entropy for human feedback acquisition and simulate human feedback for evaluation. Zhao et al. [198] uses actor-critic. The reward is BLEU and the negative of the times of request for human feedback. It regularizes the policy with MLE guidance of both the right tokens and human feedback. Luo et al. [107] use a similar reward formulation with a harmonic mean of two rewards to encourage the model to improve both sentiment reward and content preservation (coherence) reward. SURF [5] defines a new reward function and explores the asynchronous training framework. The reward is defined as $w_F \times e^{F(\hat{y}_{1:t})} + w_S \times e^{SLSS(\hat{y}_{1:t}, X)}$ Sentence Fluency and Sentence-level Semantic Similarity (SLSS). Sentence Fluency is an average log-likelihood of probabilities given by a pre-trained model. SLSS is a cosine similarity between embeddings of input and generated sentences.

5.1.3 Dialog System. Dialog systems or conversational agents are a complicated but fast-developing area in recent years. The influential InstructGPT [123] is trying to tackle the difficult open-domain dialog system [147, 155, 182]. Apart from it, a task-oriented dialog system is a parallel but important topic [95, 98, 175, 186]. Reinforcement learning has been explored in both. Also, a hybrid dialog system emerges recently [152].

MILABOT [147] tackled the Amazon Alexa Prize competition to learn an open-domain chatbot. RL is used for model selection. The reward function is a linear regressor trained from collected ratings. PRG-DM [182] fine-tunes two policies to generate posts and responses for personalized response generation by policy gradient. Sun et al. [155] propose an imitation learning approach for complex dialogue agents. The imitation objective is defined by Donsker Varadhan's representation of KL divergence to ease the hard problem of high dimensional optimization.

HCN [175] explores training a dialog control agent with reinforcement learning. To avoid degenerated actions, it iteratively trains with policy gradient and supervised loss. Lewis [95] introduce RL on a negotiation task where two agents both have a set of objects and try to exchange objects to make each type of object should belong to one agent. The reward computes whether an agreement is met. Yarats [185] apply a hierarchical generation framework and substitute the agent's state from text tokens to latent variables to improve the effectiveness of long-term planning in this game. Li et al. [98] trains a DQN agent to do task completion in neural dialogue systems. An example is to ask an agent to book a ticket. Jaques et al. [38] integrates implicit human preferences into a hierarchical open-domain dialogue generation by reinforcement learning. It employs an off-policy batch RL approach with dropout-based uncertainty estimates. Co-Gen [186] proposes to match the latent space of actions in the external database and natural language response in conversational search. It uses RL to finetune the pre-trained language model with BLEU as a reward. This finetune helps the model to achieve better results. TrufLL [109] uses the RL for question answering. Different from the normal fine-tuning method, it proposes to use a pre-trained language model as a truncation module that takes the action space of the agent as input to make the decision-making in a large action space feasible.

READER [152] is designed for mental health counselling agents by dialogue generation in a hybrid way. The agent needs to understand various contents from users but gives out effective and appropriate responses.

5.1.4 Human Value Alignment and Constraints. The output of generators is not well matched with human values. Models sometimes have hallucinations, generating fake information that they do not understand at all. Sometimes models are impacted by datasets and spit out sentences that do not match human values in some cultures. Reinforcement learning can be used to adjust the model to work better on value matching [105], impose constraints [193], or even help people to combat problems like fake news [2]. SENSEI [105] proposes to use actor-critic to align text generation with human judgments. The reward is predicted by a binary classifier trained a human-labeled text data. RCR [193] uses a discriminator to model the violations and computes a penalty accordingly. This penalty is added to the reward to regulate the actions of the text generator. FakeGAN [2] trains a deceptive reviews classifier with a two-discriminator GAN model. Although it addresses a classification problem, the method contains generating deceptive reviews, which is a generation subtask.

5.1.5 Text, Queries and Knowledge Graph. Natural language is a good interface for humans but not for search engines and databases. Therefore, translating natural language into structured queries and knowledge graphs poses a long-term problem in NLP. Reinforcement learning is used in these applications to optimize the query quality [114], create knowledge graphs [29], complete them [171], and even causal graphs[173]. Mohankumar et al. [114] incorporate human preference rewarded RL in query rewriting for advertising. The reward is provided by a fine-tuned model based on another model pre-trained in 100 languages. ReGen [29] proposes to use reinforcement learning to guide the text and knowledge generation based on large pre-trained models. GRL [171] integrates GAN and RL in the knowledge graph completion. The model is constructed on graph neural networks and LSTM. The state space includes a combination of both entity space and relation space in the graph. The action is to select the neighboring relational path to extend the path. CORL [173] proposes to generate a causal graph by reinforcement learning. The state is defined as an embedding of a causal graph node, the action is also in the node space but takes order constraints into account by imposing a mask to force the parent nodes chosen from a certain set. The reward is defined as Bayesian Information Criterion and the episodic reward and dense reward settings are explored.

5.1.6 Sequence Generation. Sequence generation is a wide area but we focus on typically generating sequences for other purposes like review generation[99, 181], critique generation [4], mathematical problems generation [179], keyword-to-sentence generation [166]. Li et al. [99] combines adversarial training and reinforcement learning for review generation of commercial purposes. It uses RL in the same way as SeqGAN[187] do. DP-GAN [181] applies similar framework like in [96, 187]. It separates the reward into two levels, word level, and sentence level. The sentence level reward is an average of all rewards of the word in it. The total reward is a product of sentence-level reward and the discounted sum of word-level reward. RL4F [4] proposes to enhance the large language model by critique generation. An critique LLM is used to generate critique for the task LLM. MWPGen [179] generates mathematical problems from a math expression and some topic words. It does the problem generation and then uses the generated problems to get an answer by a neural network-based solver. It defines the reward to check the correctness between the expression generated by the solver and the original expression. Upadhyay et al. [166] redirect a pre-trained language model towards multiple rewards to improve performance. It studies unsupervised controlled text generation and takes text style into consideration.

5.2 Code Generation

Given the application of RL on NLP, it is also natural to consider if the coding process can be automatically executed by machines. Within them, RL-based models perform well and improve their performance in multiple directions.

Sub-areas	Related Works
Code Search	[169, 183]
Comment and Annotation Generation	[16, 172]
Code Generation	[93, 148, 174, 192]

Table 7. Methods in Code Generation.

5.2.1 Code Search. Code search takes natural language text as input, and searches for a code snippet that can solve the problems presented by the text. RL is implemented to use annotation [183] or enhanced query [169] for code search. CoaCor [183] applies RL in code annotation, a form of code generation for code retrieval. They use an actor-critic algorithm where states are code snippets, actions are generated code, and rewards are defined according to code retrieval requirements. QueCos [169] uses the policy gradient method in the code search application. The agent learns to generate queries to get high-quality matched code snippets. The agent is guided by a ranking reward and a BLEU reward.

