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Abstract

This paper presents Memory Augmented Policy Optimization (MAPO): a novel policy optimization formulation that incorporates a memory buffer of promising trajectories to reduce the variance of policy gradient estimates for deterministic environments with discrete actions. The formulation expresses the expected return objective as a weighted sum of two terms: an expectation over a memory of trajectories with high rewards, and a separate expectation over the trajectories outside the memory. We propose 3 techniques to make an efficient training algorithm for MAPO: (1) distributed sampling from inside and outside memory with an actor-learner architecture; (2) a marginal likelihood constraint over the memory to accelerate training; (3) systematic exploration to discover high reward trajectories. MAPO improves the sample efficiency and robustness of policy gradient, especially on tasks with a sparse reward. We evaluate MAPO on weakly supervised program synthesis from natural language / semantic parsing tasks. On the WikiTABLEQUESTIONS benchmark we improve the state-of-the-art by 2.5%, achieving an accuracy of 46.2%, and on the WikiSQL benchmark, MAPO achieves an accuracy of 74.9% with only weak supervision, outperforming several strong baselines with full supervision. Our code is open sourced at https://github.com/crazydonkey200/neural-symbolic-machines.

1 Introduction

There has been a recent surge of interest in applying policy gradient methods to various application domains including program synthesis [24, 15, 62, 9], dialogue generation [23, 10], architecture search [63, 65], game [47, 28] and continuous control [39, 44]. Simple policy gradient methods like REINFORCE [52] use Monte Carlo samples from the current policy to perform an on-policy optimization of the expected return. This often leads to unstable learning dynamics and poor sample efficiency, sometimes underperforming random search [27].

The difficulty of gradient based policy optimization stems from a few sources: (1) policy gradient estimates have a large variance; (2) samples from a randomly initialized policy often attain small rewards, resulting in a slow training progress in the initial phase; (3) random policy samples do not explore the search space efficiently because many samples can be repeated. These issues can be especially prohibitive in applications such as program synthesis and robotics [3], which involve a large search space with sparse rewards. In such tasks, a high reward is achieved only after a long sequence of correct actions. For instance, in program synthesis, only a few programs in the large
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program space lead to the correct functional form. Unfortunately, this often leads to forgetting a high reward trajectory unless it is re-sampled frequently [24].

This paper presents MAPO: a novel formulation of policy optimization for deterministic environments with discrete actions, which incorporates a memory buffer of promising trajectories within the policy gradient framework. It estimates the policy gradient as a weighted sum of an expectation over the trajectories inside the memory and a separate expectation over those outside the memory. The gradient estimates are unbiased and attain lower variance provided that trajectories in the memory buffer have non-negligible probability. Because high-reward trajectories remain in the memory, it is almost impossible to forget them. To make an efficient algorithm for MAPO, we propose 3 techniques: (1) distributed sampling from inside and outside memory buffer in an actor-learner architecture; (2) a constraint on the marginal likelihood of the high-reward trajectories in the memory buffer to accelerate training at the cost of introducing some bias at the initial training stage; (3) systematic exploration of the search space to efficiently discover the high-reward trajectories.

We assess the effectiveness of MAPO on weakly supervised program synthesis from natural language (see Section 2). Program synthesis presents a unique opportunity to study generalization in the context of policy optimization, while having an impact on a real world application. On the challenging WikiTableQuestions [55] benchmark, MAPO achieves an accuracy of 46.2% on the test set, significantly outperforming the previous state-of-the-art of 43.7% [61]. Interestingly, on the WikiSQL [62] benchmark, MAPO achieves an accuracy of 74.9% without the supervision of gold programs, outperforming several strong fully supervised baselines.

2 The Problem of Weakly Supervised Contextual Program Synthesis

Consider the program of learning to map a natural language question x to a structured query a in a programming language such as SQL (e.g., [62]), or converting a textual problem description into a piece of source code, e.g., in python, as in programming competitions (e.g., [4]). We call this family of problems contextual program synthesis and aim at tackling such problems in a weakly supervised setting — i.e., no correct action sequence a is given as part of the training data, and training needs to solve the hard problem of exploring a large program space. Table 1 shows an example question-answer pair. The model needs to first discover the programs that can generate the correct answer in a given context, and then learn to generalize to new contexts.

