

---

# Reproducibility of Benchmarked Deep Reinforcement Learning Tasks for Continuous Control

---

**Riashat Islam**<sup>\*†</sup>

School of Computer Science  
McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
riashat.islam@mail.mcgill.ca

**Peter Henderson**<sup>†</sup>

School of Computer Science  
McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
peter.henderson@mail.mcgill.ca

**Maziar Gomrokchi**

School of Computer Science  
McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
maziar.gomrokchi@mail.mcgill.ca

**Doina Precup**

School of Computer Science  
McGill University  
Montreal, QC, Canada  
dprecup@cs.mcgill.ca

## Abstract

Policy gradient methods in reinforcement learning have become increasingly prevalent for state-of-the-art performance in continuous control tasks. Novel methods typically benchmark against a few key algorithms such as deep deterministic policy gradients and trust region policy optimization. As such, it is important to present and use consistent baseline experiments. However, this can be difficult due to general variance in the algorithms, hyper-parameter tuning, and environment stochasticity. We investigate and discuss: the significance of hyper-parameters in policy gradients for continuous control, general variance in the algorithms, and reproducibility of reported results. We provide guidelines on reporting novel results as comparisons against baseline methods such that future researchers can make informed decisions when investigating novel methods.

## 1 Introduction

Deep reinforcement learning with neural network policies and value functions has had enormous success in recent years across a wide range of domains [1, 2, 3, 4]. In particular, model-free reinforcement learning with policy gradient methods have been used to solve complex robotic control tasks [5, 6]. Policy gradient methods can be generally divided into two groups: off-policy gradient methods, such as Deep Deterministic Policy Gradients (DDPG) [1] and on-policy methods, such as Trust Region Policy Optimization (TRPO) [2].

However, often there are many sources of possible instability and variance that can lead to difficulties with reproducing deep policy gradient methods. In this work, we investigate the sources of these difficulties with both on- and off-policy gradient methods for continuous control. We use two MuJoCo [7] physics simulator tasks from OpenAI gym [8] (Hopper-v1 and Half-Cheetah-v1) for our experimental tasks. We investigate two policy gradient algorithms here: DDPG and TRPO. To our knowledge, there are few works [9] which reproduce existing policy gradients methods in reinforcement learning, yet many use as these algorithms as baselines to compare their novel work against [9, 10, 11, 12]. We use the code provided by in [9] and [10] for TRPO and DDPG

---

<sup>\*</sup>Work done while interning at Maluuba, A Microsoft Company.

<sup>†</sup>These two authors contributed equally.

(respectively), as these implementations are used in several works directly for comparison [12, 10, 9, 13, 14]

**Performance Measures :** We examine the general variance of the algorithms and address the importance of presenting all possible metrics across a large number of trials. Three main performance measures commonly used in the literature are: Maximum Average Return, Maximum Return, Standard Deviation of Returns, and Average Return. However, the first two measures are considered to be highly biased, while the last two are considered to be the most stable measures used to compare the performance of proposed algorithms. Thereby, in the rest of this work we only use the Average Return as our comparison measure unless stated otherwise, with final results displaying all metrics<sup>3</sup>.

**Hyper-parameter Settings :** We also highlight that there can be difficulty in properly fine-tuning hyper-parameter settings, leading to large variations of reported results across a wide range of works as different hyper-parameters are used. As in Tables 2 and 1, this inconsistency within the wide range of reported results makes it difficult to compare DDPG and TRPO as baseline algorithms without careful detailing of hyper-parameters, attention to the fairness of the comparison, and proper tuning of the parameters. Each cited work uses a different set of experimental hyper-parameters for supposed baseline comparisons<sup>4</sup>. Running these algorithms with suboptimal hyper-parameter configurations may result in inaccurate comparisons against these baseline methods. As such, we highlight the significance of tuning various hyper-parameters and assess which of these yield the most significant differences in performance.

Based on our analysis, we encourage that careful consistency should be maintained when reporting results with both of these algorithms, as they are quite susceptible to hyper-parameters and the external sources of variance or randomness.

