

Directly Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay

Zhuoying Chen¹, Huiping Li¹ *Senior Member, IEEE*, Zhaoxu Wang¹

¹ School of Marine Science and Technology, Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, China, 710072

Email: czysmile@mail.nwpu.edu.cn, lihuiping@nwpu.edu.cn, wangzhaoxu@mail.nwpu.edu.cn

Abstract—Prioritized Experience Replay (PER) enables the model to learn more about relatively important samples by artificially changing their accessed frequencies. However, this non-uniform sampling method shifts the state-action distribution that is originally used to estimate Q-value functions, which brings about the estimation deviation. In this article, an novel off policy reinforcement learning training framework called Directly Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay (DALAP) is proposed, which can directly quantify the changed extent of the shifted distribution through Parallel Self-Attention network, so as to accurately compensate the error. In addition, a Priority-Encouragement mechanism is designed simultaneously to optimize the sample screening criterion, and further improve the training efficiency. In order to verify the effectiveness and generality of DALAP, we integrate it with the value-function based, the policy-gradient based and multi-agent reinforcement learning algorithm, respectively. The multiple groups of comparative experiments show that DALAP has the significant advantages of both improving the convergence rate and reducing the training variance.

Index Terms—PER, DALAP, Parallel Self-Attention network, Priority-Encouragement mechanism.

I. INTRODUCTION

Experience Replay mechanism [1], as an general technical means of main stream off policy deep reinforcement learning algorithms, randomly selects a fixed number of experience transitions to provide training data for neural networks, which breaks the relevance between training samples. However, the equal probability sampling mode used in experience replay forces the agent to cost a lot of time to screen effective samples, which causes too much invalid exploration in the early stage of training. To resolve this problem, the Prioritized Experience Replay (PER) [2] is proposed. PER takes the temporal difference (TD) error as a criterion for judging the prioritization of samples, and the frequency with a sample accessed is proportional to the absolute value of its TD error. The model training efficiency can be improved by learning the relatively important experience samples more frequently, and its performance has been verified in algorithms such as DQN [3], DDQN [4].

While PER improves the training speed, it also has the apparent shortcomings. On the one hand, the non-uniform sampling shifts the state-action distribution that is originally used to estimate the Q-value function, which brings about estimation deviation. On the other hand, the priority assignment form of PER is too singular, which is easy to cause overfitting problem [5].

From the estimation deviation aspect, the conventional PER introduces hyperparameter β to adjust the importance sampling weight and compensate the estimation error. β increases linearly from the initial value β_0 to 1 with the increase of the training episodes [2]. However, this linear parameter tuning method will bring extra errors. Fujimoto *et al.* [6] proposed a Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay (LAP) algorithm, which describes the loss function in segments. LAP suppresses the sensitivity of the quadratic Loss to outliers, and stops the further expansion of the error. In order to solve the uncertainty caused by large TD error, Saglam *et al.* [7] proposed an inverse sampling method to select samples with smaller TD errors for model training, which increases the training stability. Based on [2] [6], we proposed an Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay (ALAP) algorithm in the previous work [8], which utilizes Self-Attention network to construct a non-linear mapping relationship between β and training progress to further narrow the estimation deviation. Although the above works alleviate the error caused by PER to some extent, but they do not address the root cause of the error.

In terms of priority assignment, Gao *et al.* [9] constructed a new priority parameter as the criterion for screening transitions, which is composed of reward and TD error. Gruslys [10] takes advantage of the temporal locality of neighboring observations to set replay priority more efficiently. The work [11] exploits attention network to calculate the similarity between the states in buffer and the current one, and the transition with more similar state is preferred to be selected. Brittain *et al.* [12] proposed a algorithm called Prioritized Sequence Experience Replay (PSER), which increases the priority of the adjacent transitions before the goal (the transition with max TD error). The existing priority assignment methods are too singular in the setting of sample screening, which restricts the diversity of transitions. In this case, the overfitting and overestimation issues are easy to occur.