We formulate the problem of weakly supervised contextual program synthesis as follows: to generate a program by using a parametric mapping function, \( \hat{a} = f(x; \theta) \), where \( \theta \) denotes the model parameters. The quality of a generated program \( \hat{a} \) is measured in terms of a scoring or reward function \( R(\hat{a} \mid x, y) \). The reward function may evaluate a program by executing it on a real environment and comparing the emitted output against the correct answer. For example, it is natural to define a binary reward that is 1 when the output equals the answer and 0 otherwise. We assume that the context \( x \) includes both a natural language input and an environment, for example an interpreter or a database, on which the program will be executed. Given a dataset of context-answer pairs, \( \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N} \), the goal is to find an optimal parameter \( \theta^{*} \) that parameterizes a mapping of \( x \rightarrow a \) with maximum empirical return on a heldout test set.

One can think of the problem of contextual program synthesis as an instance of reinforcement learning (RL) with sparse terminal rewards and deterministic dynamics, for which generalization plays a key role. There has been some recent attempts in the RL community to study generalization to unseen initial conditions (e.g., [40], [32]). However, most prior work aims to maximize empirical return on the training environment [5], [8]. The problem of contextual program synthesis presents a natural application of RL for which generalization is the main concern.

3 Optimization of Expected Return via Policy Gradients

To learn a mapping of \( (\text{context } x) \rightarrow \text{(program } a) \), we optimize the parameters of a conditional distribution \( \pi_{\theta}(a \mid x) \) that assigns a probability to each program given the context. That is, \( \pi_{\theta} \) is a distribution over the countable set of all possible programs, denoted \( \mathcal{A} \). Thus \( \forall a \in \mathcal{A} : \pi_{\theta}(a \mid x) \geq 0 \).
and $\sum_{a \in A} \pi_\theta(a \mid x) = 1$. Then, to synthesize a program for a novel context, one finds the most likely program under the distribution $\pi_\theta$ via exact or approximate inference $\hat{a} \approx \arg\max_{a \in A} \pi_\theta(a \mid x)$.

Autoregressive models present a tractable family of distributions that estimates the probability of a sequence of tokens, one token at a time, often from left to right. To handle variable sequence length, one includes a special end-of-sequence token at the end of the sequences. We express the probability of a program $a$ given $x$ as $\pi_\theta(a \mid x) = \prod_i \pi_\theta(a_i \mid a_{<i}, x)$, where $a_{<i} \equiv (a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1})$ denotes a prefix of the program $a$. One often uses a recurrent neural network (e.g. [13]) to predict the probability of each token given the prefix and the context.

In the absence of ground truth programs, policy gradient techniques present a way to optimize the parameters of a stochastic policy $\pi_\theta$ via optimization of expected return. Given a training dataset of context-answer pairs, $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, the objective is expressed as $E_{a \sim \pi_\theta(a \mid x)} R(a \mid x, y)$. The reward function $R(a \mid x, y)$ evaluates a complete program $a$, based on the context $x$ and the correct answer $y$. These assumptions characterize the problem of program synthesis well, but they also apply to many other discrete optimization domains. Note that these assumptions are required for the exact unbiased gradients, but we expect the MAPO algorithm to benefit many discrete RL benchmarks on which these assumptions apply to a big extent.

**Simplified notation.** In what follows, we simplify the notation by dropping the dependence of the policy parameters on $\theta$. Denoting $\pi(a \mid x)$, $R(a \mid x, y)$, the objective is expressed as $E_{a \sim \pi(a \mid x)} R(a)$.

We express the expected return objective in the simplified notation as,

$$O_{ER}(\theta) = \sum_{a \in A} \pi_\theta(a) R(a) = E_{a \sim \pi(a)} R(a).$$

(1)

The REINFORCE [52] algorithm presents an elegant and convenient way to estimate the gradient of the expected return (1) using Monte Carlo (MC) samples. Using $K$ trajectories sampled i.i.d. from the current policy $\pi_\theta$, denoted $\{a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(K)}\}$, the gradient estimate can be expressed as,

$$\nabla_{\theta} O_{ER}(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nabla \log \pi_\theta(a^{(k)}) \cdot [R(a^{(k)}) - b],$$

(2)

where a baseline $b$ is subtracted from the returns to reduce the variance of gradient estimates. A close-to-optimal form of a baseline is the on-policy average of the returns $\sum_k R(a^{(k)})/K$. This formulation enables direct optimization of $O_{ER}$ via MC sampling from an unknown search space, which also serves the purpose of exploration. To improve such exploration behavior, one often includes the entropy of the policy as an additional term inside the objective to prevent early convergence. However, the key limitation of the formulation stems from the difficulty of estimating the gradients accurately only using a few fresh samples.

There has been various attempts to incorporate off-policy samples within the policy gradient framework to improve the sample efficiency of the REINFORCE and actor-critic algorithms (e.g., [11], [51], [45], [14]). Most of these approaches sample from an old policy and resort to truncated importance correction to obtain a low variance, but biased estimate of the gradients. Previous work has aimed to incorporate a replay buffer into policy gradient in the general RL setting of stochastic dynamics and possibly continuous actions. By contrast, we focus on deterministic environments with discrete actions and develop a formulation resulting in an unbiased policy gradient estimate.