## 2 Experimental Analysis

We evaluate the off-policy DDPG [1] and on-policy TRPO [2] algorithms on continuous control environments from the OpenAI Gym benchmark [8], using the MuJoCo physics simulator [7]. We empirically show the susceptibility and variance in results due to hyper-parameter configurations on two environments: Hopper ( $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{20}, \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ ) and Half-Cheetah ( $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{20}, \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^6$ ). All experiments<sup>5</sup> are performed building upon the rllab Tensorflow implementation of TRPO [9] and the Q-Prop Tensorflow implementation of DDPG for our experiments [10].

**Experiment Details :** We run all variations for 5000 iterations and average all results across 5 runs. We investigate several hyper-parameters: batch size, policy network architecture, step size (TRPO), regularization coefficient (TRPO), generalized advantage estimation ( $\lambda$ ) (TRPO), reward scale (DDPG), and actor-critic learning rates (DDPG). For each of these hyper-parameters we hold all others constant at default settings and vary the one under investigation across commonly used values. Lastly, we run a final set of experiments using the overall best cross-section of hyper-parameters for 10 trials using random seeds. We do this to investigate whether there is a significant difference in the results just due to variance caused by the random seeds.

For TRPO, the default hyper-parameters which we use are: a network architecture of (100,50,25) with ReLU hidden activations for a Gaussian Multilayer Perception Policy [9]; a step size of 0.01; a regularization coefficient of  $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ; a Generalized Advantage Estimation  $\lambda$  of 1.0 [3]. For DDPG, we use default parameters as follows: a network architecture of (100,50,25) with relu hidden activations for a Gaussian Multilayer Perception Policy [9]; actor-critic learning rates of  $1 \cdot 10^{-3}$  and  $1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ ; batch sizes of 64; and a reward scale of 0.1.

<sup>3</sup>We leave out Maximum Return unaveraged across several trials, we posit this to be an unsuitable metric for reporting results. High-variance policies and environments may yield a vastly larger maximum return in an outlying trial.

<sup>4</sup>hyper-parameters for each paper can be found in detail in the references provided

<sup>5</sup>For code used, see: <https://github.com/Breakend/ReproducibilityInContinuousPolicyGradientMethods>.

## 2.1 Common Hyper-Parameters

First, we investigate several hyper-parameters common to both TRPO and DDPG: policy architecture and batch size. We use the same sets of hyper-parameters as reported in previous works using these implementations in an attempt to reproduce the results reported in these works.

**Policy Network Architecture :** The policy network architecture can play an important role in the maximum reward achieved by the algorithm due to the amount of information storage provided by the network. We use a hidden layer sizes (64,64) as in [2], (400,300) as in [9, 1], and (100,50,25) as in [10] for comparing the results of these algorithms<sup>6</sup>.

Our results can be found in Figures 1 and 2. Notably, the (400,300) architecture significantly outperforms both other smaller architectures for Half-Cheetah and to a less significant extent Hopper as well<sup>7</sup>. This is true for both TRPO and DDPG. However, the architecture which we found to be the best (400,300) is not the one which is used in reporting results for baselines results in [10, 12].




Figure 1: TRPO on Half-Cheetah with different network configurations




Figure 2: DDPG on Half-Cheetah and Hopper on different network configurations

For the Hopper environment, for both TRPO and DDPG, results are not as significantly impacted by varying the network architecture, unlike the Half-Cheetah environment. This is somewhat thematic of what we find across all hyper-parameter variations on Hopper, as will be further discussed later. In particular, our investigation of DDPG on different network configurations shows that for the Hopper environment, DDPG is quite unstable no matter the network architecture. This can be attributed partially to the high variance of DDPG itself, but also to the increased stochasticity of the Hopper task. As can be seen in Figure 2, even with varied network architectures, it is difficult to tune DDPG to reproduce results from other works even when using their reported hyper-parameter settings.

**Batch Size :** The batch size parameter plays an important role in both DDPG and TRPO. In the off-policy DDPG algorithm, the actor and critic updates are made by sampling a mini-batch uniformly

<sup>6</sup>All of these use RELU activations for the hidden layers and a Gaussian MLP Policy.