In order to solve the above problems, this paper proposes an novel algorithm called Directly Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay (DALAP) that based on ALAP. Firstly, we theoretically prove the positive correlation between the estimation error caused by shifted distribution and the hyperparameter β . After that, DALAP exploits the parallel Self-Attention network integrate with the Double-Sampling mechanism [8] to calculate the distribution similarity of random uniform sampling (RUS) and priority based sampling (PS), simultaneously. On this basis, the Similarity-Increment (SI) generated by PS is solved by making the difference of

the sample similarity between the two sampling methods. The alteration degree of the shifted distribution is accurately quantified by SI, so as to fit a more accurate β to eliminate the error from the root.

To screen out samples that are more worthy of learning, we propose an Priority-Encouragement (PE) mechanism, which affirm the neighboring transitions before the goal are also possess some learning value. We increase the frequency they are visited by raising their priority, and the priority growth of each transition decays as it moves away from goal under the effect of the decay coefficient ρ . In addition, we also design a greedy priority sequence, which makes ρ itself decay to 0 with the advance of training. In other words, the role of Priority-Encouragement will decrease with the progress of training. At the same time, in order to reduce the computational load, we weed out the non-essential items that have no learning value from PE.

As a general training framework for reinforcement learning, DALAP resolves the shortcomings of the existing PER variants in both the estimation deviation and the priority assignment aspects, simultaneously. In order to verify the superiority of DALAP, we integrate it with DQN [13] [14], DDPG [15] [16] and MADDPG [17], respectively, and beat ALAP algorithm in three different environments. The main contribution of this study are shown as follow:

- The theoretical proof of the positive correlation between the shifted distribution caused estimation error and the hyperparameter β is proposed.
- A parallel Self-Attention network is proposed to simultaneously compute the similarity of the sample distributions for two parallel sampling methods. On this basis, the Similarity-Increment due to PS is calculated, which can directly quantify the change degree of the shifted distribution, and fit a more accurate β .
- A Priority-Encouragement mechanism is proposed, which utilizes a greedy priority sequence to improve the priority of the adjacent transition before the goal, and removes the unnecessary items with no learning value from the sequence to reduce the computational load.

In the rest of the article: Section II introduces the basic knowledge and makes a statement about the problem. Section III describes the design process of the DALAP algorithm in detail. Section IV provides the comparative experiment results and analysis. Finally, Section V draws a conclusion of the whole work.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Prioritized Experience Replay

As a non-uniform sampling strategy, PER artificially changes the sampled frequency of the experience transitions, so that the model can learn the important one more frequently. In PER, the sampled probability of each sample i is proportional to its TD error:

$$P(i) = \frac{p_i^\alpha}{\sum_j p_j^\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

where $p_i = |\delta(i)| + \epsilon$ is the priority of transition i . The hyperparameter α is applied to smooth out the extremes, and

a minimal positive constant ϵ is added to make sure that the sampled probability of each transition is greater than 0.

Considering that PER shifts the state-action distribution, the importance sampling weight $w(i)$ is introduced to correct it:

$$w(i) = \left(\frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{P(i)} \right)^\beta, \quad (2)$$

and PER normalizes weights by $1/\max_j w_j$ for stability reason:

$$\bar{w}(i) = \frac{w(i)}{\max_j w(j)}, \quad (3)$$

$$L_{PER}(\delta(i)) = \bar{w}(i)L(\delta(i)). \quad (4)$$

Note that $\bar{w}(i)$ is embedded in formula (4) when updating the network. The hyperparameter β increases linearly from β_0 to 1 as the episode increase, and the deviation caused by shifted distribution will completely compensated when β reaches 1.

