

---

# KEA: Keeping Exploration Alive by Proactively Coordinating Exploration Strategies

---

Shih-Min Yang<sup>1</sup> Martin Magnusson<sup>1</sup> Johannes A. Stork<sup>1</sup> Todor Stoyanov<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) has achieved notable success in continuous control tasks but struggles in sparse reward settings, where infrequent rewards make efficient exploration challenging. While novelty-based exploration methods address this issue by encouraging the agent to explore novel states, they are not trivial to apply to SAC. In particular, managing the interaction between novelty-based exploration and SAC’s stochastic policy can lead to inefficient exploration and redundant sample collection. In this paper, we propose KEA (Keeping Exploration Alive) which tackles the inefficiencies in balancing exploration strategies when combining SAC with novelty-based exploration. KEA introduces an additional co-behavior agent that works alongside SAC and a switching mechanism to facilitate proactive coordination between exploration strategies from novelty-based exploration and stochastic policy. This coordination allows the agent to maintain stochasticity in high-novelty regions, enhancing exploration efficiency and reducing repeated sample collection. We first analyze this potential issue in a 2D navigation task and then evaluate KEA on sparse reward control tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite. Compared to state-of-the-art novelty-based exploration baselines, our experiments show that KEA significantly improves learning efficiency and robustness in sparse reward setups.

## 1. Introduction


Despite the success of deep reinforcement learning (RL) in continuous control tasks, such as robotic manipulation, these methods often rely on manually designed dense rewards (Zhou et al., 2023; Zhou & Held, 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024), which require task-specific domain

expertise. This reliance makes them impractical for real-world applications and difficult to generalize across diverse tasks. To reduce the reliance on handcrafted dense rewards, early works have focused on sparse reward settings, where rewards are rare or difficult to obtain. While this reduces the need for expert-designed dense rewards, it makes learning inefficient due to the lack of informative reward signals. In this setting, basic RL exploration methods, such as stochastic sampling (Tokic, 2010; Bridle, 1989) and unstructured additive noise (Silver et al., 2014), often fail because the agent struggles to identify beneficial actions with limited feedback. In this context, Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) (Haarnoja et al., 2018) has demonstrated significant success in continuous control tasks (Zhou et al., 2023; Zhou & Held, 2023; Yang et al., 2022) by optimizing both exploration and exploitation through its stochastic policies. However, in sparse reward settings, even SAC struggles due to the lack of sufficient reward signals, resulting in inefficient exploration.

Previous works (Ng et al., 1999; Hu et al., 2020; Ladosz et al., 2022) applied reward shaping to mitigate this inefficiency. However, shaped rewards can misalign the agent’s objective from the true objective of the task (Irpan, 2018; Popov et al., 2017). Solving sparse reward tasks is crucial to ensure that agents learn the correct objectives. One promising solution to the challenge of sparse rewards is to augment (extrinsic) rewards with intrinsic rewards, purposefully designed to encourage exploration. Curiosity-based methods (Pathak et al., 2017; Burda et al., 2018a) leverage a learned dynamics model of the environment to predict future states, deriving intrinsic rewards from the prediction errors. Similarly, novelty-based methods (Burda et al., 2018b; Badia et al., 2020) compute intrinsic rewards based on the novelty of visited states, encouraging the agent to explore unfamiliar regions. However, while unvisited states may offer high intrinsic rewards, the agent cannot identify them due to a lack of prior experience. As a result, novelty-based methods primarily encourage revisiting previously known states with high intrinsic rewards, lacking a mechanism to drive exploration of entirely unvisited states.

To address this inefficiency, NovelD (Zhang et al., 2021), combines novelty differences with episodic counting-based bonuses to encourage exploration at the boundary between

<sup>1</sup>Department of AASS, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden. Correspondence to: Shih-Min Yang <shih-min.yang@oru.se>.



**Figure 1. Interactions between exploration strategies.** Exploration behavior is influenced by two primary factors: novelty-based intrinsic rewards, which drive exploration toward novel states; and stochasticity in the policy, often maintained through entropy. Each histogram shows action probabilities for *move right*, *move left*, *move up*, and *move down* at different stages: (1) High intrinsic rewards encourage the agent to repeatedly visit this region. (2) As intrinsic rewards in this region decrease, increasing entropy increases the likelihood of exploring unvisited states. (3) After discovering unvisited states, high intrinsic rewards drive the agent to exploit them, focusing on revisiting these newly discovered areas.

explored and unexplored regions, thus increasing the likelihood of crossing into unknown space by chance.

While novelty-based methods have been shown to improve exploration when coupled with an on-policy RL method such as PPO (Schulman et al., 2017), applying these intrinsic reward-based methods to sample-efficient modern off-policy learning algorithms presents additional challenges. A prominent example is Soft Actor-Critic (SAC), a highly successful off-policy algorithm that optimizes both exploration and exploitation through stochastic policy sampling. However, SAC’s exploration is inherently driven by stochastic policy sampling rather than intrinsic rewards, which can lead to unintended interactions when combined with novelty-based methods due to the lack of explicit coordination between exploration strategies. In particular, novelty-based exploration and SAC’s stochastic policy can overlap or interfere, alternately dominating the agent’s behavior. As shown in Fig. 1, relying on natural shifts between these strategies can result in delays and inefficiencies: the agent may repeatedly revisit previously explored states with high intrinsic rewards instead of exploring unvisited ones, leading to redundant experience collection and inefficient exploration. To enable more effective exploration, a mechanism is needed for dynamic and effective coordination between exploration strategies to mitigate these risks.