<sup>7</sup>For TRPO Half-Cheetah using a two-sample t-test on the sample rollouts: against (64,64)  $t = -13.4165, p = 0.0000$ ; against (100,50,25)  $t = -11.3368, p = 0.0016$ . For TRPO Hopper: against (100,50,25)  $t = -0.5904, p = 0.2952$ ; against (64,64)  $t = -1.9081, p = 0.2198$

from the replay buffer. Typically, the replay buffer is allowed to be large. In [1] and [10], a batch size of 64 was used, whereas the original rllab implementation uses a batch size of 32. Our analysis with different mini-batches for DDPG (32, 64, 128) shows that similar performance can be obtained with mini-batch sizes of 32 and 64, whereas significant improvements can be obtained with a batch size of 128.

For TRPO, larger batch sizes are necessary in general. We investigate the same batch sizes as used in [10, 2] of (1000,5000,25000). As expected, a batch size of 25000 produces the best results. As we constrain learning to 5000 episodes, it is intuitive that a larger batch size would perform better in this time frame as more samples are seen. Furthermore, as can be seen in Figure 3 for Half-Cheetah, the smaller batch sizes begin to plateau to a much lower optimum.

By intuition, this may be due to TRPO’s use of conjugate gradient optimization with a KL constraint. With small sample batch sizes, gradients differences between steps may be much larger in a high variance environment and results in a more unstable training regime.




Figure 3: TRPO on Half-Cheetah and Hopper - Significance of batch size




Figure 4: DDPG on Half-Cheetah and Hopper - Significance of the mini batch size

We also highlight that the DDPG algorithm with different batch sizes produces similar results for the Hopper environment. While other works have reported different tuned parameters for DDPG, we establish the high variance of this algorithm, producing similar results with different batch sizes for the Hopper environment, while a larger batch size improves performance in Half-Cheetah as seen in Figure 4.

## 2.2 TRPO-Specific Hyper-Parameters

**Regularization Coefficient :** The regularization coefficient (RC) (or conjugate gradient damping factor) is used as a regularizer by adding a factor of the identity matrix to the Fisher matrix (or finite difference HVP in [9]) during the conjugate gradient step. We investigate a range of values between  $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$  to .1 based on values used in aforementioned works. We don’t see a significant difference<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>Using an average of 2-sample t-test comparisons, the largest difference from the default parameter in Hopper is  $t = 2.8965$ ,  $p = 0.1443$  with  $RC=0.1$  and  $t = 0.8020$ ,  $p = 0.4540$  with  $RC=.0001$ .

in using one particular value of RC over another, though it seems to have a more significant effect on Hopper. Figure 5 shows the average learning graphs for these variations.




Figure 5: Regularization coefficient variations for TRPO. Cited implementation values may use different sets hyper-parameters. See associated works for specific details.

**Generalized Advantage Estimation :** Generalized advantage estimation [3] has been shown to improve results dramatically for TRPO. Here, we investigate using  $\lambda = 1.0$  and  $\lambda = .97$  for this. We find that for longer iterations, a lower GAE  $\lambda$  does in fact improve results for longer sequences in Half-Cheetah and mildly for Hopper<sup>9</sup>. Figure 6 shows the average learning graphs for these variations.




Figure 6: Generalized advantage estimation lambda value variations for TRPO. Cited implementation values may use different sets hyper-parameters. See associated works for specific details.

**Step Size :** The step size (SS) (effectively the learning rate of TRPO) is the same as the KL-divergence bound for the conjugate gradient steps. Here, we find that the default value of 0.01 appears to work generally the best for both Hopper and Half-Cheetah<sup>10</sup>. Figure 7 shows the average learning curves for these variations. The intuition here is the same behind adjusting learning rates in standard gradient optimization methods, though the formulation is through a constraint rather than a learning rate, it effectively has the same characteristics when tuning it.

### 2.3 DDPG-Specific Hyper-Parameters

We investigate two hyper-parameters which are unique to DDPG which previous works have described as important for improving results [9, 10]: reward scale and actor-critic learning rates.

**Reward Scale :** As in [9], all the rewards for all tasks were rescaled by a factor of 0.1 to improve the stability of DDPG. It has been claimed that this external hyper-parameter, depending on the task,

<sup>9</sup>For Half-Cheetah,  $t = 2.9109$ ,  $p = 0.0652$  for last 500 iterations and  $t = 1.9231$ ,  $p = 0.1978$  overall. For Hopper,  $t = 1.9772$ ,  $p = 0.1741$  for last 500 iterations and  $t = -0.1255$ ,  $p = 0.2292$  overall.