### 4 MAPO: Memory Augmented Policy Optimization

We consider a RL environment with a finite number of discrete actions, deterministic dynamics, and deterministic terminal returns. In other words, the set of all possible action trajectories $A$ is countable, even though possibly infinite, and re-evaluating the return of a trajectory $R(a)$ twice results in the same value. These assumptions characterize the problem of program synthesis, but also apply to many combinatorial optimization domains (e.g., [6]).

Our goal is to optimize the expected return objective (1) via gradient ascent. We assume the access to a memory buffer of trajectories and their corresponding returns denoted $B \equiv \{(a^{(i)}, r^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^M$, where $r^{(i)} = R(a^{(i)})$. Let $B_a$ and $B_r$ denote the action trajectories and the rewards stored in the
memory independently, i.e. $B_d \equiv \{(a^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^{M}$ and $B_r \equiv \{(r^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^{M}$. Our key observation is that one can re-express the expected return objective in terms of a sum of two terms: an enumeration over the memory buffer elements, and a separate enumeration over the unknown trajectories,

$$O_{ER} (\theta) = \sum_{(a,r) \in B} \pi_{\theta} (a) \cdot r + \sum_{a \in (A - B_d)} \pi_{\theta} (a) \cdot R(a),$$

where $A - B_d$ denotes the set of action trajectories not included in the memory. The significance of this decomposition hinges on the fact that one can enumerate the trajectories in the buffer and compute their exact expected reward and its gradient with no variance, and use the budget of MC samples to compute the expectation only in the unexplored part of the space.

Let $\pi_B = \sum_{a \in B_d} \pi_{\theta} (a)$ denote the total probability of the trajectories in the buffer, and let $\pi_B^+ (a)$ and $\pi_B^- (a)$ denote a normalized probability distribution inside and outside of the buffer,

$$\pi_B^+ (a) = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi_{\theta} (a)}{\pi_B} & \text{if } a \in B_d, \\ 0 & \text{if } a \notin B_d, \end{cases} \quad \pi_B^- (a) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \in B_d, \\ \frac{\pi_{\theta} (a)}{(1 - \pi_B)} & \text{if } a \notin B_d. \end{cases}$$

Then, one can re-express the expected return objective as the linear combination of two expectations,

$$O_{ER} (\theta) = \pi_B \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_B^+ (a)} [R(a)] + (1 - \pi_B) \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_B^- (a)} [R(a)].$$

The key intuition of the MAPO algorithm is to use enumeration to evaluate the former expectation and $\pi_B$, and MC sampling to compute the latter expectation. To sample from $\pi_B^+ (a)$, one can resort to rejection sampling by sampling from $\pi_B (a)$ and rejecting the sample if $a \in B_d$. We get an exact estimate of the first expectation while sampling from a smaller stochastic space of size $(1 - \pi_B)$ to get an estimate of the latter expectation.

Based on (5), using $K$ trajectories $\{a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(K)}\}$ sampled $i.i.d.$ from current $\pi_B$, i.e. the unexplored region of the space, we formulate an unbiased estimator of the policy gradients as,

$$\nabla_{\theta} O_{ER} (\theta) \approx \sum_{(a,r) \in B} \nabla \pi_{\theta} (a) \cdot [r - b] + \frac{1 - \pi_B}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nabla \log \pi_{\theta} (a^{(k)}) \cdot [R(a^{(k)}) - b].$$

Assuming that $\pi_B > 0$, using a full enumeration of the buffer and a budget of $K$ MC samples, the variance of the estimator in (6) is lower than the estimator in (2) because it has less stochasticity. For practical applications in which sample evaluation is expensive, we expect the MAPO estimator in (6) to significantly outperform policy gradients. Note that even if we use sampling to approximate the first term, this can be viewed as a stratified sampling estimator. The variance reduction still holds as long as the trajectories inside and outside $B$ have different distributions, which is usually true.

In the following we present 3 techniques to create an efficient algorithm. An overview of the MAPO training algorithm is also shown in Figure 1.
4.1 Distributed Sampling

An exact computation of the first term on the RHS of (9) involves an enumeration over \( B \), which is efficient only when \( |B| \) is small. If \( |B| \) is large, enumeration can become prohibitive even though it involves no fresh samples. One solution is to simply truncate the memory buffer to keep only a few trajectories with the highest probabilities. However, this simple approach may lead to suboptimal result, because one often benefits from keeping all of the promising programs in the buffer to let model select the ones that generalize well. For example, in program synthesis, there can sometimes be many programs that compute the correct answer for a certain question, but only a handful will generalize and others are spurious (getting the correct answer because of luck, e.g., using 2 + 2 to answer the question “what is two times two”). The generalizable programs could be discarded during the truncation of the memory buffer, making it hard for the model to overcome the spurious programs.