In this paper, we propose KEA (Keeping Exploration Alive) to address inefficiencies arising from the complex interactions between novelty-based exploration and stochastic policy exploration. KEA proactively coordinates different exploration strategies, resulting in consistent exploration behavior, maintaining diversity in exploration, and preventing the agent from repeatedly revisiting explored states.

To implement proactive coordination, we first introduce an additional co-behavior agent (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) that works

alongside SAC, which incorporates existing novelty-based exploration (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ ). Then, we introduce a switching mechanism based on state novelty, which dynamically shifts control between  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ . Additionally, KEA leverages off-policy RL, enabling data collection using multiple exploration and action policies. This allows us to use distinct exploration strategies (from  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) to gather diverse data from the environment.

We evaluate our method in two experimental settings (Section 3). First, we analyze a 2D navigation task with sparse rewards to study the underlying challenges of novelty-based exploration. Then, we test KEA on the DeepMind Control Suite (Tassa et al., 2018) using sparse rewards in continuous control tasks. In the 2D navigation task, KEA substantially improves learning efficiency by proactively coordinating exploration strategies. Similarly, in the more challenging tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite, KEA improves performance over both RND (Burda et al., 2018b) and Nov-eID (Zhang et al., 2021) in three continuous control tasks.

Beyond SAC, we also investigate KEA’s generalization to other off-policy RL methods by applying it to Deep Q-Networks (DQN) (Mnih, 2013) and Soft Q-Learning (SQL) (Haarnoja et al., 2017). Our findings reveal that KEA is most effective in settings where the original exploration strategy interacts with novelty-based exploration. This demonstrates KEA’s potential beyond SAC, highlighting its ability to across different off-policy RL methods.

Our main contributions are as follows: (1) We analyze a potential problem when combining SAC with novelty-based exploration, where the complex interactions between the exploration strategies may cause inefficiencies. (2) We propose a method that proactively coordinates exploration strategies, improving exploration efficiency and consistency. KEA is simple to integrate with existing novelty-based ex-




Figure 2. **Overview.** KEA introduces an additional co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) that works alongside and complements a novelty-based SAC agent ( $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$ ). A switching mechanism ( $\psi$ ) proactively coordinates between  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$  based on the current state novelty computed by the novelty-based model. The stochastic policies,  $\pi^{\text{SAC}}$  and  $\pi^B$ , are derived from  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ , respectively.

ploration methods, offering broad applicability.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Background

A Markov Decision Process (MDP) is represented by the state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , action  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , transition function  $\mathcal{T} : (s, a) \rightarrow s'$ , reward function  $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and discount factory  $\gamma$ . The agent’s goal is to find a policy  $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  that maps the state  $s_t$  to the action  $a_t$  for maximizing the sum of expected rewards. In this paper, we consider a setup where the primary reward of interest (the “extrinsic” reward) is a sparse binary signal, supplemented by dense “intrinsic” rewards calculated by an intrinsic reward model. In KEA, we denote the overall reward for  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  at each time step  $t$  as  $r_t = \beta^{\text{ext}} r_t^{\text{ext}} + \beta^{\text{int}} r_t^{\text{int}}$ , where  $r_t^{\text{ext}}$  represents the extrinsic reward from the environment,  $r_t^{\text{int}}$  is the intrinsic reward from novelty-based exploration model, and  $\beta^{\text{ext}}$  and  $\beta^{\text{int}}$  are scaling hyperparameters. The overall reward for  $\mathcal{A}^B$  at each time step  $t$  is  $r_t = \beta^{\text{ext}} r_t^{\text{ext}}$ , incorporating only the extrinsic reward.

### 2.2. Overview

As Fig. 2, we introduce a co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ), which works alongside  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$ , providing a complementary exploration strategy to address inefficiencies caused by the complexity of interactions between the exploration strategies. To coordinate  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ , we devise a switching mechanism, denoted as  $\psi$ , which dynamically coordinates based on state novelty, measured by the novelty-based model.

In this paper, because Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) (Haarnoja et al., 2018; Christodoulou, 2019) has demonstrated significant success in continuous control tasks, we use it as the base RL agent and leverage Random Network Distillation (RND) (Burda et al., 2018b) to compute intrinsic reward

for exploration (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$ ). In an off-policy manner, we can collect transitions with multiple policies while training with another. This allows us to use distinct exploration strategies (e.g.  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) to gather diverse data from the environment.

### 2.3. Exploration Strategies

**Novelty-based Exploration.** Novelty-based exploration encourages the agent to focus on novel states within the explored region, increasing the chances of discovering previously unvisited areas. In this paper, we use SAC as the base RL agent and leverage RND to compute intrinsic rewards that guide this exploration (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$ ). Specifically, the SAC policy is updated to account for both extrinsic rewards (from the environment) and intrinsic rewards (based on novelty), we modify the Soft Bellman update target for the Q network in SAC (Haarnoja et al., 2018) as shown below:

$$y_Q = (\beta^{\text{ext}} r_t^{\text{ext}} + \beta^{\text{int}} r_t^{\text{int}}) + \gamma \left( \min_{\theta'_i} Q_{\theta'_i}(s', a') - \alpha \log \pi^{\text{SAC}}(\cdot | s') \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta^{\text{ext}}$  and  $\beta^{\text{int}}$  are scaling factors for extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. The  $\alpha$  is the temperature parameter controlling the entropy regularization. The  $r_t^{\text{int}}$  is an intrinsic reward computed based on the state novelty, which measures the prediction error of Random Network Distillation (RND), calculated as:

$$r_t^{\text{int}} = \|\hat{f}(s_t; \theta) - f(s_t)\|^2 \quad (2)$$

, where  $f : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$  represents a randomly initialized target network that maps an observation  $s_t$  to an embedding in  $\mathbb{R}^K$ , and  $\hat{f} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$  is a predictor network trained via gradient descent to minimize the expected mean squared error (MSE) with the target network.