5.2.2 Comment and Annotation Generation. Reinforcement learning can be used for code summarization as well [16, 172], which takes code as input and outputs natural language to summarize the usage of the code. Wang et al. [172] proposes to use RL to guide code summarization with a hierarchical attention network. It uses RL to combat the exposure bias [168] in the code summarization dataset. The reward is BLEU metric, and the algorithm is actor-critic architecture. TAG [16] incorporates type auxiliary guiding for code comment generation by reinforcement learning. It contains two stages in the decoding process, an operation selection stage, and a word selection stage. RL is used to guide the operation selection stage because there is no labelled signal to learn it directly. Similarly, it uses non-differentiable evaluation metrics to provide rewards and trains the two stages jointly under the RL framework.

5.2.3 Code Generation. Code generation is different from code search in the sense that it directly generates the code instead of searching based on matching. COMPCODER [174]’s training consists of three stages. In the first stage, the code generation model is fine-tuned from a language model. Then, reinforcement learning is used to introduce the compiler guidance. The last stage uses a discriminator to learn the compiler feedback on the generated candidates. The discriminator is trained on whether the code can be successfully compiled. LearnedSQLGen [192] applies actor-critic algorithm on SQL generation problem. The state contains elements of SQL sequence, including reserved words like *Select*, *From*, *Where*, metadata of tables and attributes, cell values, operations like =, >, <, and EOF showing the termination of the sequence. The action space is the same as the state space. CodeRL [93] incorporates unit tests into code generation. The code generator is trained with rewards that are defined based on unit test signals that are *CompileError*, *RuntimeError*, *FailedTest*, *PassedTest*. A critic network is used to predict the probability of four types of test signals. PPOCoder [148] generates code with multiple constraints in reward. The reward function is defined as a sum of test error, syntactic matching score, semantic matching score, and a KL constraint to prevent RL from diverging too far.

5.3 Computer Vision

Computer vision is another cornerstone of modern machine-learning research. Generation tasks in computer vision are also capable of using reinforcement learning algorithms in many sub-areas, including text generation tasks such as image captioning, visual question answering, visual dialog, and visual entity generation like image generation and 3D objects and scenes generation.

Sub-areas	Related Works
Image Captioning	[110, 135, 136, 191]
Visual Question Answering	[189, 200]
Visual Dialog System	[51, 190]
Text-to-Image Generation	[8, 12, 52]
3D Generation	[3, 122, 194, 196]

Table 8. Methods in Computer Vision.

5.3.1 Image Captioning. Image captioning is a task where the model aims to describe related events and entities in an image. New algorithms are explored, including reward normalization [136], architecture advancement [135], new reward function [110, 191]. SCST [136] incorporates REINFORCE with a baseline as the training algorithm to normalize the rewards an agent experiences. It defines the reward by the performance of a current model under the inference algorithm. The baseline uses the test dataset to compute the reward. Ren et al. [135] uses an RL algorithm whose state comprises an image and up-to-now generated words. An action is the next word. The reward is defined as a cosine similarity between the generated captions and the image. Zhang et al. [191] uses an actor-critic algorithm and a separation of RNN between the actor-network and the critic network to do image captioning. TOPIC [110] uses policy gradient on multi-model product title compression where text and images are input for title generation.

5.3.2 Visual Question Answering. In VQA, topics like reward design [189] and new architecture[200] are interesting topics. VQG [189] applies RL on the vision-and-language problems like the environment GuessWhat [27]. This game comprises three components, a questioner, a guesser and an oracle. The guesser guesses the targeted object in an image given the context collected by the questioner. The oracle contains information about the targeted object. VQG models the questioner as the agent and proposes to formulate the reward through three dimensions: goal achieved reward, progressive reward, and informativeness reward. Zhao et al. [200] combines multi-model representation learning with a reinforced GAN-based model for visual question answering. The representation model contains a pre-trained convolutional network, a frame-level dynamics network, and a segment-level attention network.

5.3.3 Visual Dialog System. RL enhances the visual dialog system by incorporating discriminators [51, 190]. Fan et al. [51] borrows SeqGAN [187] model into a visual dialog system. They devise a model that contains two modules, an encoder to embed images, captions, and questions into the embedding vector, which is fed into an RL-based decoder as the state. The decoder is an RL-based GAN. The generator is the agent that outputs answers as actions. The discriminator learns to classify the generated answers from real ones in the embedding space. SCH-GAN [190] learn a cross-modal hashing GAN with reinforcement learning. Text and image modalities are considered. The generator tries to retrieve an image from texts or vice versa. The discriminator aims to distinguish true examples of the query.

5.3.4 Text-to-Image Generation. Recent advancement in image generation is diffusion models, thereby it might be beneficial explore how to combine reinforcement learning with diffusion models by improvement on images characteristics that are hard to be described by prompts[12] and online reinforcement learning methods [52]. The action for the agent in [12] is the image generated in steps given the last step output and a context variable. The agent is first pre-trained on DDPM loss reweighted by exponentiated rewards. The policy gradient algorithms with importance sampling are incorporated to train the agent. The reward takes file size and human aesthetic preference acquired from another predictor into consideration. An extra alignment using a vision language model is incorporated for RLAIIF [8]. [52] proposes to compare the RL-directed fine-tuning and supervised fine-tuning in the context of KL divergence as a

regularizer. The RL fine-tuning uses a policy gradient with a KL term to constrain models on a pre-trained model. The reward in RL fine-tuning is typically from human preference matching.

5.3.5 3D Generation. Apart from 2D images, 3D generation is able to introduce reinforcement learning to get a new generation method[3], better scene generation[122], surface completion[194], and point cloud completion[196]. Akizuki et al. [3] propose to use RL to generate objects in 2D or 3D space. It models the generation as a link game, where an agent is required to link from pixel to pixel or from voxel to voxel. The action space is the direction to extend the pixel. The reward is based on whether the next pixel or voxel is in the object. It also successfully learns to generate Lego structures given fabrication constraints. RLSS [122] generates 3D indoor scenes with reinforcement learning. The state contains structures or objects represented by the center position and bounding boxes as well as the replacement information. The action is to place an object in a place. The reward is constructed by programs that include multiple conditions such as successful condition, count of objects, and failure conditions. QINet [194] completes the corrupted 3D point cloud with the actor-critic algorithm. It first generates masks as pre-processing. Then it converts the discrete point cloud to the continuous surface. The policy is trained by rewards defined as IoU between generated cloud and the true cloud and a latent code constraint to prevent the latent code drift far away. Zhang et al. [196] complete point cloud with A3C algorithm. The state is the updated point cloud of each iteration. The action is the next best view for the completion. The agent adjusts the camera points in the coordinate system to change the views.