Alternatively, we can approximate the expectations over the trajectories both inside and outside \( B \) using sampling. As mentioned above, this can be viewed as stratified sampling from inside and outside the memory buffer and variance reduction still holds. A key insight is that the cost of sampling can be distributed through an actor-learner architecture depicted in Figure 2 inspired by [14]. The actors uses a stale model checkpoint to sample trajectories from inside the memory buffer through renormalization, and uses rejection sampling to pick trajectories from outside the memory. It also computes the weights for these trajectories using the stale model. These trajectories and their weights are then pushed to a queue of samples. A learner fetches samples from the queue and use them to compute gradient estimates to update the parameters.

4.2 Marginal Likelihood Constraint

Policy gradient methods usually suffer from a cold start problem if the model is randomly initialized. When supervised data in the form of demonstrations \( D \) is available, a reasonable approach (e.g., [54]) incorporates such data by combining the expected return objective with a conditional log likelihood objective via,

\[
O_{\text{AUG}}(\theta) = \lambda O_{\text{ERL}}(\theta) + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{a \in D} \log \pi(\theta)(a) \tag{7}
\]

In our setup, we do not have access to demonstrations, but through exploration we accumulate the memory buffer with various high-reward trajectories. Instead of optimizing \( O_{\text{AUG}}(\theta) \), which introduces some bias, we adopt a clipping mechanism that ensures that the buffer probability is greater or equal to \( \alpha \), i.e., \( \pi_B \geq \alpha \), otherwise clips it to \( \alpha \). Then, the policy gradient estimates are forced to pay a certain amount of attention to the high-reward trajectories in the buffer effectively optimizing

\[
O_{\text{MML}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \log \sum_{a \in B_i} \pi(\theta)(a) = \frac{1}{N} \log \prod_i \sum_{a \in B_i} \pi(\theta)(a). \tag{8}
\]

At the beginning of training, the clipping will be active and it will introduce a bias, but will facilitate much faster training. Once the policy is off the ground, the buffer probabilities are almost never clipped given that they are naturally larger than \( \alpha \) and the gradients are not biased any more.

4.3 Systematic Exploration

To avoid repeated samples during exploration, we propose to use systematic exploration. More specifically we keep a set \( B^c \) of fully explored partial sequences, which can be efficiently implemented using a bloom filter. Then, we use it to enforce a policy to only take actions that lead to unexplored

---

Algorithm 1 Systematic Exploration

\[\text{Input: context } x, \text{ policy } \pi, \text{ exploration buffer of fully explored subsequences } B^c, \text{ memory buffer of high-reward sequences } B\]

\[\text{Initialize: empty sequence } a_{0:0}\]

\[\text{while true do}\]

\[V = \{a \mid a_{0:t-1}\|a \not\in B^c\}\]

\[\text{if } V = \emptyset \text{ then}\]

\[B^c \leftarrow B^c \cup a_{0:t-1}\]

\[\text{break}\]

\[\text{sample } a_t \sim \pi(V)(a|a_{0:t-1})\]

\[a_{0:t} \leftarrow a_{0:t-1}\|a_t\]

\[\text{if } a_t = \text{EOS} \text{ then}\]

\[B \leftarrow B \cup a_{0:t}\]

\[B^c \leftarrow B^c \cup a_{0:t}\]

\[\text{break}\]
sequences. Using a bloom filter we can store billions of sequences in $B^c$ with only several gigabytes of memory. The pseudo code for this approach is shown in Algorithm [1]. We warm start the memory buffer using systematic exploration from random policy as it can be trivially parallelized. In parallel to training, we continue the systematic exploration with the current policy to discover new high reward trajectories.

### 4.4 Final Algorithm

Putting things together, the final training procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2. As mentioned above, we adopt the actor-learner architecture for distributed training. It uses multiple actors to collect training samples asynchronously and one learner for updating the parameters based on the training samples. Each actor interacts with a set of environments to generate new trajectories. For efficiency, an actor uses a stale policy ($\pi_\theta^{old}$), which is often a few steps behind the policy of the learner and will be synchronized periodically. To apply MAPO, each actor also maintains a memory buffer $B_i$ to save the high-reward trajectories. To prepare training samples for the learner, the actor picks $n_a$ samples from inside $B_i$ and also performs rejection sampling with $n_o$ on-policy samples, both according to the actor’s policy $\pi_\theta^{old}$. We then use the actor policy to compute a weight $\max(\pi_\theta(B), \alpha)$ for the samples in the memory buffer, and use $1 - \max(\pi_\theta(B), \alpha)$ for samples outside of the buffer. These samples are pushed to a queue and the learner reads data from the queue to compute gradients and update the parameters.