**Stochastic Policy via Co-behavior Agent.** We introduce an additional co-behavior agent (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) that works alongside a SAC agent that incorporates existing novelty-based methods for exploration (denoted as  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ ), facilitating smoother coordination between the strategies.  $\mathcal{A}^B$  includes a stochastic policy that maintains high variance by slowing down its gradient updates until extrinsic rewards are obtained, ensuring to have an exploration strategy that always has high stochasticity.

With  $\mathcal{A}^B$  maintaining high variance in its actions, we proactively coordinate  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$  to prevent reliance solely on natural shifts in exploration strategies caused by changes in entropy and intrinsic rewards. This coordination ensures a consistent escape from local minima by maintaining diverse exploration behaviors and mitigating deterministic actions in regions of high novelty but low entropy.

In this paper, we implement  $\mathcal{A}^B$  using another SAC agent to enhance data efficiency by sharing experiences in a unified replay buffer with  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ . During training, experiences are sampled from this shared buffer, and the policy and Q-networks of  $\mathcal{A}^B$  are updated concurrently with those of  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ . The notable difference is that the co-behavior agent is trained using a different reward signal, only taking into account the primary (sparse reward) task, which allows it to retain high entropy for the exploration of unvisited states.

## 2.4. Switching Mechanism

Since our method involves two exploration strategies, we require a mechanism to determine when to use each. The role of the switching mechanism is crucial for proactively coordinating  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ . Simply averaging the action distributions from both agent policies would not be effective, as their objectives may differ significantly. Instead, we design a switching mechanism that adapts based on the novelty of the agent’s current state. This mechanism ensures that  $\mathcal{A}^B$  operates near the boundary between explored and unexplored regions, while  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  frequently revisits relatively novel states within the explored regions.

We define switching criterion as follows:

$$\pi(s_t) = \psi(r_t^{int}, \pi^{SAC}(s_t), \pi^B(s_t)), \quad (3)$$

$$\psi = \begin{cases} \pi^B(s_t) & , \text{ if } r_t^{int} > \sigma \\ \pi^{SAC}(s_t) & , \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $\pi^B$  and  $\pi^{SAC}$  are stochastic policies from  $\mathcal{A}^B$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ , respectively, and  $\sigma$  is a threshold hyperparameter. When the received intrinsic reward falls below the predefined threshold, the agent switches to  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  for novelty-based exploration, which encourages the agent to visit relatively novel areas more often. Conversely, when the received intrinsic reward exceeds the threshold, the agent switches to  $\mathcal{A}^B$ , focusing on stochastic policy exploration to enter

unexplored regions. This switching mechanism provides a proactive coordination of exploration strategies, further improving the exploration efficiency.

## 3. Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the KEA’s performance in several RL tasks with sparse rewards to demonstrate its ability to manage the complex interactions between different exploration strategies and improve overall exploration efficiency.

We begin by testing our method on a 2D Navigation task, where the agent must navigate to a fixed goal position while avoiding obstacles. Next, we analyze the sensitivity of KEA to the switching threshold ( $\sigma$ ), a critical hyperparameter that affects the balance between the co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) and SAC ( $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ ). To evaluate KEA’s generalization to other off-policy RL methods, we conduct additional experiments by applying KEA to methods such as Deep Q-Networks (DQN)(Mnih, 2013) and Soft Q-Learning (SQL)(Haarnoja et al., 2017). Finally, we evaluate KEA on more challenging environments from the DeepMind Control Suite (Tassa et al., 2018) with sparse rewards, which present additional difficulties for exploration in continuous control tasks.

For all experiments (except 3.3), we use Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) as the base RL agent and demonstrate the flexibility of our method by integrating it with two different novelty-based exploration methods. Specifically, we combine SAC with **Random Network Distillation (RND)** (Burda et al., 2018b), denoted as **KEA-RND**, and also with **Novelty** (Zhang et al., 2021), denoted as **KEA-NovelD**. Our method adapts these novelty-based approaches by incorporating a co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) and a dynamic switching mechanism ( $\psi$ ) to proactively coordinate exploration strategies, ensuring more efficient and effective exploration.

Each method is evaluated across five random seeds, with results presented as the mean and standard deviation of episodic return. The primary evaluation metric is mean episodic return, which reflects both task performance and convergence speed. Our results demonstrate that KEA significantly improves exploration efficiency by proactively coordinating exploration strategies, reducing the negative effect of their complex interactions, and enhancing overall learning efficiency.