5.4 Speech and Music Generation

Speech and music data can be transformed to sequential data points. Thereby, it is natural to incorporate reinforcement learning. In practice, RL is employed to improve the quality [104, 113], decrease latency [113], control the bit rate in speech coding [60], and melody generation [100]. Tacotron 2 [113] learns an agent to control the text-to-speech translation. The state of the agent is a product of an attentive vector and hidden vectors, the attentive vectors, and the output sequence. The action is whether to read or speak. When it reads, it generates an attention vector. When it speaks, it generates the output in the form of a mel-spectrogram frame. The reward motivates the agent to produce high-quality translation as well as low latency. i-ETTS [104] explores reinforced emotional text-to-speech synthesis. The input of the model is reference audio and the targeted character sequence. The reference latent vector encodes tokens that indicate the emotion with an attention model. Then two modality is fused to decode and generate an emotional speech that is fed into a speech emotion recognition classifier. The reward for the speech generator is recognition accuracy. The agent is trained with a policy gradient. Gibson and Oh [60] apply RL in speech coding, an essential technology for digital cellular communications. The agent is a tree-structured controller for the bit rate in speech coding. The system uses a reconstruction error as the penalty. [100] proposes to incorporate LeakGAN [66] into music melody generation. The music notes are converted to symbolic representation.

5.5 AI For Science

Machine learning community also want to help scientists in other research areas with useful machine-learning tools. Molecule design is a critical area because the design process is typically an expensive and long process. Therefore automatically finding patterns from large amounts of data accumulated in scientific areas become another hot area in recent years. RL can also play an important role in its flexibility.

Sub-areas	Related Works
Molecule Design	[13, 15, 20, 25, 57, 62, 76, 77, 106, 129–131, 154, 161]
Reaction Optimization	[203]
Quantum Architecture Design	[90]

Table 9. Methods in AI For Science.

5.5.1 Molecule Design. Drug discovery or de novo molecule design can be viewed as policy search in the molecule space. Thereby it is natural to introduce RL on this application. Abundant research has been conducted, including various mainstream methods listed in Section 3, like GAN-based models [139], human prior [121].

For Gan-based models, the direction of architecture design [131, 139], sample selection [130] are explored. ORGANIC [139] uses RL directly in the GAN model to discover drugs. RANC [131] combines ORGANIC style architecture with a memory network DNC, which enables the model to remember complex sequences and generate longer sequences. ReLeaSE proposed by Popova et al. [129] incorporates a prediction model to bias the generated chemical structures toward those with the desired physical or biological properties. ATNC [130] modifies the OGRANITC model by introducing a new sample selection scheme function that filters out molecules which are far from training samples and regenerates the sequences until the number of new sequences is higher than the threshold. MolGAN [25] uses DDPG on small molecular graph generation to cope with high dimensional action space. The reward is emitted from a differential approximation of the true reward function.

For human-designed reward methods, various topics are investigated, like reward design [62, 121], memory architecture [13], ranking methods [161], training methods [15]. Inspired by Sequence Tutor [79], REINVENT proposed by Olivecrona et al. [121] uses RL to tune the MLE pre-trained RNN on the molecular de-novo generation task. It defines the reward as the distance between an augmented likelihood and the agent’s likelihood. The augmented likelihood adds a reward of the desirable properties of a molecule onto the log-likelihood of data distribution. Blacshke et al. [13] augment the REINVENT [121] model with a memory to cope with the mode collapse problem. The agent is penalized for generating similar compounds to the ones in the memory unit. Atance et al. [6] propose the best agent reminder (BAR) loss for training by motivating the agent to update the gradient towards the best agent collected during the training process. It balances between the best agent loss and the REINVENT loss with a factor. The reward function considers the average size of the molecules, drug-like metrics and special molecule DRD2 metrics. AHC [161] combines the REINVENT loss with samples selected by the Hill-Climb method [15]. Brown et al. [15] propose an evaluation framework for de-novo molecular design that includes two benchmarks, one for an in-distribution learning test and the other for goal-directed benchmark.

Most works above aim to tackle the general generation problem, ignoring the resolution of molecular design. recent works start to combine reinforcement learning methods to representations of different resolutions, like fragments [20], tree [77], and population of candidate molecules [57]. FaST [20] investigates PPO [144] on fragment-based molecular optimization. The action for the agent is to add or delete a fragment from the current molecular. The reward is +1 if the novel qualified molecule is discovered and -0.1 if an invalid molecule is explored. RTJ-RL [77] proposes to apply PPO [144] on a reversible junction tree (RJT) that is a new representation for molecules. RJT representations are convertible to valid molecules, which describe the state of the agent. The action is the modification of the tree, containing information about node, word, site, and stop. RGA [57] combines genetic algorithms and reinforcement learning to optimize the structure-based drug design. The state is population at a certain step generation, including the candidate molecules and their 3D poses. Action space is based on crossover and mutation, two main steps in the evolution process. The action is composed of probabilities to choose candidates or ligands in the population.

For molecular design, it is common to use multiple constraints or goals to guide the model. Therefore, multi-objective optimization is also an interesting direction, including weighted sum [62, 76], alternation [62, 76], reward weighted sum [76], and Pareto optimization [106, 154]. The state and action of MoleGuLAR [62] are defined as sequence generation. The reward is calculated by solute property measure LogP, drug-likeness metric (QED), and impact in human factor (TPSA). when conflicts exist between rewards, they set all rewards as 0 to guide the generation model towards molecules where the single property is optimal. Hu et al. [76] use the REINFORCE method for fine-tuning. They devise a reward-mixing strategy for multiple objective conflicts. MolSearch [154] proposes to use MCTS on multi-objective molecular generation and property optimization. The model maintains a global pool for Pareto molecules which are defined as molecules that have at least one property at the best state. DrugEx3 [106] uses a Transformer model for the generation to allow users to input prior information like the desired scaffold.

5.5.2 Reaction Optimization. It is also feasible to use RL searching in the formula space for chemical applications. Zhou et al. [203] propose to use DRL for chemical reaction optimization. It models a chain of reactions where an agent has the experimental conditions as states and can change the conditions by actions such as increasing the temperature. Once an action is applied, the condition of the reaction changes, and then the agent is required to further take the following action. The reward is about the output of the reaction, such as product yield, selectivity, purity, and cost. RNN as the model is used to construct the agent.

5.5.3 Quantum Architecture Design. [90] propose to do a quantum architecture search by reinforcement learning. The state is defined as a multi-qubit entangled state, the action space is the quantum gate for the design, and the fidelity of the target state measures the reward. The experiment is carried on a simulation environment, which is adapted towards the OpenAI Gym [14].