## 5 Experiments

We evaluate MAPO on two program synthesis from natural language (also known as *semantic parsing*) benchmarks, WIKITABLEQUESTIONS and WIKIQUESTIONS, which requires generating programs to query and process data from tables to answer natural language questions. We first compare MAPO to four common baselines to show the advantage of combining samples from inside and outside the memory buffer and ablating systematic exploration and marginal likelihood constraint to show their utility. Then we compare MAPO to the state-of-the-art on these two benchmarks. On WIKITABLEQUESTIONS, MAPO is the first RL-based approach that significantly outperforms the previous state-of-the-art. On WIKIQUESTIONS, MAPO trained with weak supervision (question-answer pairs) outperforms several strong models trained with full supervision (question-program pairs).

### 5.1 Experimental setup

**Datasets.** WIKITABLEQUESTIONS [35] contains tables extracted from Wikipedia and question-answer pairs about the tables. See Table [1] as an example. There are 2,108 tables and 18,496 question-answer pairs. We follow the construction in [35] for converting a table into a directed graph that can be queried, where rows and columns are converted to graph nodes while column names become labeled directed edges. For the questions, we use string match to identify phrases that appear in the table. We also identify numbers and dates using the CoreNLP annotation released with the dataset. The task is challenging in several aspects. First, the tables are taken from Wikipedia and cover a wide range of topics. Second, at test time, new tables that contain unseen column names appear. Third, the table contents are not normalized as in knowledge-bases like Freebase, so there are noises and ambiguities in the table annotation. Last, the semantics are more complex comparing to previous datasets like WEBQUESTIONS [50]. It requires multiple-step reasoning using a large set of functions, including comparisons, superlatives, aggregations, and arithmetic operations [35]. See Supplementary Material [A] for more details about the functions.

---

### Algorithm 2 MAPO

| Input | data {((x_i, y_i))}^N_{i=1}, memory and exploration buffer {(B_i, B'_i)}^M_{i=1}, constants $\alpha$, $\epsilon$, $M$ |
| repeat | $\Rightarrow$ for all actors |
| Initialize training batch $D \leftarrow \emptyset$ |
| Get a batch of inputs $C$ |
| for $(x_i, y_i, B^c_i, B_i) \in C$ do |
| SystematicExploration($x_i, \pi_\theta^{old}(B^c_i, B_i)$) |
| Sample $A^+_i \sim \pi_\theta^{old}$ over $B_i$ |
| $w^+_i \leftarrow \max(\pi_\theta^{old}(B_i), \alpha)$ |
| $D \leftarrow D \cup (A^+_i, R(A^+_i), w^+_i)$ |
| Sample $A_i \sim \pi_\theta^{old}$ |
| if $A_i \notin B_i$ then |
| $w_i \leftarrow (1 - w^+_i)$ |
| $D \leftarrow D \cup (A_i, R(A_i), w_i)$ |
| Push $D$ to training queue |
| until converge |
| repeat | $\Rightarrow$ for the learner |
| Get a batch $D$ from training queue |
| for $(a_i, R(a_i), w_i) \in D$ do |
| $d\theta \leftarrow d\theta + w_i R(a_i) \nabla \log \pi_\theta(a_i)$ |
| update $\theta$ using $d\theta$ |
| $\pi_\theta^{old} \leftarrow \pi_\theta$ |
| until converge or a certain number of steps is reached |
| Output: final parameters $\theta$ |
**WikiSQL** [62] is a recently introduced large scale dataset on learning natural language interfaces for databases. The dataset also uses tables extracted from Wikipedia, but is much larger and is annotated with programs (SQL). There are 24,241 tables and 80,654 question-program pairs in the dataset. Comparing to WikiTableQuestions, the semantics are simpler because the SQLs use fewer operators (column selection, aggregation, and conditions). We perform similar preprocessing as for WikiTableQuestions. Most of the state-of-the-art models relies on question-program pairs for supervised training, while we only use the question-answer pairs for weakly supervised training.

**Model architecture.** We adopt the Neural Symbolic Machines framework [24], which combines (1) a neural “programmer”, which is a seq2seq model augmented by a key-variable memory that can translate a natural language utterance to a program as a sequence of tokens, and (2) a symbolic “computer”, which is a Lisp interpreter that implements a domain specific language with built-in functions and provides code assistance by eliminating syntactically or semantically invalid choices.