### 3.1. 2D Navigation Task

**Task Description.** As shown in Fig. 3, the 2D Navigation task involves navigating an agent to a fixed goal position on the right (blue point) while avoiding an obstacle placed in the middle of the environment. The agent’s starting position (green point) is randomly initialized within the left half of the environment, at the beginning of each episode. The environment provides sparse extrinsic rewards, meaning the






Figure 3. *Left*: 2D Navigation task involves navigating an agent from a randomly chosen start (light green circles) to a fixed goal position on the right (blue point) while avoiding an obstacle placed in the middle of the environment. *Right*: Mean episodic returns during training. The shaded area spans one standard deviation.

Method	Mean Episodic Return
SAC	0. $\pm$ 0.
RND	0.235 $\pm$ 0.184
KEA-RND (ours)	<b>0.403 <math>\pm</math> 0.042</b>
NovelD	<b>0.607 <math>\pm</math> 0.042</b>
KEA-NovelD (ours)	0.604 $\pm$ 0.051

Table 1. Mean episodic return (mean $\pm$ std.) in 2D Navigation task.

agent only receives extrinsic rewards when it successfully reaches the goal.

The observation space is discrete, consisting of the agent’s current  $(x, y)$  position, while the action space includes four possible actions: (*move right, move left, move up, move down*). Additionally, the transition function is unknown, and the agent must learn to navigate the environment through trial and error. We implement this environment by Gymnasium (Towers et al., 2024).

**Experimental Setup.** In this experiment, we compare the performance of our method (KEA-RND and KEA-NovelD) against standard SAC, RND, and NovelD, measured by the mean episodic return during training. The training is halted after the agent collects 300,000 transitions from the environment. Our method variants — KEA-RND and KEA-NovelD — use RND and NovelD, respectively, to compute the intrinsic rewards, combined with  $\mathcal{A}^B$  and a dynamic switching mechanism to coordinate exploration strategies. Each method is tested across five random seeds, and we report both the mean and standard deviation of the performance to ensure statistical significance.

**Experimental Results.** As shown in Fig. 3, our method significantly outperforms the baselines. The final performances

Threshold	Mean Episodic Return	$\mathcal{A}^B$ Usage
0.50	0.358 $\pm$ 0.151	0.24
0.75	0.348 $\pm$ 0.033	0.19
1.00	<b>0.407 <math>\pm</math> 0.055</b>	0.14
1.25	0.348 $\pm$ 0.150	0.11
1.50	0.334 $\pm$ 0.167	0.08

Table 2. Mean episodic return (mean $\pm$ std.) of KEA-RND with different switching thresholds.

metrics are summarized in Table 1. KEA-RND achieves a mean episodic return of 0.403  $\pm$  0.042 after 300,000 environment steps, compared to RND’s 0.235  $\pm$  0.184, representing a more than 70% improvement in performance. In the NovelD setup, NovelD reaches a mean episodic return of 0.607  $\pm$  0.042, while KEA-NovelD achieves 0.604  $\pm$  0.051 after 300,000 environment steps. Although the final performance between KEA-NovelD and NovelD is similar, KEA-NovelD converges significantly faster, reaching a return of 0.6 around 190,000 environment steps, whereas NovelD requires 250,000 steps to achieve a similar return. This demonstrates that our method not only maintains exploration efficiency but also improves convergence speed.

### 3.2. Different Switching Thresholds

The switching threshold ( $\sigma$ ) is a critical hyperparameter in KEA that determines the usage of the co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) during training, influencing the balance between  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^B$ .

To analyze KEA’s sensitivity to different switching thresholds ( $\sigma$ ), we evaluate KEA-RND’s mean episodic return on the 2D Navigation task (Section 3.1). As shown in Table 2, varying the switching threshold affects KEA’s performance.




Figure 4. **Performance comparison of KEA across off-policy RL methods.** *Left:* Mean episodic returns during training (shaded area represents one standard deviation). *Right:* Improvement in episodic return from KEA across various off-policy RL methods. **(RND & KEA) - DQN** represents the gain from applying KEA to DQN (KEA-RND-DQN minus RND-DQN). Similarly, **(RND & KEA) - DQN-P** and **(RND & KEA) - SQL** denote improvements in DQN-P and SQL. KEA improves exploration in RND-SQL and RND-DQN-P, where the original exploration strategy interacts with novelty-based exploration, but has minimal impact in RND-DQN due to independent  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration.

Notably, the highest mean episodic return is achieved at  $\sigma = 1.0$ , with a value of  $0.407 \pm 0.055$ . While performance slightly drops at other thresholds, all tested configurations consistently outperform the baseline RND ( $0.235 \pm 0.184$ ). This demonstrates that KEA maintains robust performance across a range of threshold values.

To better understand KEA’s switching behavior, we analyze  $\mathcal{A}^B$ ’s usages across different thresholds (Table 2, column  $\mathcal{A}^B$  Usage). As  $\sigma$  increases, the usage of  $\mathcal{A}^B$  steadily decreases, dropping from 0.24 at  $\sigma = 0.50$  to 0.08 at  $\sigma = 1.50$ . This indicates that a higher threshold restricts  $\mathcal{A}^B$  to states with very high intrinsic rewards, resulting in more frequent reliance on  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ . These findings highlight the trade-off between exploration strategies influenced by  $\sigma$ . Lower thresholds encourage greater usage of  $\mathcal{A}^B$ , promoting more stochastic exploration, while higher thresholds focus on  $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ , leading to more relying on novelty-based exploration.