B. Loss Adjust Prioritized Experienced Replay

PER uses the Mean Square Error (MSE) as the Loss to update the network, and its sensitivity to outliers is easy to further amplify the deviation. LAP exploits the segmental loss function to deal with TD errors of different sizes:

$$L_{Huber}(\delta(i)) = \begin{cases} 0.5\delta(i)^2 & |\delta(i)| \leq 1, \\ |\delta(i)| & otherwise, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and combined with priority clipping scheme to alleviate the deviation:

$$P(i) = \frac{\max(|\delta(i)|^\alpha, 1)}{\sum_j \max(|\delta(j)|^\alpha, 1)}. \quad (6)$$

It can be seen from fomular (5) that LAP utilizes different loss functions to update the network in the face of different sizes of TD errors. The MSE is applied as the loss when the absolute value of TD error is less than or equal to 1, and MAE is used in other cases to suppress the sensitivity to outliers. It is worth noting that when MSE is executed, the priority of transition i is clipped to 1, which means the uniform sampling is carried out with a sampled probability of $\frac{1}{N}$ according to fomular (6).

C. Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay

PER ignores the bias generated during the training process, and only focuses on the unbiasedness of the convergence stage. It believes that the error compensation strength should increase with the convergence process (training progress), so PER makes β increases linearly with the episodes increase. However, the training progress is not uniformly distributed on the scale of the episodes, so a linearly varying β may introduce additional errors. ALAP utilizes the similarity of transitions to quantify the training progress, and proposes an improved Self-Attention network (SAN), which can calculate the similarity of the distribution in buffer:

$$Self-Attention(Q, K) = softmax\left(\frac{Q \bullet K^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right), \quad (7)$$

$$Q \bullet K^T = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{(q_i \cdot k_i)}{|k_i|}. \quad (8)$$

The input of the Self-Attention network is the mini-batch sized state-action pair sequence $X = [(s_1, a_1), \dots, (s_m, a_m)]$, and the output is the similarity of the internal elements of X . In the formula (7) and (8), $Q = XW_Q$, W_Q represents the initial weight matrix of Q , and the elements in Q are randomly rearranged (by shuffle operation) to get $K = \text{shuffle}(Q)$. According to formula (8), ALAP computes the similarity of the corresponding vectors q_i and k_i through vector projection, and estimates the similarity between Q and K by summing all the projected values, which is represented by $Q \bullet K^T$.

In addition, since PS uses fixed criterion to screen out samples, the sample distribution in X does not reflect the original one in the buffer D . Therefore, ALAP proposes a Double-Sampling (DS) mechanism based on mirror buffer D^* , where the algorithm simultaneously adopts two parallel sampling methods: RUS is responsible for providing inputs for Self-attention, and PS provides high-quality training samples for the model. The mirror buffer has the same data distribution as the original one, which ensures the stability of the parallel sampling.

D. Prioritized Sequence Experience Replay

PSER records the transition with max TD error in buffer as the goal G , and gives some priority growth to each neighboring transitions before G :

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n-1} &= \min(p_n \rho + p_{n-1}, \max_n p_n) \\ p_{n-2} &= \min(p_n \rho^2 + p_{n-2}, \max_n p_n) \\ &\dots \\ p_{n-i} &= \min(p_n \rho^i + p_{n-i}, \max_n p_n), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Where ρ represents the decay coefficient, p_n is the priority of G , and P_{n-i} is the priority of the transition that is located i steps before G in the sample sequence. Note that the priority growth $p_n \rho^i$ of each transition will decay as their distance from G increases. To avoid the computation waste, the growth decay has a threshold of 1% p_n , after which the decay will stop. PSER set a window W to realize this function by limiting the times of decay:

$$p_n \rho^W \leq 0.01 p_n, W \leq \frac{\ln 0.01}{\ln \rho} \quad (10)$$

III. DIRECTLY ATTENTION LOSS ADJUSTED PRIORITIZED EXPERIENCE REPLAY

This section will describe the design process of DALAP algorithm from three parts: theoretical foundation, Parallel Self-Attention network, and Priority-Encouragement mechanism.