For the Lisp interpreter, we added functions according to [61] [31] for WikiTableQuestions experiments and used the subset of functions equivalent to column selection, aggregation, and conditions for WikiSQL. See the Supplementary Material A for more details about functions used.

We implemented the seq2seq model augmented with key-variable memory from [24] in TensorFlow. (1) we used a bi-directional LSTM for the encoder; (2) we used two-layer LSTM with skip-connections in both the encoder and decoder. GloVe [38] embeddings are used for the embedding layer in the encoder and also to create embeddings for column names by averaging the embeddings of the words in a name. Following [31] [22], we also add a binary feature in each step of the encoder, indicating whether this word is found in the table, and an integer feature for a column name counting how many of the words in the column name appear in the question. For the WikiTableQuestions dataset, we use the CoreNLP annotation of numbers and dates released with the dataset. For the WikiSQL dataset, only numbers are used, so we use a simple parser to identify and parse the numbers in the questions, and the tables are already preprocessed. The tokens of the numbers and dates are anonymized as two special tokens <NUM> and <DATE>. The hidden size of the encoder and decoder LSTM is 200. We keep the GloVe embeddings fixed during training, but project it to 200 dimensions using a trainable linear transformation. The same architecture is used for both WikiTableQuestions and WikiSQL.

**Training Details.** We first apply systematic exploration using a random policy to discover high-reward programs to warm start the memory buffer of each example. For WikiTableQuestions, we generated 10k programs per example using systematic exploration with pruning rules inspired by the grammars from [61]. We apply 0.2 dropout on both encoder and decoder, and 0.01 entropy regularization [28]. Each batch includes samples from 25 examples. For experiments on WikiSQL, we generated 1k programs per example due to computational constraint. Because the dataset is much larger, we don’t use any regularization. Each batch includes samples from 125 questions.

We use distributed sampling for WikiTableQuestions. For WikiSQL, due to computational constraints, we use the simple approach to truncate each memory buffer to top 5 and then enumerate all 5 programs for training. For both experiments, the samples outside memory buffer are drawn using rejection sampling from 1 on policy sample per example. At inference time, we apply beam search of size 5. We evaluate the model periodically on the dev set to select the best model.

We apply a distributed actor-learner architecture for training. The actors use CPUs to generate new trajectories and push the samples into a queue for training. The learner reads batches of data from the queue and uses GPU to accelerate training. We use Adam optimizer for training and the learning rate is $10^{-3}$. All the hyperparameters are tuned on the dev set.

### 5.2 Comparison to baselines implemented within our framework

To assess the effectiveness of MAPO, we compare against the following baselines in a controlled manner by using the same neural architecture and experimental framework.

- **MML:** Maximum Marginal Likelihood maximizes the marginal probability of the memory buffer as in [63]. Assuming binary rewards and assuming that the memory buffer contains almost all of the trajectories with a reward of 1, MML optimizes the marginal probability of generating a rewarding program. Note that under these assumptions, expected return can be expressed as $O_{\text{ERR}}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{a \in B_i} \pi_{\theta}(a)$. Comparing the two objectives, we can see that
Figure 3: Comparison of MAPO and 3 baselines’ dev set accuracy curves. Results on WikiTableQuestions is on the left and results on WikiSQL is on the right. The plot is average of 5 runs with a bar of one standard deviation. The horizontal coordinate (training steps) is in log scale.

MAPO maximizes the product of marginal probabilities, whereas expected return maximizes the sum. More discussion of these two types of objectives can be found in [15, 33, 42].

- **Hard EM**: Expectation-Maximization algorithm is commonly used to optimize the marginal likelihood in the presence of latent variables. Hard EM uses the samples with the highest probability to approximate the gradient to $O_{MML}$.

- **IML**: Iterative Maximum Likelihood training [24] uniformly maximizes the likelihood of all the trajectories with the highest rewards $O_{CLL}(\theta) = \sum_{a \in B} \log \pi_{\theta}(a)$.

Because the memory buffer is too large to enumerate, we use samples from the buffer to approximate the gradient for MML and IML, and uses samples with highest $\pi_{\theta}(a)$ for Hard EM.

The results are summarized in Table 2. We show the accuracy curves on the dev set in Figure 3. Removing systematic exploration or the marginal likelihood constraint significantly weaken MAPO possibly because high-reward trajectories are not found or easily forgotten. REINFOrCE barely learns anything useful because starting from a random policy, most samples result in a reward of zero. MML and Hard EM converge faster, but the learned models underperform MAPO, which suggests that the expected return is a better objective. IML runs faster than MML and MAPO because it randomly samples from the buffer, but the objective is prone to spurious programs.