### 3.3. Generalization to Other Off-Policy RL Methods

In this paper, we primarily focus on SAC, as the interaction between SAC’s stochastic exploration and novelty-based exploration can lead to inefficiencies, which KEA addresses, as demonstrated in Section 3.1. However, a natural question arises: can KEA generalize to other off-policy RL methods? To investigate this, we conducted additional experiments applying KEA to two off-policy methods, Deep Q-Networks (DQN) (Mnih, 2013) and Soft Q-Learning (SQL) (Haarnoja et al., 2017).

DQN employs  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration, where actions are selected randomly with probability  $\epsilon$ , independent of the current best Q-value. In contrast, SQL uses stochastic sampling, where action selection is influenced by all Q-values in the

state. To facilitate direct comparison, we further modified DQN’s  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration to use proportional sampling, where actions are sampled based on their Q-values rather than uniformly. With this modification, the  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration becomes dependent on Q-values in the state.

**Experimental Setup.** We evaluate six configurations: (1) RND-DQN and RND-SQL, incorporating Random Network Distillation (RND). (2) KEA-RND-DQN and KEA-RND-SQL, applying KEA to RND-DQN and RND-SQL. (3) RND-DQN-P and KEA-RND-DQN-P, modifying  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration with proportional sampling. As in previous experiments, training is halted after the agent collects 300,000 transitions, and each method is tested across five random seeds.

**Experimental Results.** As shown in Fig. 4, our results provide key insights into KEA’s generalization across different off-policy RL methods. In the baseline RND-DQN, KEA (KEA-RND-DQN) does not improve performance because  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration selects actions with a fixed probability, independent of novelty-based exploration. Since KEA is designed to coordinate exploration strategies that influence each other, its impact is minimal in this setting. When proportional sampling is introduced in  $\epsilon$ -greedy (RND-DQN-P), performance drops due to the emerging interaction between exploration strategies. However, applying KEA in this setting (KEA-RND-DQN-P) improves performance by proactively coordinating proportional sampling and novelty-based exploration. In SQL-RND, KEA (KEA-RND-SQL) significantly improves exploration efficiency. SQL, like SAC, maintains a stochastic policy that interacts with novelty-based exploration, leading to balance shifts similar to those observed in SAC. By proactively coordinating these strate-

Method	Walker Run Sparse	Cheetah Run Sparse	Reacher Hard Sparse
SAC	0. $\pm$ 0.	0. $\pm$ 0.	715.17 $\pm$ 216.57
RND	287.65 $\pm$ 334.12	512.02 $\pm$ 466.26	790.32 $\pm$ 143.26
KEA-RND (ours)	<b>629.74 <math>\pm</math> 196.75</b>	<b>773.76 <math>\pm</math> 162.74</b>	<b>874.61 <math>\pm</math> 94.58</b>
NovelD	553.26 $\pm$ 191.03	647.29 $\pm$ 382.58	<b>860.40 <math>\pm</math> 76.15</b>
KEA-NovelD (ours)	<b>706.47 <math>\pm</math> 389.23</b>	<b>734.67 <math>\pm</math> 316.95</b>	837.12 $\pm$ 68.95

Table 3. Mean episodic return (mean $\pm$ std.) in three tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite.




Figure 5. Performance on three continuous control tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite. Our method (KEA-RND and KEA-NovelD) performs notably better than baselines in more challenging exploration tasks. The shaded regions indicate the one standard deviation across evaluation runs.




Figure 6. Three tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite (Tassa et al., 2018) are used for evaluation: **Walker Run**, **Cheetah Run**, and **Reacher Hard**. The objective in the first two tasks is to run as fast as possible, while in the third task, the agent must reach a specified goal position.

gies, KEA enhances exploration consistency, resulting in better performance.

These findings suggest that KEA is most effective in scenarios where the base exploration strategy is coupled with novelty-based exploration. Specifically, KEA demonstrates the following order of effectiveness: (1) entropy-regularized (probabilistic) policies, such as SAC and SQL, (2) Q-value proportional exploration within a non-greedy exploration step, as in the modified DQN-P, and (3) basic  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration, where its impact is minimal. This hierarchy reflects the degree of interaction between the original exploration strategy and novelty-based exploration, which KEA is designed to coordinate.

### 3.4. DeepMind Control Suite

**Task Description.** The DeepMind Control Suite (Tassa et al., 2018) is a set of continuous control tasks to evaluate RL algorithms. These tasks simulate various physical environments and require agents to learn complex motor

skills to achieve specified goals. Observation spaces are continuous, consisting of joint positions and velocities, while action spaces are represented as continuous values (e.g., joint torques or forces). The number of observation and action dimensions depends on the specific task.

**Experimental Setup.** In this experiment, we compare the performance of our method (KEA-RND and KEA-NovelD) against standard SAC, RND, and NovelD, measured by the mean episodic return during training. The training is halted after the agent collects 500,000 transitions from the environment. As describe earlier in 3.1, KEA-RND and KEA-NovelD incorporate a co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) and a dynamic switching mechanism to proactively coordinate exploration strategies. They use RND and NovelD, respectively, to compute intrinsic rewards. Each method is tested across five random seeds, and we report both the mean and standard deviation of the performance to ensure statistical significance.