<sup>10</sup>Hopper most significant t-test difference from default is  $SS=0.1$  with  $t = 1.0302$ ,  $p = 0.2929$ , and for Half-Cheetah difference from default and  $SS=0.001$   $t = -3.1255$ ,  $p = 0.0404$




Figure 7: Step size variations for TRPO. Cited implementation values may use different sets hyper-parameters. See associated works for specific details.

can make the DDPG algorithm unstable. Experimental results in [10] give indication that DDPG is particularly sensitive to different reward scale settings.




Figure 8: DDPG on Half-Cheetah and Hopper - Significance of the Reward Scaling parameter

Figure 8 shows that even though DDPG performance have been reported to be highly susceptible to the reward scaling parameter, our analysis shows that DDPG does not improve by rescaling the rewards. In fact, for the Half-Cheetah environment, we find that no reward scaling ( $RS=1$ ) yields much higher returns, even though [10] and [9] have reported an optimal reward scale value to be 0.1. Furthermore, we highlight that often for DDPG, learning curves are not shown for all environments and only tabular results are presented, making it difficult to compare how reward scaling has affected results in prior work.

**Actor-Critic Learning Rates :** We further investigate the effects of the actor and critic base learning rates as given in [10] and [9], which both use 0.001, 0.0001 (for the critic, and actor respectively). Interestingly, we find that the actor and critic learning rates for DDPG have less of an effect on the Hopper environment than the Half-Cheetah environment. This brings into consideration that keeping other parameters fixed, DDPG is not only susceptible to the learning rates, but there are other sources of variation and randomness in the DDPG algorithm.

## 2.4 General Variance

We investigate the general variance of multiple trials with different random seeds. Variance across random seeds is of particular interest since it has been noted that in several known codebases, there are implementations<sup>11</sup> for searching for the best random seed to use. In particular, we determine whether it is possible to generate learning curves by randomly averaging trials together (with only the seed varied) such that we see statistically significant differences in the average reward learning curve distributions. Thereby, we wish to determine if it is possible to report significantly worse results

<sup>11</sup>One such example in the codebase we use here: [https://github.com/openai/rlab/blob/master/contrib/rlab\\_hyperopt/example/main.py#L21](https://github.com/openai/rlab/blob/master/contrib/rlab_hyperopt/example/main.py#L21).




Figure 9: DDPG on Half-Cheetah and Hopper - Actor and Critic Learning Rates

on a baseline policy gradient method such as TRPO or DDPG, just by varying the random seed (or significantly better results for the algorithm under investigation by doing so).

We run a total of 10 trials with our best tuned hyper-parameter configurations as examined previously. We randomly average two groups of 5 and plot the results. We find that there can be a significant<sup>12</sup> difference as seen in Figure 10. Particularly for Half-Cheetah it is possible to get training curves that do not fall within the same distribution at all, just by averaging different runs with the same hyper-parameters, but random seeds.




Figure 10: TRPO with best hyper-parameter configurations, with average of 5 runs over 2 different set of experiments under same configuration, producing variant results.

Figure 11 also shows the significance of DDPG instability. Even with fine-tuned hyper-parameter configurations, our analysis shows that stable results with DDPG, on either of the environments cannot be achieved. This further suggests that there might be randomness due to other external sources which affects performance of DDPG on these continuous control tasks.

Our results show that for both DDPG and TRPO, taking two different average across 5 experiment runs do not necessarily produce the same result, and in fact, there is high variance in the obtained results. This emphasizes the need for averaging many runs together when reporting results using a different randoms seed for each. In this way, future works should attempt to negate the effect of random seeds and environment stochasticity when reporting their results.

### 3 Discussion and Conclusion

Tables 1 and 2 highlight results and metrics presented in various related works which compares to TRPO and DDPG (respectively). We include results from an average of 5 runs across the best cross-section of hyper-parameters (based on our previous investigations). We show various metrics

<sup>12</sup>Average 2-sample t-test run across entire training distributions resulting in  $t = -9.0916, p = 0.0016$  for Half-Cheetah and  $t = 2.2243, p = 0.1825$  for Hopper






Figure 11: DDPG with tuned hyper-parameter configurations, with average of 5 runs over 2 different set of experiments under same configuration, producing variant results.