5.6 Recommender System and Information Retrieval

We include most works in this survey about how to generate content without collaboration with humans. There are also applications where RL can be used to generate interactions between two entities, such as a robot and an environment. For the recommender systems, it is better for readers to read surveys about how reinforcement learning is injected into the process [32, 48]. In general, user interaction history is considered as states and items are defined as actions. The agent is required to generate items that users might be interested in. Thereby, the user feedback can be incorporated as rewards to guide the learning process.

5.7 Robotics

Robotics is another useful area that deviates from the generative applications mentioned above. Generally speaking, robotics can be treated as an interactive agent that generates responses to humans' orders. Recent advancement [37] shows that large language models plus visual foundation models might lead to a large step towards better robotics control policies. Or even the policy takes code as actions and employs a generation process in MineCraft [47].

5.8 Other Areas

Generation models have wide applications. We also list works that apply RL in niche areas like procedure generation[83], simulated robotics [68], graph generation[24]. PCGRL [83] proposes an abstract description of formulating the procedure generation problem into an MDP. The procedure generation problem is often used for game construction. They highlight three types of representations for the state and action modelling. Narrow representation only changes game elements

at predefined locations. Turtle representation provides an agent with the ability to move around on the map. The broad representation enables an agent to change game elements at other positions. Ha [68] proposes to not only optimize a policy for a bipedal walker to complete tasks but also optimize the shape of the walker. It conducts experiments on the OpenAI Gym [14] BipedalWalkerHardcore-v2 task and learns to generate an agent that can achieve better performance. Apart from knowledge graphs and causal graphs, reinforcement learning agents can also generate other types of graphs like road graphs and power grid graphs [24], where the state is the set of nodes and edges, the action is the selection of a node either the start node or the end node. The reward is defined for robustness study expected critical fraction of nodes to the removal. The reward is estimated by Monte Carlo sampling. Q-learning is employed for this task. Reinforcement learning is also used in quantum computer design. Kuo et al.

6 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As far as we know, applying reinforcement learning on generative models originates from around 2015 [134]. Some of the directions have been well explored, and new ones keep emerging. Based on analysis and organization in previous sections, we present several promising directions to guide further research in this area.

Reward function design and multi-objective optimization A large number of works have been conducted on how to guide model training with hand-designed new signals by RL. Multiple objectives are usually utilized for various constraints and guidance modelling. It is ideal that the optimal values can be achieved all at once. But it is often not the case, making the Pareto optimization a useful tool for analyzing the result. While according to our exploration, few works have addressed multi-objective optimization and Pareto optimization in application areas. It might be valuable to trade-off in multiple contradictory losses. Therefore, it is advantageous to explore how to trade off between them for a more robust model.

Model enhancement and control Recent research has tailored RL to help solve the difficulty of sampling of EBM via RL as a distributional approach [126] or increasing the efficiency by searching backward propagation of DDPM [53]. These approaches pave a new way to exert RL to improve the generative model, in contrast to classic applications where RL is a way to introduce new training signals or serve as an architecture builder. The aforementioned works show the feasibility of RL application, more advancement in the RL community might be transferred to these models to further improve the model performance. A good example is [39], which compares the difference between distributional formulation and policy gradient but still exploits the similarity which lay the foundation for variance reduction to be applied to distributional methods.

Human preference modelling and Interpretability The RLHF method [153] is a hot research direction since the high impact of large language models [1]. New studies also emerge to explore whether the RL is an indispensable factor. Preference-based models have been proposed to model human preference. Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [45] aims to substitute reinforcement learning by directly utilizing reward functions by preference modelling. More research can be conducted in this line to find an optimal way for preference modelling. Also, human preference also is dynamic, so the capture of dynamics and improvement on current generative applications might be an interesting direction.

Sample-efficiency and Generalization Recent works also show that it might be difficult to generalize logic inference tasks even for the best GPT-4 [40]. Thereby, the difficulty of generalization of deep generative models might be further addressed by the RL algorithms. More work should be devoted to how to design a model that can better generalize and achieve better results on out-of-distribution data. Retraining [164], and causal machine learning [142] might be interesting ways to complement the capability of RL-based generators for better learning and adaptation.

Introducing of novel RL methods Most RL algorithms applied to generative models conform to the offline setting where the training dataset is fixed. In our exploration, most works focus on classic algorithms like policy gradient. The gap between the recent advancement of offline reinforcement learning and the application of classic models might be a fruitful direction for future research. This combination might help alleviate the problems in current generative models. For example, powerful large language models suffer from the hallucination problem which might originate from out-of-distribution generalization, where the conservative strategy [49] in offline RL might be used to address the problem.

LLM and foundation models LLM has demonstrated great transferability on a number of sequence modelling problems. Combined with vision foundation models, it is a potential way to achieve more powerful models for diverse task settings. The fast-developing literature in this area is drawing the capability of current large models and exposing new problems for methods like RLHF. This might foster new directions for how RL is incorporated into generative models.

7 CONCLUSION

In this survey, we propose a unified taxonomy for RL applied in generative AI. We collect works from various directions and extract the key usage of reinforcement learning. We first briefly introduce the concept of generative models and reinforcement learning methods. Then we introduce the key application methods for RL to be incorporated into the generative models. We also search and summarize the problems of reinforcement learning and discuss them in Section ???. Furthermore, we extract exemplar works in a range of application areas for readers who want to narrow down to a specific area. Finally, we show the promising directions of future research and conclude the whole survey.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>. Accessed: 2023-08-01.
- [2] Hojjat Aghakhani et al. 2018. Detecting deceptive reviews using generative adversarial networks. In *2018 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops (SPW)*. IEEE, 89–95.
- [3] Yuta Akizuki et al. 2020. Generative Modelling with Design Constraints—Reinforcement Learning for Object Generation. In *RE: Anthropocene, Design in the Age of Humans—Proceedings of the 25th CAADRIA Conference*, Vol. 1. Association for Computer Aided Architectural Design Research in Asia, 445–454.
- [4] Afra Feyza Akyurek et al. 2023. RL4F: Generating Natural Language Feedback with Reinforcement Learning for Repairing Model Outputs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08844* (2023).
- [5] Atijit Anuchitanukul et al. 2022. SURF: Semantic-level Unsupervised Reward Function for Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 4508–4522. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.334>
- [6] Sara Romeo Atance et al. 2022. De novo drug design using reinforcement learning with graph-based deep generative models. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 62, 20 (2022), 4863–4872.
- [7] Minkyung Baek et al. 2021. Accurate prediction of protein structures and interactions using a three-track neural network. *Science* 373, 6557 (2021), 871–876.
- [8] Yuntao Bai et al. 2022. Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073* (2022).
- [9] Yuntao Bai et al. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862* (2022).
- [10] Richard Bellman et al. 1954. The theory of dynamic programming. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 60, 6 (1954), 503–515.
- [11] Camille Bilodeau et al. 2022. Generative models for molecular discovery: Recent advances and challenges. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* 12, 5 (2022), e1608.
- [12] Kevin Black et al. 2023. Training Diffusion Models with Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13301* (2023).
- [13] Thomas Blaschke et al. 2020. Memory-assisted reinforcement learning for diverse molecular de novo design. *Journal of cheminformatics* 12, 1 (2020), 1–17.
- [14] Greg Brockman et al. 2016. Openai gym. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540* (2016).