We evaluate the methods on three tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite: **Walker Run Sparse**, **Cheetah Run Sparse**, and **Reacher Hard Sparse** (shown in Fig. 6). In Reacher Hard Sparse, the reward structure is originally sparse. For Walker Run Sparse and Cheetah Run Sparse, rewards are provided sparsely only when the original reward exceeds a certain threshold. The threshold for Walker Run is set at 0.3, while for Cheetah Run, it is 0.35.

**Experimental Results.** As shown in Fig. 5, Walker Run Sparse and Cheetah Run Sparse present significant explo-

ration challenges. Without novelty-based exploration, SAC struggles to reach the goal. In contrast, Reacher Hard Sparse is relatively easier, as SAC can reach the goal even without intrinsic rewards. Besides, novelty-based exploration improves performance across all three tasks, and our method further enhances this performance.

As shown in Table 3, after 500,000 environment steps, KEA-RND achieves significant improvements over RND, with increases of 119%, 51%, and 11% in mean episodic returns across the three tasks. Similarly, KEA-NovelD demonstrates approximately a 10% improvement over NovelD. Although KEA-NovelD shows similar results to NovelD on the Reacher Hard Sparse task, it performs notably better in the more challenging exploration tasks, Walker Run Sparse and Cheetah Run Sparse.

## 4. Related Work

Computing novelty to improve exploration has emerged as a critical component for improving exploration efficiency in sparse reward setups, where extrinsic rewards are limited (Ladosz et al., 2022; Burda et al., 2018a; Kim et al., 2018). These methods complement our work, as KEA can integrate with various curiosity- and novelty-based explorations.

**Prediction Error-based Novelty.** One popular approach is prediction error-based novelty, which measures state novelty by predicting the next state and calculating the error. Stadie et al. (Stadie et al., 2015) compute the error between the predicted and the actual state in the latent space, while ICM (Pathak et al., 2017) measures the prediction error of an agent’s ability to anticipate action outcomes in a learned feature space using a self-supervised inverse dynamics model. RND (Burda et al., 2018b) computes state novelty using prediction error of a randomly initialized network.

**Count-based Novelty.** Count-based novelty methods offer another effective strategy by measuring the novelty based on state visitation frequency. Early works (Bellemare et al., 2016; Ostrovski et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017) use pseudo-counts to estimate state visitation in high-dimensional environments. Machado et al. (Machado et al., 2020) improves upon earlier methods by using the norm of the successor representation for implicit state counts without requiring domain-specific density models.

**Including Episodic Memory.** Some approaches combine episodic memory and lifelong novelty. For example, NGU (Badia et al., 2020) encourages exploration across episodes and throughout training. RIDE (Raileanu & Rocktäschel, 2020) combines forward and inverse dynamics models with episodic count-based novelty to compute intrinsic rewards based on the distance between consecutive observations in the state embedding space. AGAC (Flet-

Berliac et al., 2021) integrates episodic count-based novelty with the KL-divergence between the agent’s policy and an adversarial policy to compute intrinsic rewards.

NovelD (Zhang et al., 2021) combines count-based novelty and novelty difference to encourage uniform and boundary exploration, showing strong results in sparse reward tasks. In this paper, we propose KEA, leveraging NovelD for intrinsic rewards while introducing a co-behavior agent and a switching mechanism to proactively coordinate exploration strategies and improve efficiency.

**Other Exploration Methods.** Beyond prediction and count-based novelty approaches, other exploration methods include adding noise to parameters (Fortunato et al., 2017; Plappert et al., 2017), computing intrinsic rewards via hierarchical RL (Kulkarni et al., 2016), using curriculum learning to guide exploration (Bengio et al., 2009; Portelas et al., 2020), combining self-supervised reward-shaping methods and count-based intrinsic reward (Devidze et al., 2022), using distance-based metrics for reward shaping (Trott et al., 2019), diversifying policies by regularizing the loss function with distance metrics (Hong et al., 2018), and combining a novelty-based exploration method with switching controls to determine which states to add shaping rewards in a multi-agent RL framework (Zheng et al., 2021).

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we present **KEA**, a novel approach to address the challenges of applying novelty-based exploration in SAC. By introducing a co-behavior agent ( $\mathcal{A}^B$ ) that works alongside SAC, which incorporates existing novelty-based methods, like RND and NovelD, for exploration ( $\mathcal{A}^{SAC}$ ). KEA proactively coordinates exploration strategies through a dynamic switching mechanism. This ensures consistent discovery of new regions while maintaining a balance between exploration strategies. Compared to previous methods that rely solely on intrinsic rewards, KEA reduces the complexity arising from the interactions between novelty-based exploration strategy and stochastic policy exploration strategy, leading to a more stable training process. Our experiments on sparse reward tasks from the DeepMind Control Suite demonstrate KEA’s substantial improvement over RND and NovelD, underscoring its effectiveness in balancing different exploration strategies.

While KEA offers several advantages, one limitation is that it is restricted to off-policy learning, as the co-behavior agent shares experiences with the target policy. Nevertheless, we believe KEA provides a principled approach to balancing exploration strategies, advancing exploration in complex environments.