at different numbers of iterations such that a fair comparison can be made against reported results from other works. It can be noted that while some works demonstrate similar results to our own, others vary wildly from our own findings. Furthermore, many works only include the Max Average Return, which can be misleading. Due to the variance we have demonstrated here and the difficulty in reproducing these algorithms, it is extremely important for future works to: (1) report all possible metrics to characterize their own algorithms against TRPO and DDPG (particularly Average Return and Standard Deviation of the returns); (2) report all hyper-parameters used for optimization; (3) attempt to use a somewhat optimal set of hyper-parameters; (4) average results on greater than 5 trials and report how many trials are averaged together<sup>13</sup>. We intend this work to act as both a guide for accomplishing this and a starting point for determining whether observed values are in line with possible best results on Hopper and Half-Cheetah environments for novice researchers in policy gradients.

Environment	Metric	rllab [9]	QProp [10]	IPG [12]	TRPO [2, 3] <sup>14</sup>	Ours	Ours	Ours	Ours
Half-Cheetah	Length (iters)	500	—	—	500	500	1000	2500	5000
	Length (episodes)	~25k	30k	10k	~12.5k	~12.5k	~25k	~62.5k	~125k
	Average Return	1914.0	—	—	3576.08	3576.08	3995.4	4638.52	5010.83
	Max Average Return	—	4734	2889	4855.00	3980.61	4360.77	4889.18	5197.40
	Std Return	120.1	—	—	—	434.78	502.57	419.08	443.87
Hopper	Length (iters)	500	—	—	500	500	1000	2500	5000
	Length (episodes)	~25k	30k	10k	~22k	~12.5k	~25k	~62.5k	~125k
	Average Return	1183.3	—	—	—	2021.34	2285.73	2526.41	2421.067
	Max Average Return	—	2486	—	3668.81	3229.14	3442.26	3456.05	3476.00
	Std Return	150.0	—	—	—	654.37	757.68	714.07	796.58

Table 1: Results and descriptions of reported values by various works using TRPO (Hopper and Half-Cheetah environments) as a baseline. "Length(iters)" denotes algorithm iterations and "Length(episodes)" denotes number of episodes.

We present a set of results, highlighting the difficulty in reproducing results with policy gradient methods in reinforcement learning. We show the difficulty of fine-tuning and the significant sources of variance in hyper-parameter selection for both TRPO and DDPG algorithms. Our analysis shows that these state-of-the-art on-policy and off-policy policy gradient methods often suffer from large variations as a result of different hyper-parameter settings. In addition, results across different continuous control domains are not always consistent, as shown in the Hopper and Half-Cheetah experiment results. We find that Half-Cheetah is more susceptible to performance variations from hyper-parameter tuning, while Hopper is not. We posit that this may be due to the difference in stochasticity within the environments themselves. Half-Cheetah has a much more stable dynamics

<sup>13</sup>Further investigation needs be done to determine the amount of trials ( $N$ ) necessary to ensure a fair comparison (i.e. for what  $N$  would any  $N$ -sample average always result in a similarly distributed returns, unlike as has been demonstrated to be possible in Figure 10)

<sup>14</sup>Results from original implementation evaluation on OpenAI Gym: [https://gym.openai.com/evaluations/eval\\_W27eCzLQBy60FciaSGSJw](https://gym.openai.com/evaluations/eval_W27eCzLQBy60FciaSGSJw); [https://gym.openai.com/evaluations/eval\\_Gudf6XDS2WL76S7wZicLA](https://gym.openai.com/evaluations/eval_Gudf6XDS2WL76S7wZicLA)



Environment	Metric	rlab [9]	QProp [10]	SDQN [11]	Ours	Ours	Ours	Ours
Half-Cheetah	Length (iters)	500	$1e^6$ (steps)	–	500	1000	2500	5000
	Length (episodes)	~25k	30k	10k	~ 12.5k	~25k	~62.5k	~125k
	Average Return	2148.6	–	–	2707.1	3127.9	3547.1	3725.3
	Max Average Return	–	7490	6614.26	3788.2	4029.2	4460.7	4460.7
	Std Return	–	–	–	907.1	784.3	634.9	512.8
Hopper	Length (iters)	500	–	–	500	1000	2500	5000
	Length (episodes)	~25k	30k	10k	~ 12.5k	~25k	~62.5k	~125k
	Average Return	267.1	–	–	790.6	883.6	838.7	857.6
	Max Average Return	–	2604	3296.49	1642.1	1642.1	1642.1	1642.1
	Std Return	–	–	–	367.9	305.2	230.9	213.7

Table 2: Results and descriptions of reported values by various works using DDPG (Hopper and Half-Cheetah environments) as a baseline. "Length(iters)" denotes algorithm iterations and "Length(episodes)" denotes number of episodes.

model, and thus is less variant in failure modes. Hopper, on the other hand, is prone to quick failure modes which introduce larger external variance, possibly making tuning difficult.