- [15] Nathan Brown et al. 2019. GuacaMol: benchmarking models for de novo molecular design. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* 59, 3 (2019), 1096–1108.
- [16] Ruichu Cai et al. 2020. TAG: Type auxiliary guiding for code comment generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02835* (2020).
- [17] Miguel A Carreira-Perpinan et al. 2005. On contrastive divergence learning. In *International workshop on artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 33–40.
- [18] Anshuman Chauhan et al. 2023. DQNAS: Neural Architecture Search using Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.06687* (2023).
- [19] Tong Che et al. 2017. Maximum-likelihood augmented discrete generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.07983* (2017).
- [20] Benson Chen et al. 2021. Fragment-based Sequential Translation for Molecular Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.01009* (2021).
- [21] Hongshen Chen et al. 2017. A survey on dialogue systems: Recent advances and new frontiers. *Acm Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter* 19, 2 (2017), 25–35.
- [22] Xin Chen et al. 2020. Catch: Context-based meta reinforcement learning for transferrable architecture search. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XIX 16*. Springer, 185–202.
- [23] Yen-Chun Chen et al. 2018. Fast Abstractive Summarization with Reinforce-Selected Sentence Rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 675–686. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1063>
- [24] Victor-Alexandru Darvari et al. 2021. Goal-directed graph construction using reinforcement learning. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 477, 2254 (2021), 20210168.
- [25] Nicola De Cao et al. 2018. MolGAN: An implicit generative model for small molecular graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11973* (2018).
- [26] Gustavo H de Rosa et al. 2021. A survey on text generation using generative adversarial networks. *Pattern Recognition* 119 (2021), 108098.
- [27] Harm De Vries et al. 2017. Guesswhat?! visual object discovery through multi-modal dialogue. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5503–5512.
- [28] R Devon Hjelm et al. 2017. Boundary-Seeking Generative Adversarial Networks. *arXiv e-prints* (2017), arXiv–1702.
- [29] Pierre Dognin et al. 2021. ReGen: Reinforcement Learning for Text and Knowledge Base Generation using Pretrained Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 1084–1099. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.83>
- [30] Domenic Donato et al. 2022. MAD for Robust Reinforcement Learning in Machine Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.08583* (2022).
- [31] Bowen et al. Baker. 2017. Designing Neural Network Architectures using Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1c2cvqee>
- [32] Xiacong et al. Chen. 2021. A Survey of Deep Reinforcement Learning in Recommender Systems: A Systematic Review and Future Directions. *CoRR* abs/2109.03540 (2021). arXiv:2109.03540 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.03540>
- [33] Leshem et al. Choshen. 2020. On the Weaknesses of Reinforcement Learning for Neural Machine Translation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=H1eCw3EKvH>
- [34] Yuanqi et al. Du. 2022. MolGenSurvey: A Systematic Survey in Machine Learning Models for Molecule Design. arXiv:2203.14500 [cs.LG]
- [35] Open et al. Ended Learning Team. 2021. Open-Ended Learning Leads to Generally Capable Agents. *CoRR* abs/2107.12808 (2021). arXiv:2107.12808 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.12808>
- [36] Chi-Hung et al. Hsu. 2018. MONAS: Multi-Objective Neural Architecture Search using Reinforcement Learning. *CoRR* abs/1806.10332 (2018). arXiv:1806.10332 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1806.10332>
- [37] Wenlong et al. Huang. 2023. VoxPoser: Composable 3D Value Maps for Robotic Manipulation with Language Models. arXiv:2307.05973 [cs.RO]
- [38] Natasha et al. Jaques. 2019. Way Off-Policy Batch Deep Reinforcement Learning of Implicit Human Preferences in Dialog. *CoRR* abs/1907.00456 (2019). arXiv:1907.00456 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.00456>
- [39] Tomasz et al. Korbak. 2022. On Reward Maximization and Distribution Matching for Fine-Tuning Language Models. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8f95ajHrFc>
- [40] Hanmeng et al. Liu. 2023. Evaluating the Logical Reasoning Ability of ChatGPT and GPT-4. arXiv:2304.03439 [cs.CL]
- [41] Chengzhi et al. Mao. 2022. Discrete Representations Strengthen Vision Transformer Robustness. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8hWs60AZcWk>
- [42] Volodymyr et al. Mnih. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nat.* 518, 7540 (2015), 529–533. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14236>
- [43] Timothy et al. P. Lillicrap. 2016. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. In *4th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2016, San Juan, Puerto Rico, May 2–4, 2016, Conference Track Proceedings*, Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (Eds.). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02971>
- [44] Romain et al. Paulus. 2018. A Deep Reinforced Model for Abstractive Summarization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HkAClQgA->
- [45] Rafael et al. Rafailov. 2023. Direct Preference Optimization: Your Language Model is Secretly a Reward Model. arXiv:2305.18290 [cs.LG]
- [46] Zhan et al. Shi. 2018. Toward Diverse Text Generation with Inverse Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13–19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden*, Jérôme Lang (Ed.). ijcai.org, 4361–4367. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2018/606>
- [47] Guanzhi et al. Wang. 2023. Voyager: An Open-Ended Embodied Agent with Large Language Models. arXiv:2305.16291 [cs.AI]