## References

- Badia, A. P., Sprechmann, P., Vitvitskiy, A., Guo, D., Piot, B., Kapturowski, S., Tieleman, O., Arjovsky, M., Pritzel, A., Bolt, A., et al. Never give up: Learning directed exploration strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06038*, 2020.
- Bellemare, M., Srinivasan, S., Ostrovski, G., Schaul, T., Saxton, D., and Munos, R. Unifying count-based exploration and intrinsic motivation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., and Weston, J. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pp. 41–48, 2009.
- Bridle, J. Training stochastic model recognition algorithms as networks can lead to maximum mutual information estimation of parameters. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2, 1989.
- Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Pathak, D., Storkey, A., Darrell, T., and Efros, A. A. Large-scale study of curiosity-driven learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.04355*, 2018a.
- Burda, Y., Edwards, H., Storkey, A., and Klimov, O. Exploration by random network distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12894*, 2018b.
- Christodoulou, P. Soft actor-critic for discrete action settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07207*, 2019.
- Devizze, R., Kamalaruban, P., and Singla, A. Exploration-guided reward shaping for reinforcement learning under sparse rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5829–5842, 2022.
- Flet-Berliac, Y., Ferret, J., Pietquin, O., Preux, P., and Geist, M. Adversarially guided actor-critic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04376*, 2021.
- Fortunato, M., Azar, M. G., Piot, B., Menick, J., Osband, I., Graves, A., Mnih, V., Munos, R., Hassabis, D., Pietquin, O., Blundell, C., and Legg, S. Noisy networks for exploration. *ArXiv*, abs/1706.10295, 2017. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:5176587>.
- Haarnoja, T., Tang, H., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1352–1361. PMLR, 2017.
- Haarnoja, T., Zhou, A., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1861–1870. PMLR, 2018.
- Hong, Z.-W., Shann, T.-Y., Su, S.-Y., Chang, Y.-H., Fu, T.-J., and Lee, C.-Y. Diversity-driven exploration strategy for deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Hu, Y., Wang, W., Jia, H., Wang, Y., Chen, Y., Hao, J., Wu, F., and Fan, C. Learning to utilize shaping rewards: A new approach of reward shaping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15931–15941, 2020.
- Irpan, A. Deep reinforcement learning doesn’t work yet. <https://www.alexirpan.com/2018/02/14/rl-hard.html>, 2018.
- Kim, H., Kim, J., Jeong, Y., Levine, S., and Song, H. O. Emi: Exploration with mutual information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01176*, 2018.
- Kulkarni, T. D., Narasimhan, K., Saeedi, A., and Tenenbaum, J. Hierarchical deep reinforcement learning: Integrating temporal abstraction and intrinsic motivation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Ladosz, P., Weng, L., Kim, M., and Oh, H. Exploration in deep reinforcement learning: A survey. *Information Fusion*, 85:1–22, 2022.
- Machado, M. C., Bellemare, M. G., and Bowling, M. Count-based exploration with the successor representation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pp. 5125–5133, 2020.
- Mnih, V. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*, 2013.
- Ng, A. Y., Harada, D., and Russell, S. Policy invariance under reward transformations: Theory and application to reward shaping. In *Icml*, volume 99, pp. 278–287, 1999.
- Ostrovski, G., Bellemare, M. G., Oord, A., and Munos, R. Count-based exploration with neural density models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2721–2730. PMLR, 2017.
- Pathak, D., Agrawal, P., Efros, A. A., and Darrell, T. Curiosity-driven exploration by self-supervised prediction. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2778–2787. PMLR, 2017.
- Plappert, M., Houthoofd, R., Dhariwal, P., Sidor, S., Chen, R. Y., Chen, X., Asfour, T., Abbeel, P., and Andrychowicz, M. Parameter space noise for exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.01905*, 2017.
- Popov, I., Heess, N., Lillicrap, T., Hafner, R., Barth-Maron, G., Vecerik, M., Lampe, T., Tassa, Y., Erez, T., and Riedmiller, M. Data-efficient deep reinforcement learning for dexterous manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03073*, 2017.

- Portelas, R., Colas, C., Weng, L., Hofmann, K., and Oudeyer, P.-Y. Automatic curriculum learning for deep RL: A short survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04664*, 2020.
- Raileanu, R. and Rocktäschel, T. Ride: Rewarding impact-driven exploration for procedurally-generated environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12292*, 2020.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Silver, D., Lever, G., Heess, N., Degris, T., Wierstra, D., and Riedmiller, M. Deterministic policy gradient algorithms. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 387–395. Pmlr, 2014.
- Stadie, B. C., Levine, S., and Abbeel, P. Incentivizing exploration in reinforcement learning with deep predictive models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.00814*, 2015.
- Tang, H., Houthoofd, R., Foote, D., Stooke, A., Xi Chen, O., Duan, Y., Schulman, J., DeTurck, F., and Abbeel, P. # exploration: A study of count-based exploration for deep reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Tassa, Y., Doron, Y., Muldal, A., Erez, T., Li, Y., Casas, D. d. L., Budden, D., Abdolmaleki, A., Merel, J., Lefrancq, A., et al. Deepmind control suite. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00690*, 2018.
- Tokic, M. Adaptive  $\epsilon$ -greedy exploration in reinforcement learning based on value differences. In *Annual conference on artificial intelligence*, pp. 203–210. Springer, 2010.
- Towers, M., Kwiatkowski, A., Terry, J., Balis, J. U., De Cola, G., Deleu, T., Goulão, M., Kallinteris, A., Krimmel, M., KG, A., et al. Gymnasium: A standard interface for reinforcement learning environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17032*, 2024.
- Trott, A., Zheng, S., Xiong, C., and Socher, R. Keeping your distance: Solving sparse reward tasks using self-balancing shaped rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Yang, Q., Dürr, A., Topp, E. A., Stork, J. A., and Stoyanov, T. Variable impedance skill learning for contact-rich manipulation. *IEEE robotics and automation letters*, 7 (3):8391–8398, 2022.
- Yang, S.-M., Magnusson, M., Stork, J. A., and Stoyanov, T. Learning extrinsic dexterity with parameterized manipulation primitives. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5404–5410. IEEE, 2024.
- Zhang, T., Xu, H., Wang, X., Wu, Y., Keutzer, K., Gonzalez, J. E., and Tian, Y. Noveld: A simple yet effective exploration criterion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25217–25230, 2021.
- Zhang, X., Jain, S., Huang, B., Tomizuka, M., and Romeres, D. Learning generalizable pivoting skills. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5865–5871. IEEE, 2023.
- Zheng, L., Chen, J., Wang, J., He, J., Hu, Y., Chen, Y., Fan, C., Gao, Y., and Zhang, C. Episodic multi-agent reinforcement learning with curiosity-driven exploration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 3757–3769, 2021.
- Zhou, W. and Held, D. Learning to grasp the ungraspable with emergent extrinsic dexterity. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 150–160. PMLR, 2023.
- Zhou, W., Jiang, B., Yang, F., Paxton, C., and Held, D. Hacman: Learning hybrid actor-critic maps for 6d non-prehensile manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03942*, 2023.