A. Theoretical Foundation

We start our algorithm design by establishing the theoretical foundation of the DALAP training framework, which proves the positive correlation between the estimation error and the

hyperparameter β . We first introduce the **Theorem 1**, which is identified by Saglam *et al.* (2022) to support our argument.

Theorem 1. If δ_θ is the TD error that is relevant to the Q_θ network, then there exists a transition tuple $\tau_t = (s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1})$ with $\delta_\theta \neq 0$ so that if the magnitude of TD error on τ_t increases, the magnitude of estimation error of Q_θ on at least τ_t or τ_{t+1} will increase as well:

$$|\delta(\tau_t)| \propto \underbrace{|Q_\theta(s_i, a_i) - Q^*(s_i, a_i)|}_\varepsilon; i = t \vee t + 1, \quad (11)$$

where ε stands for the estimation error. $Q_\theta(s_i, a_i)$ and $Q^*(s_i, a_i)$ are estimated and optimal values under policy π , respectively. We now follow the **Theorem 1** to prove our conclusion **Lemma 1**. For ease of description, we use \uparrow and \downarrow to define the increase or decrease of values in the whole process of the proof, respectively.

Lemma 1. The estimation error caused by shifted distribution ε_t is positively correlated with the hyperparameter β , which is applied to regulate the error correction strength:

$$\varepsilon_t \propto |\delta(\tau_t)| \propto \beta. \quad (12)$$

proof. We should first clarify that in PER, ε_t is the main part of ε , so we ignore the rest of ε that is much smaller than ε_t , and it's easy to obtain $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon \propto |\delta(\tau_t)|$ according to formula (11). Then, bringing formula (2) into (3) yields:

$$\bar{w}(i) = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{P(i)}\right)^\beta}{N \cdot \left(\frac{1}{N} \cdot \frac{1}{\min(P(j))}\right)^\beta} = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\frac{\min(P(j))}{P(i)}\right)^\beta}_{f(\beta)}, \quad (13)$$

where $P(i)$ is a non-zero probability distribution according to formula (1), and it is obvious that $\frac{\min(P(j))}{P(i)} \in (0, 1)$.

When $\varepsilon_t \uparrow$, the $|\delta(\tau_t)|$ will \uparrow as well, which leads the loss $L(\delta(\tau_t)) \uparrow$ eventually. In addition, we've already known that $L_{PER}(\delta(\tau_t)) = \bar{w}(t)L(\delta(\tau_t))$ from formula (4), and our goal is to minimize the loss $L_{PER}(\delta(\tau_t))$ as the optimization direction. Since $|\delta(\tau_t)|$ is \uparrow at the current step, the only way to $\downarrow L_{PER}(\delta(\tau_t))$ is $\downarrow \bar{w}(i)$. We can easily deduce that $\bar{w}(i) \propto f(\beta)$ as $\frac{1}{N}$ is a positive constant. Considering that $\frac{\min(P(j))}{P(i)} \in (0, 1)$, the $f(\beta)$ is the exponential function with $\frac{\min(P(j))}{P(i)}$ as the base, which decreases monotonously within the range of β . That is to say, you need to $\uparrow \beta$ to meet the requirement of \downarrow both $\bar{w}(i)$ and $f(\beta)$. Therefore, $\beta \uparrow$ as the $|\delta(\tau_t)| \uparrow$. So far, we demonstrate the positive correlation between $|\delta(\tau_t)|$ and β : $|\delta(\tau_t)| \propto \beta$.

To sum up, we draw our conclusion $\varepsilon_t \propto |\delta(\tau_t)| \propto \beta$ in the basis of $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon \propto |\delta(\tau_t)|$ and $|\delta(\tau_t)| \propto \beta$. The key point of DALAP is to find a more accurate β to compensate the estimation error, and this could be figured out if we can quantify the ε_t .