### 5.3 Comparison to state-of-the-art

On WikiTableQuestions (Table 3), MAPO is the first RL-based approach that significantly outperforms the previous state-of-the-art by 2.5%. Unlike previous work, MAPO does not require manual feature engineering or additional human annotation. On WikiSQL (Table 4), even

\[\text{Table 2: Ablation study on both datasets. We report mean accuracy } \% \text{ ± standard deviation on dev sets based on 5 runs.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>WikiTable</th>
<th>WikiSQL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REINFOrCE</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MML (Soft EM)</td>
<td>39.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>70.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard EM</td>
<td>39.3 ± 0.6</td>
<td>70.2 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML</td>
<td>36.8 ± 0.5</td>
<td>70.1 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPO</td>
<td>42.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>72.2 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Systematic Exploration</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Marginal Likelihood</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Table 3: Results on WikiTableQuestions. E.S. is the ensemble size, when applicable.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhong et al. (2017)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang et al. (2017)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu et al. (2017)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2018)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu et al. (2018)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun et al. (2018)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong &amp; Lapata (2018)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weakly supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPO</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPO (ensemble of 5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Table 4: Results on WikiSQL. Unlike other methods, MAPO only uses weak supervision.}\]
though MAPO does not exploit ground truth programs and only uses weak supervision, it is able to outperform many strong baselines trained using programs as full supervision. The techniques introduced in other models can be incorporated to further improve the result of MAPO, but we leave that as future work. We also qualitatively analyzed a trained model and see that it can generate fairly complex programs. See the Supplementary Material for some examples of generated programs.

6 Related work

Program synthesis & semantic parsing. There has been a surge of recent interest in applying reinforcement learning to program synthesis [9, 1, 58, 30] and combinatorial optimization [64, 6]. Different from these efforts, we focus on the contextualized program synthesis where generalization to new contexts is important. Semantic parsing [59, 60, 25] maps natural language to executable symbolic representations. Training semantic parsers through weak supervision is challenging because the model must interact with a symbolic interpreter through non-differentiable operations to search over a large space of programs [7, 24]. Previous work [15, 31] reports negative results when applying simple policy gradient methods like REINFORCE [52], which highlights the difficulty of exploration and optimization when applying RL techniques to program synthesis or semantic parsing. MAPO takes advantage of discrete and deterministic nature of program synthesis and significantly improves upon REINFORCE.

Experience replay. An experience replay buffer [26] enables storage and usage of past experiences to improve the sample efficiency of RL algorithms. Prioritized experience replay [43] prioritizes replays based on temporal-difference error for more efficient optimization. Hindsight experience replay [3] incorporates goals into replays to deal with sparse rewards. MAPO also uses past experiences to tackle sparse reward problems, but by storing and reusing high-reward trajectories, similar to [24, 34]. Previous work [24] assigns a fixed weight to the trajectories, which introduces bias into the policy gradient estimates. More importantly, the policy is often trained equally on the trajectories that have the same reward, which is prone to reinforcing spurious programs. By contrast, MAPO uses the trajectories in a principled way to obtain an unbiased low variance gradient estimate.

Variance reduction. Policy optimization via gradient descent is challenging because of: (1) large variance in gradient estimates; (2) small gradients in the initial phase of training. Prior variance reduction approaches [53, 52] mainly relied on control variate techniques by introducing a critic model [21, 28, 45]. MAPO takes a different approach to reformulate the gradient as a combination of expectations inside and outside a memory buffer. Standard solutions to the small gradient problem involves supervised pretraining [46, 17, 41] or using supervised data to generate rewarding samples [33, 12], which cannot be applied when supervised data are not available. MAPO solves this problem by a soft constraint on the marginal likelihood of the memory buffer, which accelerates training at the beginning and becomes unbiased once the constraint is satisfied.

Exploration. Recently there has been a lot of work on improving exploration [37, 49, 19] by introducing additional reward based on information gain or pseudo count. For program synthesis [4, 31, 9], the search spaces are enumerable and deterministic. Therefore, we propose to conduct systematic exploration, which ensures that only novel trajectories are generated.