- [48] Siyu et al. Wang. 2023. Causal Decision Transformer for Recommender Systems via Offline Reinforcement Learning. arXiv:2304.07920 [cs.IR]
- [49] Richard et al. Yuanzhe Pang. 2021. Text Generation by Learning from Demonstrations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=RovX-uQ1Hua>
- [50] Barret et al. Zoph. 2017. Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1Ue8Hcxg>
- [51] Hehe Fan et al. 2020. Recurrent attention network with reinforced generator for visual dialog. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)* 16, 3 (2020), 1–16.
- [52] Ying Fan et al. 2023. DPOK: Reinforcement Learning for Fine-tuning Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16381* (2023).
- [53] Ying Fan et al. 2023. Optimizing DDPM Sampling with Shortcut Fine-Tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13362* (2023).
- [54] William Fedus et al. 2018. Maskgan: better text generation via filling in the_. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.07736* (2018).
- [55] Chelsea Finn et al. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1126–1135.
- [56] Jenna C Fromer et al. 2023. Computer-aided multi-objective optimization in small molecule discovery. *Patterns* 4, 2 (2023).
- [57] Tianfan Fu et al. 2022. Reinforced genetic algorithm for structure-based drug design. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 12325–12338.
- [58] Yang Gao et al. 2019. Reward learning for efficient reinforcement learning in extractive document summarisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.12894* (2019).
- [59] Yang Gao et al. 2020. Preference-based interactive multi-document summarisation. *Information Retrieval Journal* 23 (2020), 555–585.
- [60] Jerry Gibson et al. 2022. A Reinforcement Learning Approach to Speech Coding. *Information* 13, 7 (2022), 331.
- [61] Dongyoung Go et al. 2023. Aligning language models with preferences through f-divergence minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08215* (2023).
- [62] Manan Goel et al. 2021. MoleGuLAR: molecule generation using reinforcement learning with alternating rewards. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 61, 12 (2021), 5815–5826.
- [63] Lin Gui et al. 2019. Neural topic model with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 3478–3483.
- [64] Gabriel Lima Guimaraes et al. 2017. Objective-reinforced generative adversarial networks (organ) for sequence generation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10843* (2017).
- [65] Han Guo et al. 2022. Efficient (soft) q-learning for text generation with limited good data. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. 6969–6991.
- [66] Jiaxian Guo et al. 2018. Long text generation via adversarial training with leaked information. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [67] Minghao Guo et al. 2019. Irlas: Inverse reinforcement learning for architecture search. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 9021–9029.
- [68] David Ha et al. 2019. Reinforcement learning for improving agent design. *Artificial life* 25, 4 (2019), 352–365.
- [69] Tuomas Haarnoja et al. 2017. Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1352–1361.
- [70] Tuomas Haarnoja et al. 2018. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1861–1870.
- [71] Kaiming He et al. 2016. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- [72] Jonathan Ho et al. 2020. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 6840–6851.
- [73] Ukyo Honda et al. 2023. Switching to Discriminative Image Captioning by Relieving a Bottleneck of Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 1124–1134.
- [74] Timothy Hospedales et al. 2021. Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 44, 9 (2021), 5149–5169.
- [75] MD Zakir Hossain et al. 2019. A comprehensive survey of deep learning for image captioning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 51, 6 (2019), 1–36.
- [76] Pengwei Hu et al. 2023. De novo drug design based on Stack-RNN with multi-objective reward-weighted sum and reinforcement learning. *Journal of Molecular Modeling* 29, 4 (2023), 1–12.
- [77] Ryuichiro Ishitani et al. 2022. Molecular Design Method Using a Reversible Tree Representation of Chemical Compounds and Deep Reinforcement Learning. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 62, 17 (2022), 4032–4048.
- [78] Yesmina Jaafra et al. 2019. Reinforcement learning for neural architecture search: A review. *Image and Vision Computing* 89 (2019), 57–66.
- [79] Natasha Jaques et al. 2017. Sequence tutor: Conservative fine-tuning of sequence generation models with kl-control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1645–1654.
- [80] Wengong Jin et al. 2020. Multi-objective molecule generation using interpretable substructures. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4849–4859.
- [81] John Jumper et al. 2021. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* 596, 7873 (2021), 583–589.

- [82] Pei Ke et al. 2019. ARAML: A Stable Adversarial Training Framework for Text Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 4271–4281. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1436>
- [83] Ahmed Khalifa et al. 2020. Pcgrl: Procedural content generation via reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, Vol. 16. 95–101.
- [84] Muhammad Khalifa et al. 2020. A distributional approach to controlled text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.11635* (2020).
- [85] Samuel Kiegl et al. 2021. Revisiting the weaknesses of reinforcement learning for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08942* (2021).
- [86] Tomasz Korbak et al. 2021. Energy-based models for code generation under compilability constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04985* (2021).
- [87] Maria Korshunova et al. 2022. Generative and reinforcement learning approaches for the automated de novo design of bioactive compounds. *Communications Chemistry* 5, 1 (2022), 129.
- [88] Julia Kreutzer et al. 2021. Offline Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback in Real-World Sequence-to-Sequence Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Structured Prediction for NLP (SPNLP 2021)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.spnlp-1.4>
- [89] Divya Kumari et al. 2021. Sentiment Preservation in Review Translation using Curriculum-based Re-inforcement Framework. In *Proceedings of Machine Translation Summit XVIII: Research Track*. 150–162.
- [90] En-Jui Kuo et al. 2021. Quantum architecture search via deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07715* (2021).
- [91] Tsz Kin Lam et al. 2018. A Reinforcement Learning Approach to Interactive-Predictive Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*. Alicante, Spain, 189–198. <https://aclanthology.org/2018.eamt-main.17>
- [92] Sylvain Lamprier et al. 2022. Generative cooperative networks for natural language generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 11891–11905.
- [93] Hung Le et al. 2022. Coderl: Mastering code generation through pretrained models and deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 21314–21328.
- [94] Ngan Le et al. 2022. Deep reinforcement learning in computer vision: a comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2022), 1–87.
- [95] Mike Lewis et al. 2017. Deal or No Deal? End-to-End Learning of Negotiation Dialogues. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2443–2453. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D17-1259>
- [96] Jiwei Li et al. 2016. Deep reinforcement learning for dialogue generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01541* (2016).
- [97] Jiwei Li et al. 2017. Adversarial Learning for Neural Dialogue Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2157–2169. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D17-1230>
- [98] Xijun Li et al. 2017. End-to-End Task-Completion Neural Dialogue Systems. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Taipei, Taiwan, 733–743. <https://aclanthology.org/I17-1074>
- [99] Yang Li et al. 2018. A generative model for category text generation. *Information Sciences* 450 (2018), 301–315.
- [100] Zihan Li et al. 2021. A Symbolic-domain Music Generation Method Based on Leak-GAN. In *2021 3rd International Academic Exchange Conference on Science and Technology Innovation (IAECST)*. IEEE, 549–552.
- [101] Baihan Lin et al. 2022. Reinforcement learning and bandits for speech and language processing: Tutorial, review and outlook. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13623* (2022).
- [102] Kevin Lin et al. 2017. Adversarial ranking for language generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [103] Zeming Lin et al. 2023. Evolutionary-scale prediction of atomic-level protein structure with a language model. *Science* 379, 6637 (2023), 1123–1130.
- [104] Rui Liu et al. 2021. Reinforcement learning for emotional text-to-speech synthesis with improved emotion discriminability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01408* (2021).
- [105] Ruibo Liu et al. 2022. Aligning generative language models with human values. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*. 241–252.
- [106] Xuhan Liu et al. 2023. DrugEx v3: scaffold-constrained drug design with graph transformer-based reinforcement learning. *Journal of Cheminformatics* 15, 1 (2023), 24.
- [107] Fuli Luo et al. 2019. Towards fine-grained text sentiment transfer. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 2013–2022.
- [108] Sohvi Luukkonen et al. 2023. Artificial intelligence in multi-objective drug design. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology* 79 (2023), 102537.
- [109] Alice Martin et al. 2022. Learning Natural Language Generation with Truncated Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 12–37.
- [110] Lianhai Miao et al. 2020. Multi-modal product title compression. *Information Processing & Management* 57, 1 (2020), 102123.
- [111] Volodymyr Mnih et al. 2016. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1928–1937.
- [112] Kaixiang Mo et al. 2018. Personalizing a dialogue system with transfer reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 32.