B. Design of Parallel Self-Attention Network

ALAP follows PER's idea of error compensation, which argues that the compensation strength should increase with the training progress. However, this approach only emphasizes the unbiasedness at the convergence stage and ignores the error

effect in the remaining part. What's more, ALAP is unable to directly calculate the extent to which PER shifts the state-action distribution, and does not address the root cause of the problem.

To resolve this problem, a Parallel Self-Attention Network (PSAN) is proposed on the basis of the Self-Attention network (SAN) that is applied in ALAP [8]. The PSAN can directly quantify the influence of PER on the distribution to calculate ε_t , and fit a more accurate β according to **Lamma 1**.

As training progresses, the agent tend to exploit rather than explore. In other words, given a state, the agent may choose roughly the same action, at which point the transitions generated by the agent interacting with the environment will gradually become similar. We denote this training-generated similarity as I_t . When the input of SAN is the transitsons provided by RUS, this random uniform sampling method ensures the consistency of sample distribution between mini-batch and experience pool, so the output is I_t in this case. When PS is used as the input to SAN, the output of SAN at this point is similarity I_p . It is worth noting that I_p consists of two parts, one is the sample similarity brought by training itself (I_t); the other is the Similarity-Increment brought by PS screening samples with a fixed criterion, which we denote as Δ_i . It is obvious that when we remove the similarity I_t that generated by training in I_p , the remain part is the Similarity-Increment Δ_i due to the use of PS:

$$\Delta_i = I_p - I_t, \quad (14)$$

where the Similarity-Increment Δ_i quantify the extent to which PER changes the state-action distribution, and this change is the root cause of the estimation error ε_t . As a result, we obtain:

$$\Delta_i \propto \varepsilon_t \propto \beta, \quad (15)$$

and we can get the exact β after normalizing Δ_i according to formular (15).

Clearly, if we know I_p and I_t , we can calculate Δ_i according to formula (14). However, the SAN adopted by ALAP can only compute one of them individually, which is the reason we design PSAN. PSAN expands the network structure of SAN by adapting the single-input single-output system (SISO) to multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO). PSAN has two parallel SAN networks, which can simultaneously receive two different data sources (RUS, PS) provided by the Double-Sampling mechanism, and compute the I_p and I_t , respectively. The schematic diagram of PSAN is shown in Fig.1.

From Fig.1 we can see, the PSAN contains two SAN that share the same network structure, the hyperparameter β can be obtained after entering Δ_i into the normalization layer Π .

C. Design of Priority-Encouragement Mechanism

The preceeding paragraphs III-A and III-B improve PER mainly in terms of reducing estimation deviation, while this subsection will improve PER with respect to priority assignment.

PS adopts a singular sample selection criterion, and is approximately greedy of selecting the sample with the largest TD error for training, which makes training samples too single




Fig. 1. Parallel Self-Attention Network.

and easy to bring overfitting. When facing the sparse reward [18] [19] environment, since the absolute value of TD error corresponding to most transitions is very small at the beginning of training, it will aggravate the greedy characteristic of PS on sample selection if the mini-batch size is small as well.

In order to address this problem, we propose a Priority-Encouragement (PE) mechanism, which enriches sample diversity by adding priority to samples with small TD error but still have some value to learn. PE follows the basic conclusions and variable symbol settings of PSER in II-D. It believe that the adjacent transitions before reaching the goal G also have some learning value, even if their TD errors are small. Therefore, we give these transitions some priority growth, which will decay as their distances from G increase under the effect of the decay coefficient ρ :

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n-1} &= \min(p_n \rho + p_{n-1}, p_n) \\ p_{n-2} &= \min(p_n \rho^2 + p_{n-2}, p_n) \\ &\dots \\ p_{n-i} &= \min(p_n \rho^i + p_{n-i}, p_n), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where p_n denotes the priority of G . Different from PSER, PE brodens the range of G . PSER only labels the transition with the highest priority in buffer as G , which limits the diversity of the training samples. In addition, in the sparse reward environment, the initial TD error of most transitions in buffer is close to 0, which is because the reward value of most states are 0, and the estimated Q function based on reward expectation is also close to 0. Therefore, it can be seen that the TD error consisting of Q and the instant reward r_t is close to 0 as well, according to formular (17):

$$\delta(\tau_t) = r_t + \gamma Q_\theta(s_t + 1, a_t + 1) - Q_\theta(s_t, a_t). \quad (17)$$