## A. Analysis of Varying UTD Ratios

The influence of interaction between exploration strategies is not only affected by the exploration strategies mechanism but also influenced by how aggressively the SAC agent and intrinsic reward model are updated. The Update-to-Data (UTD) ratio affects the evolution of both entropy and intrinsic rewards, thereby impacting the shifting between these exploration strategies.

To evaluate KEA’s ability to coordinate different exploration strategies and mitigate the inefficiency caused by the complexity of interaction between exploration strategies, we conducted an experiment with varying Update-to-Data (UTD) ratios in the 2D Navigation task (shown in Fig. 3). We compare **KEA-RND** with **RND** to evaluate how different UTD ratios (for SAC and RND) affect the overall performances. This comparison highlights how KEA maintains efficient exploration and robustness across a range of UTD ratio settings. We further visualize the training process using a specific example to illustrate how the balance between exploration strategies shifts over time and how these shifts impact exploration performance. Our method demonstrates proactive coordination of exploration strategies, reducing inefficiencies by combining SAC with novelty-based methods, ensuring more consistent and efficient exploration.

### A.1. Experimental Restuls

In this experiment, we varied the UTD ratios by adjusting the number of SAC gradient updates to **8, 16, 32, and 48 times** per transition, while the number of RND updates was set to either **8 or 16 times**. The goal is to observe how the mean episodic return evolves during training, with a total of 300,000 samples collected from the environment.

As shown in the Fig. 7, KEA-RND consistently achieves higher mean episodic returns across all UTD ratios when compared to RND. Specifically, KEA-RND attains its best performance at  $0.403 \pm 0.042$ , whereas RND reaches a lower episodic return of  $0.292 \pm 0.197$ . However, at the highest UTD ratio (**48 updates**), both methods experience a performance decline. Despite this drop, KEA-RND maintains a better performance advantage over RND. Moreover, KEA-RND exhibits smaller standard deviations across all configurations, indicating that it is more robust and stable even as the update intensity increases.




Figure 7. Varying UTD ratios for SAC at **8, 16, 32, and 48**, and for RND at **8 and 16**. *Left*: The final results, where IR-8 and IR-16 represent UTD ratios in RND of 8 and 16, respectively. *Right*: The training curves for all UTD ratios, denoted as **SAC’s-RND’s** (e.g., 8-16 means the UTD ratio in SAC is 8 and in RND is 16).

### A.2. Visualization

In Fig. 8, we visualize intrinsic rewards, entropy, and action probabilities throughout the training process to illustrate how exploration evolves over time. While RND successfully reaches the goal in its best cases for both 48 and 8 gradient updates ((a2) and (b2)), it becomes stuck in local minima in the worst cases ((a1) and (b1)), limiting further exploration. In contrast, KEA-RND consistently reaches the goal across all setups. Compared to RND, KEA-RND maintains higher entropy in regions with high intrinsic rewards, especially before reaching the goal. This demonstrates that our method proactively coordinates different exploration strategies (novelty-based exploration via  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SAC}}$  and stochastic policy via  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{B}}$ ), thereby reducing the negative effect from the complexity of their interaction. As a result, KEA-RND ensures more thorough exploration, decreasing the likelihood of getting stuck in local minima.




Figure 8. Panels (a) and (b) depict RND using 48 and 8 gradient updates, respectively, while panels (c) and (d) show KEA-RND under the same conditions. Additionally, (1) highlights the worst performance across five random seeds and (2) highlights the best. In each sub-figure (e.g., (a1)), intrinsic rewards (left) and entropy (right) are presented at three different stages of training: after collecting 20,000, 100,000, and 300,000 samples. Action probabilities are represented by arrows pointing in different directions. For clarity, we focus on the right part of the environment, which showcases the most interesting exploration behaviors, with unexplored states removed. The central obstacle in the environment is shown in Fig. 3.