- [113] Devang S Ram Mohan et al. 2020. Incremental text to speech for neural sequence-to-sequence models using reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03096* (2020).
- [114] Akash Kumar Mohankumar et al. 2021. Diversity Driven Query Rewriting in Search Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (Virtual Event, Singapore) (KDD '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3423–3431. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467202>
- [115] Monireh Mohebbi Moghaddam et al. 2023. Games of GANs: Game-theoretical models for generative adversarial networks. *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2023), 1–37.
- [116] Shashi Narayan et al. 2018. Ranking Sentences for Extractive Summarization with Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1747–1759. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1158>
- [117] Khanh Nguyen et al. 2017. Reinforcement Learning for Bandit Neural Machine Translation with Simulated Human Feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1464–1474. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D17-1153>
- [118] Tan M Nguyen et al. 2019. InfoCNF: An efficient conditional continuous normalizing flow with adaptive solvers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03978* (2019).
- [119] Jinjie Ni et al. 2023. Recent advances in deep learning based dialogue systems: A systematic survey. *Artificial intelligence review* 56, 4 (2023), 3055–3155.
- [120] Mohammad Norouzi et al. 2016. Reward augmented maximum likelihood for neural structured prediction. *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems* 29 (2016).
- [121] Marcus Olivecrona et al. 2017. Molecular de-novo design through deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of cheminformatics* 9, 1 (2017), 1–14.
- [122] Azimkhon Ostonov et al. 2022. Rlss: A deep reinforcement learning algorithm for sequential scene generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2219–2228.
- [123] Long Ouyang et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [124] Dong Pang et al. 2021. RL-DARTS: Differentiable neural architecture search via reinforcement-learning-based meta-optimizer. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 234 (2021), 107585.
- [125] Kishore Papineni et al. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. 311–318.
- [126] Tetiana Parshakova et al. 2019. Distributional reinforcement learning for energy-based sequential models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.08517* (2019).
- [127] Hieu Pham et al. 2018. Efficient neural architecture search via parameters sharing. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4095–4104.
- [128] Ngoc-Quan Pham et al. 2018. Towards one-shot learning for rare-word translation with external experts. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Neural Machine Translation and Generation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, 100–109. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W18-2712>
- [129] Mariya Popova et al. 2018. Deep reinforcement learning for de novo drug design. *Science advances* 4, 7 (2018), eaap7885.
- [130] Evgeny Putin et al. 2018. Adversarial threshold neural computer for molecular de novo design. *Molecular pharmaceutics* 15, 10 (2018), 4386–4397.
- [131] Evgeny Putin et al. 2018. Reinforced adversarial neural computer for de novo molecular design. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* 58, 6 (2018), 1194–1204.
- [132] Valentina Pyatkin et al. 2022. Reinforced Clarification Question Generation with Defeasibility Rewards for Disambiguating Social and Moral Situations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10409* (2022).
- [133] Rajkumar Ramamurthy et al. 2022. Is Reinforcement Learning (Not) for Natural Language Processing?: Benchmarks, Baselines, and Building Blocks for Natural Language Policy Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01241* (2022).
- [134] Marc'Aurelio Ranzato et al. 2015. Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06732* (2015).
- [135] Zhou Ren et al. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning-based image captioning with embedding reward. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 290–298.
- [136] Steven J Rennie et al. 2017. Self-critical sequence training for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 7008–7024.
- [137] Jorai Rijdsdijk et al. 2021. Reinforcement learning for hyperparameter tuning in deep learning-based side-channel analysis. *IACR Transactions on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems* (2021), 677–707.
- [138] Stéphane Ross et al. 2011. 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*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 627–635.
- [139] Benjamin Sanchez-Lengeling et al. 2017. Optimizing distributions over molecular space. An objective-reinforced generative adversarial network for inverse-design chemistry (ORGANIC). (2017).
- [140] Santanu Santra et al. 2021. Gradient descent effects on differential neural architecture search: A survey. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 89602–89618.
- [141] Muhammad Sarmad et al. 2019. RL-GAN-Net: A Reinforcement Learning Agent Controlled GAN Network for Real-Time Point Cloud Shape Completion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- [142] Bernhard Schölkopf et al. 2021. Toward causal representation learning. *Proc. IEEE* 109, 5 (2021), 612–634.