In this condition, the transitions in the buffer have almost the same priority, at which time the priority of G ($\max_n p_n$), according to formular (9) has no significant advantage over other transitions. In other words, G , at this moment, is probably not the most worthwhile sample to learn, and the priority propagation based on G alone is likely to cause an overestimation problem. PE builds on PSER by extending the scope of G to all transitions in the mini-batch excluding

the item where the minimum priority is located. That is, we believe that almost all the samples screened out by PS can be used as the goal G . One point to emphasize here is that PER constructs a non-zero probability distribution rely on ϵ , which gives all samples a chance to be selected, according to formular (1). For samples with small TD errors, this chance is small, but does exists. Obviously, such samples are not what we need for G , and the transitions adjacent to them should not be assigned additional priority. As a result, we avoid this chance by excluding the smallest priority term in the mini-batch from G .

To relieve the computation load, we follow the window W exploited by PSER to limit the number of decays. In addition, considering that the agent’s choice between exploration and exploitation will gradually favour the latter as the training progresses, and its need for sample diversity will diminish as the number of exploration decreases. Hence, we propose a greedy encourage strategy that progressively weakens the strength of priority encouragement through a decreasing decay coefficient ρ :

$$\rho = \rho_0(1 - e/e_{total}), \quad (18)$$

where ρ_0 represents the initial value of ρ . e and e_{total} denote current and total episodes, respectively. At this point, we have completed the design of DALAP, and its running flow can be found in **Algorithm 1**.

IV. EXPERIMENT

In order to demonstrate the outstanding performance of DALAP, we embed it into DQN, DDPG, and MADDPG, respectively, and compare it with ALAP in the corresponding **OPENAIgym** [20] [21] environments such as **cartpole-v0**, **simple**, **simple_tag**, etc. In addition, to further demonstrate the stability of DALAP, and to exclude the interference of some accidental results. The comparison experiments will be carried out under different mini-batch configurations in each environment. In each case, we have run 20 tests, and set a 50% confidence interval to draw the confidence band, which can describe the magnitude of training variance for each algorithm.

A. Results with DQN

In **cartpole-v0**, DQN will be used as a carrier for each training framework, and we compare DALAP, ALAP, LAP, and PER after integrating them with DQN, respectively. All these training frameworks only change the training mode of the model, and do not modify its basic network structure. At the same time, to ensure that the training method is the only difference in the comparison test, all the algorithms share the uniform hyperparameter configuration. During training, these algorithms will excute different sampling manners to draw mini-batch samples from the corresponding experience pool of volume 2×10^4 . The model is consturcted by 3-layer ReLU MLP with 24 units per layer. The total episodes of training, the maximum simulation step, and the maximum reward value are all 200. Furthermore, the adam optimizer will be exploited for network updating with learning rate and discount factor of 0.001 and 0.99, respectively.

Algorithm 1 DALAP Algorithm

Input: mini-batch m , step-size σ , replay period K , buffer sotrage N , exponent α and β , budget T , tiny positive contant ϵ .