Based on our experiments, we suggest that the ML research community requires better fine-tuned implementations of these algorithms with provided hyper-parameter presets. These implementations should have benchmark results for a wide range of commonly used tasks. Our analysis shows that due to the under-reporting of hyper-parameters, different works often report different baseline results and performance measures for both TRPO and DDPG. This leads to an unfair comparison of baselines in continuous control environments. Here, we provide some insight into the impact of different hyper-parameters to aid future researchers in finding the ideal baseline configurations.

However, we also suggest that these algorithms are often susceptible to external randomness, introduced by the environment and other external hyper-parameters (e.g reward scale in DDPG) which makes it quite difficult to reproduce results with these state-of-the-art policy gradient algorithms. As such, we provide the aforementioned recommendations in reporting implementation details (provide all hyper-parameters and number of trial experiments), reporting results (report averages and standard deviations, not maximum returns), and implementing proper experimental procedures (average together many trials using different random seeds for each).

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Joelle Pineau and David Meger for comments on the paper draft. We would like to thank the McGill University Reasoning and Learning Lab and the Mobile Robotics Lab for allowing an engaging and productive research environment. We would also like to thank Alex Lamb and Anirudh Goyal for providing initial feedback on the direction of this work, as part of the ICML Reproducibility in Machine Learning workshop. This work was supported by the *AWS Cloud Credits for Research* program, McGill Graduate Excellence Scholarships, and *NSERC*.

## References

- [1] Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- [2] John Schulman, Sergey Levine, Pieter Abbeel, Michael Jordan, and Philipp Moritz. Trust region policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-15)*, pages 1889–1897, 2015.
- [3] John Schulman, Philipp Moritz, Sergey Levine, Michael Jordan, and Pieter Abbeel. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02438*, 2015.
- [4] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharmashan Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 02 2015.

- [5] Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Darrell, and Pieter Abbeel. End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies. *CoRR*, abs/1504.00702, 2015.
- [6] Shixiang Gu, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Ilya Sutskever, and Sergey Levine. Continuous deep q-learning with model-based acceleration. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2016, New York City, NY, USA, June 19-24, 2016*, pages 2829–2838, 2016.
- [7] Emanuel Todorov, Tom Erez, and Yuval Tassa. Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, IROS 2012, Vilamoura, Algarve, Portugal, October 7-12, 2012*, pages 5026–5033, 2012.
- [8] Greg Brockman, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. Openai gym. *CoRR*, abs/1606.01540, 2016.
- [9] Yan Duan, Xi Chen, Rein Houthoof, John Schulman, and Pieter Abbeel. Benchmarking deep reinforcement learning for continuous control. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2016.
- [10] Shixiang Gu, Timothy Lillicrap, Zoubin Ghahramani, Richard E Turner, and Sergey Levine. Q-prop: Sample-efficient policy gradient with an off-policy critic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02247*, 2016.
- [11] Luke Metz, Julian Ibarz, Navdeep Jaitly, and James Davidson. Discrete sequential prediction of continuous actions for deep rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.05035*, 2017.
- [12] Shixiang Gu, Timothy Lillicrap, Zoubin Ghahramani, Richard E Turner, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Sergey Levine. Interpolated policy gradient: Merging on-policy and off-policy gradient estimation for deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.00387*, 2017.
- [13] Rein Houthoof, Xi Chen, Yan Duan, John Schulman, Filip De Turck, and Pieter Abbeel. Vime: Variational information maximizing exploration. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1109–1117, 2016.
- [14] Aravind Rajeswaran, Sarvejit Ghotra, Sergey Levine, and Balaraman Ravindran. Epopt: Learning robust neural network policies using model ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.01283*, 2016.