- [143] John Schulman et al. 2015. Trust region policy optimization. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1889–1897.
- [144] John Schulman et al. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* (2017).
- [145] Thomas Scialom et al. 2020. Coldgans: Taming language gans with cautious sampling strategies. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 18978–18989.
- [146] Thomas Scialom et al. 2021. To beam or not to beam: That is a question of cooperation for language gans. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 26585–26597.
- [147] Iulian V Serban et al. 2017. A deep reinforcement learning chatbot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.02349* (2017).
- [148] Parshin Shojaee et al. 2023. Execution-based code generation using deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13816* (2023).
- [149] David Silver et al. 2014. Deterministic Policy Gradient Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 32)*, Eric P. Xing and Tony Jebara (Eds.). PMLR, Beijing, China, 387–395. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v32/silver14.html>
- [150] David Silver et al. 2016. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature* 529, 7587 (2016), 484–489.
- [151] David Silver et al. 2017. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *nature* 550, 7676 (2017), 354–359.
- [152] Aseem Srivastava et al. 2023. Response-act guided reinforced dialogue generation for mental health counseling. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 1118–1129.
- [153] Nisan Stiennon et al. 2020. Learning to summarize with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 3008–3021.
- [154] Mengying Sun et al. 2022. MolSearch: Search-based Multi-objective Molecular Generation and Property Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4724–4732.
- [155] Zhoujian Sun et al. 2023. Replicating Complex Dialogue Policy of Humans via Offline Imitation Learning with Supervised Regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03987* (2023).
- [156] Richard Stuart Sutton et al. 1984. *Temporal credit assignment in reinforcement learning*. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- [157] Richard S Sutton et al. 1990. Integrated architectures for learning, planning, and reacting based on approximating dynamic programming. In *Machine learning proceedings 1990*. Elsevier, 216–224.
- [158] Richard S Sutton et al. 2018. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press.
- [159] Xu Tan et al. 2021. A survey on neural speech synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15561* (2021).
- [160] Bowen Tang et al. 2021. Generative AI models for drug discovery. In *Biophysical and Computational Tools in Drug Discovery*. Springer, 221–243.
- [161] Morgan Thomas et al. 2022. Augmented Hill-Climb increases reinforcement learning efficiency for language-based de novo molecule generation. *Journal of Cheminformatics* 14, 1 (2022), 1–22.
- [162] Yuan Tian et al. 2020. Off-policy reinforcement learning for efficient and effective gan architecture search. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VII 16*. Springer, 175–192.
- [163] Emanuel Todorov et al. 2006. Linearly-solvable Markov decision problems. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 19 (2006).
- [164] Austin Tripp et al. 2020. Sample-efficient optimization in the latent space of deep generative models via weighted retraining. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 11259–11272.
- [165] Victor Uc-Cetina et al. 2023. Survey on reinforcement learning for language processing. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 56, 2 (2023), 1543–1575.
- [166] Bhargav Upadhyay et al. 2022. Efficient reinforcement learning for unsupervised controlled text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07696* (2022).
- [167] Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets et al. 2017. Feudal networks for hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 3540–3549.
- [168] Yao Wan et al. 2018. Improving automatic source code summarization via deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE international conference on automated software engineering*. 397–407.
- [169] Chaozheng Wang et al. 2022. Enriching query semantics for code search with reinforcement learning. *Neural Networks* 145 (2022), 22–32.
- [170] Li Wang et al. 2018. A Reinforced Topic-Aware Convolutional Sequence-to-Sequence Model for Abstractive Text Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (Stockholm, Sweden) (IJCAI’18)*. AAAI Press, 4453–4460.
- [171] Qi Wang et al. 2020. GRL: Knowledge graph completion with GAN-based reinforcement learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 209 (2020), 106421.
- [172] Wenhua Wang et al. 2020. Reinforcement-learning-guided source code summarization using hierarchical attention. *IEEE Transactions on software Engineering* 48, 1 (2020), 102–119.
- [173] Xiaoqiang Wang et al. 2021. Ordering-based causal discovery with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06631* (2021).
- [174] Xin Wang et al. 2022. Compilable neural code generation with compiler feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05132* (2022).
- [175] Jason D. Williams et al. 2017. Hybrid Code Networks: practical and efficient end-to-end dialog control with supervised and reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Vancouver, Canada, 665–677. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P17-1062>
- [176] Ronald J Williams et al. 1992. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Reinforcement learning* (1992), 5–32.
- [177] Lijun Wu et al. 2018. A Study of Reinforcement Learning for Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 3612–3621. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1397>
- [178] Qingyang Wu et al. 2021. Textgail: Generative adversarial imitation learning for text generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 14067–14075.

- [179] Qinzhuo Wu et al. 2022. Automatic Math Word Problem Generation With Topic-Expression Co-Attention Mechanism and Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* 30 (2022), 1061–1072.
- [180] Yuxiang Wu et al. 2018. Learning to extract coherent summary via deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [181] Jingjing Xu et al. 2018. Diversity-promoting GAN: A cross-entropy based generative adversarial network for diversified text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. 3940–3949.
- [182] Min Yang et al. 2017. Personalized response generation via domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1021–1024.
- [183] Ziyu Yao et al. 2019. Coacor: Code annotation for code retrieval with reinforcement learning. In *The world wide web conference*. 2203–2214.
- [184] Ziyu Yao et al. 2020. An imitation game for learning semantic parsers from user interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00689* (2020).
- [185] Denis Yarats et al. 2018. Hierarchical text generation and planning for strategic dialogue. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5591–5599.
- [186] Chenchen Ye et al. 2022. Structured and natural responses co-generation for conversational search. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 155–164.
- [187] Lantao Yu et al. 2017. Seqgan: Sequence generative adversarial nets with policy gradient. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 31.
- [188] Chunyan Zhang et al. 2022. A survey of automatic source code summarization. *Symmetry* 14, 3 (2022), 471.
- [189] Junjie Zhang et al. 2018. Goal-oriented visual question generation via intermediate rewards. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 186–201.
- [190] Jian Zhang et al. 2018. SCH-GAN: Semi-supervised cross-modal hashing by generative adversarial network. *IEEE transactions on cybernetics* 50, 2 (2018), 489–502.
- [191] Li Zhang et al. 2017. Actor-critic sequence training for image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.09601* (2017).
- [192] Lixi Zhang et al. 2022. LearnedSQLGen: Constraint-Aware SQL Generation Using Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (SIGMOD '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 945–958. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526155>
- [193] Ruiyi Zhang et al. 2020. Reward constrained interactive recommendation with natural language feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01618* (2020).
- [194] Ruonan Zhang et al. 2022. QINet: Decision Surface Learning and Adversarial Enhancement for Quasi-Immune Completion of Diverse Corrupted Point Clouds. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 60 (2022), 1–14.
- [195] Xingxing Zhang et al. 2017. Sentence Simplification with Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen, Denmark, 584–594. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D17-1062>
- [196] Zhaoxuan Zhang et al. 2023. Point Cloud Scene Completion with Joint Color and Semantic Estimation from Single RGB-D Image. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2023).
- [197] Tiancheng Zhao et al. 2016. Towards end-to-end learning for dialog state tracking and management using deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02560* (2016).
- [198] Tianxiang Zhao et al. 2020. Balancing quality and human involvement: An effective approach to interactive neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 9660–9667.
- [199] Tingting Zhao et al. 2023. A multi-scenario text generation method based on meta reinforcement learning. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 165 (2023), 47–54.
- [200] Zhou Zhao et al. 2020. Open-ended video question answering via multi-modal conditional adversarial networks. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 29 (2020), 3859–3870.
- [201] Zhao Zhong et al. 2018. Practical block-wise neural network architecture generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2423–2432.
- [202] Wangchunshu Zhou et al. 2020. Self-adversarial learning with comparative discrimination for text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.11691* (2020).
- [203] Zhenpeng Zhou et al. 2017. Optimizing chemical reactions with deep reinforcement learning. *ACS central science* 3, 12 (2017), 1337–1344.
- [204] Banghua Zhu et al. 2023. Principled Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback from Pairwise or K -wise Comparisons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11270* (2023).
- [205] Daniel M Ziegler et al. 2019. Fine-tuning language models from human preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08593* (2019).