- 1: Initialize replay buffer $D = \emptyset$, mirror replay buffer $D^* = \emptyset$, $p_1 = 1$, $\Delta = 0$
- 2: Observe environment state s_0 and choose action a_0
- 3: **for** $t=1$ **to** T **do**
- 4: Observe s_t, r_t, γ_t
- 5: Store transition $(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, r_t, \gamma_t, s_t)$ in D
- 6: Store transition $(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, r_t, \gamma_t, s_t)$ in D^*
- 7: **if** $t > K$ **then**
- 8: **for** $t=1$ **to** K **do**
- 9: Sample transition $j \sim P(j) = p_j^\alpha / \sum_i p_i^\alpha$
- 10: Obtain transitions S with mini-batch m from D by PS for model training
- 11: Obtain goal transtions G after removing the minimum priority term from S
- 12: **for** every G_i in G **do**
- 13: Assign priority growth to the transitions before G_i according to PE
- 14: **end for**
- 15: Obtain transitions S^* with mini-batch m from D^* by RUS
- 16: Obtain β after inputing S and S^* into PSAN
- 17: Compute TD-error δ_j and update transition priority $p_j \leftarrow |\delta(j)| + \epsilon$
- 18: Compute importance sampling weight $\bar{w}(i) = (N \cdot P(j))^{-\beta} / \max_i w(i)$
- 19: Compute weight-change $\Delta \leftarrow \Delta + \bar{w}(j) \cdot \delta(j) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} Q(s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$
- 20: **end for**
- 21: Update weights $\theta \leftarrow \theta + \sigma \cdot \Delta$, reset $\Delta = 0$
- 22: Copy parametes to target network $\theta_{target} \leftarrow \theta$
- 23: **end if**
- 24: Choose action $a(t) \sim \pi_{\theta}(s_t)$
- 25: **end for**

Fig.2 describes the average reward curves of different training frameworks combined with DQN, and it is very clear to see that DALAP converges faster and has higher steady-state rewards, which gives it a better performance compared to other algorithms. DALAP has the smallest confidence bands throughout the training process under different mini-batch configurations, which suggests its excellent stability. When mini-batch=128, DALAP has the equivalent convergence speed and steady-state rewards as ALAP, but its confidence band is much smaller than ALAP, indicating that DALAP possesses a smaller training variance at this point.

B. Results with DDPG

Similar to **cartpole-v0**, DDPG only plays the role of a training framework carrier in **simple**. Considering the increased complexity of the environment, we adjusted the sample volume of the experience pools D and D^* to 10^6 , and they will provide training samples for the 3-layer ReLU MLP network




Fig. 2. Mean rewards of different training frameworks integrated with DQN.

that accommodates 64 neurons per layer. During training, the agent rewarded for approaching landmark. The total episodes of training are 2000, the maximum simulation step is 25. The learning rate and the discount factor are 0.001 and 0.95, respectively.

Fig.3 describes the average reward curves for different training frameworks integrated with DDPG, and DALAP exhibits the fastest convergence speed with the smallest training variance under all different mini-batch configurations. In the early stage of training, the confidence band of DALAP is much narrower than that of other algorithms, which indicates DALAP is effective in suppressing the estimation bias due to PS.

C. Results with MADDPG

The training framework carrier in **simple_tag** is MADDPG. **simple_tag** will follow the model network structure, hyperparameter configuration and experience pool volume setting in **simple**. Unlike DQN and DDPG, MADDPG is a multi-agent algorithm, and the agents in **simple_tag** will be divided into two camps of a pursuit-escape relationship. Both pursuers and evaders adopt the zero-sum reward shaping, and the reward value is determined by the relative distance.

Fig.4 describes the average reward curves for different training frameworks integrated with MADDPG. It is obvious that DALAP outperforms other algorithms under any mini-batch configurations. When mini-batch=64, although the variance of DALAP is equal to that of ALAP, the steady-state rewards of DALAP is much higher than the rest of the algorithms. In other cases, DALAP has the faster convergence speed, and the smaller training variance.

With the above experimental results, we have fully demonstrated the great advantages of DALAP in terms of convergence speed and stability. Meanwhile, DALAP can be applied to value-function based, policy-gradient based, and multi-agent algorithms, which shows its generality.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we propose an advanced and generalized reinforcement learning training framework called DALAP, which greatly improves the convergence rate and stability of the algorithm. First of all, we theoretically prove the positive

correlation between the estimation bias and the hyperparameter β . On this basis, we designed a PSAN network to directly quantify the change degree of the shifted state-action distribution, so as to estimate a more accurate β , and fundamentally address the estimation bias problem of PER. In addition, a Priority-Encouragement mechanism is proposed to screen out more high-quality transitions with learning value, which further improves the training speed. Finally, the superior performance of DALAP is verified by comparative tests.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Lin, "Self-improving reactive agents based on reinforcement learning, planning and teaching," *Machine Learning*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 293–321, 1992.
- [2] T. Schaul, J. Quan, I. Antonoglou, and D. Silver, "Prioritized experience replay," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.
- [3] F. Bu, D. Chang, "Double prioritized state recycled experience replay," in *IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics*, pp. 1–6, 2020.
- [4] X. Tao, A. S. Hafid, "DeepSensing: a novel mobile crowdsensing framework with double deep q-network and prioritized experience replay," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 11547–11558, 2020.
- [5] Y. Yue, B. Kang, "Offline prioritized experience replay," *arXiv:2306.05412*, 2023.
- [6] S. Fujimoto, D. Meger, and D. Precup "An equivalence between loss functions and non-uniform sampling in experience replay," in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 14219–14230, 2020.
- [7] B. Saglam, F. B. Mutlu, D. C. Cicek, S. S. Kozat, "Actor prioritized experience replay," *arXiv:2209.00532*, 2022.
- [8] Z. Y. Chen, H. P. Li, and R. Z. Wang, "Attention Loss Adjusted Prioritized Experience Replay," *arXiv:2309.06684*, 2023.
- [9] J. Gao, X. Li, W. Liu and J. Zhao, "Prioritized experience replay method based on experience reward," in *International Conference on Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems Engineering*, pp. 214–219, 2021.
- [10] A. Gruslys, W. Dabney, "The reactor: a fast and sample-efficient actor-critic agent for reinforcement learning," *arXiv:1704.04651*, 2017.
- [11] P. Sun, W. Zhou, and H. Li, "Attentive experience replay," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 5900–5907, 2020.
- [12] M. Brittain, J. Bertram, X. Yang, and P. Wei, "Prioritized sequence experience replay," *arXiv:2002.12726*, 2020.
- [13] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nature*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [14] J. Sharma, P. A. Andersen, O. C. Granmo and M. Goodwin, "Deep Q-Learning With Q-Matrix Transfer Learning for Novel Fire Evacuation Environment," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 7363–7381, 2021.
- [15] P. Timothy, J. Hunt, "Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2016.




Fig. 3. Mean rewards of different training frameworks integrated with DDPG.




Fig. 4. Mean rewards of different training frameworks integrated with MADDPG.

- [16] R. Yang, D. Wang, and J. Qiao, "Policy gradient adaptive critic design with Ddynamic prioritized experience replay for wastewater treatment process control," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 3150–3158, 2022.
- [17] R. Lowe, Y. Wu, A. Tamar, J. Harb, O. P. Abbeel, and I. Mordatch, "Multi-agent actor-critic for mixed cooperative-competitive environments," in *Proceedings of the 31th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 6379–6390, 2017.
- [18] H. Zhang, H. Wang, and Z. Kan, "Exploiting transformer in sparse reward reinforcement learning for interpretable temporal logic motion planning," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 4831–4838, 2023.
- [19] H. Zhao, J. Wu, Z. Li, W. Chen, and Z. Zheng, "Double sparse deep reinforcement learning via multilayer sparse coding and nonconvex regularized pruning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 765–778, 2023.
- [20] G. Brockman, V. Cheung, L. Pettersson, J. Schneider, J. Schulman, J. Tang, and W. Zaremba, "Openai gym," *arXiv:1606.01540*, 2016.
- [21] F. Rezazadeh, H. Chergui, L. Alonso, and C. Verikoukis, "Continuous Multi-objective Zero-touch Network Slicing via Twin Delayed DDPG and OpenAI Gym," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 1–6, 2020.