7 Conclusion

We present memory augmented policy optimization (MAPO) that incorporates a memory buffer of promising action trajectories to reduce the variance of policy gradients. We propose 3 techniques to enable an efficient training algorithm for MAPO. (1) distributed sampling from inside and outside memory buffer in an actor-learner architecture; (2) a constraint over the marginal likelihood of the trajectories in the memory buffer to accelerate training; (3) systematic exploration to efficiently discover high-reward trajectories. MAPO is evaluated on real world program synthesis from natural language / semantic parsing tasks. On WikiTableQuestions, MAPO is the first RL approach that significantly outperforms previous state-of-the-art; on WikiSQL, MAPO trained with only weak supervision outperforms several strong baselines trained with full supervision.
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A  Domain Specific Language

We adopt a Lisp-like domain specific language with certain built-in functions. A program $C$ is a list of expressions $(c_1,...,c_N)$, where each expression is either a special token “EOS” indicating the end of the program, or a list of tokens enclosed by parentheses “$\langle F.A_1...A_K\rangle$”. $F$ is a function, which takes as input $K$ arguments of specific types. Table A defines the arguments, return value and semantics of each function. In the table domain, there are rows and columns. The value of the table cells can be number, date time or string, so we also categorize the columns into number columns, date time columns and string columns depending on the type of the cell values in the column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Returns</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(hop v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a column.</td>
<td>a list of cells.</td>
<td>Select the given column of the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(argmax v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones with the largest / smallest value in the given column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(argmin v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones with the largest / smallest value in the given column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(filter$_=$ v q p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. q: a number or date. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones whose given column has certain order relation with the given value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(filter$_&lt;$ v q p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. q: a number or date. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones whose given column have certain order relation with the given value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(filter$_&gt;$ v q p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. q: a number or date. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones whose given column have certain order relation with the given value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(filter$_&lt;$ v q p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. q: a number or date. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones whose given column have certain order relation with the given value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(filter$_&gt;$ v q p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. q: a number or date. p: a number or date column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the ones whose given column have certain order relation with the given value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first v)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows.</td>
<td>a row.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the one with the smallest / largest index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(last v)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows.</td>
<td>a row.</td>
<td>From the given rows, select the one with the smallest / largest index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(previous v)</td>
<td>v: a row.</td>
<td>a row.</td>
<td>Select the row that is above / below the given row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(next v)</td>
<td>v: a row.</td>
<td>a row.</td>
<td>Select the row that is above / below the given row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(count v)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Count the number of given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(max v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number column.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Compute the maximum / minimum / average / sum of the given column in the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(min v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number column.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Compute the maximum / minimum / average / sum of the given column in the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number column.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Compute the maximum / minimum / average / sum of the given column in the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sum v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a number column.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Compute the maximum / minimum / average / sum of the given column in the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mode v p)</td>
<td>v: a list of rows. p: a column.</td>
<td>a cell.</td>
<td>Get the most common value of the given column in the given rows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(same_as v p)</td>
<td>v: a row. p: a column.</td>
<td>a list of rows.</td>
<td>Get the rows whose given column is the same as the given row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(diff v0 v1 p)</td>
<td>v0: a row. v1: a row. p: a number column.</td>
<td>a number.</td>
<td>Compute the difference in the given column of the given two rows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Functions used in the experiments.

In the WIKITABLEQUESTIONS experiments, we used all the functions in the table. In the WIKISQL experiments, because the semantics of the questions are simpler, we used a subset of the functions (hop, filter$_=$, filter$_>$, filter$_<$, count, maximum, minimum, average and sum). We created the functions according to [61, 31].

The only function we have added to capture some complex semantics is the same_as function, but it only appears in 1.2% of the generated programs (among which 0.6% are correct and the other 0.6% are incorrect), so even if we remove it, the significance of the difference in Table 3 will not change.
The following table shows examples of several types of programs generated by a trained model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nt-13901: the most points were scored by which player?</td>
<td>(argmax all_rows r.points-num) Sort all rows by column ‘points’ and take the first row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(hop v0 r.player-str) Output the value of column ‘player’ for the rows in v0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt-457: how many more passengers flew to los angeles than to saskatoon?</td>
<td>(filter in all_rows ['saskatoon'] r.city-str) Find the row with ‘saskatoon’ matched in column ‘city’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(filter in all_rows ['los angeles'] r.city-str) Find the row with ‘los angeles’ matched in column ‘city’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(diff v1 v0 r.passengers-num) Calculate the difference of the values in the column ‘passenger’ of v0 and v1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt-10832: which nation is before peru?</td>
<td>(filter in all_rows ['peru'] r.nation-str) Find the row with ‘peru’ matched in ‘nation’ column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(previous v0) Find the row before v0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(hop v1 r.nation-str) Output the value of column ‘nation’ of v1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt-647: in how many games did sri lanka score at least 2 goals?</td>
<td>(filter in all_rows [2] r.score-num) Select the rows whose value in the ‘score’ column &gt;= 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(count v0) Count the number of rows in v0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nt-1133: other than william stuart price, which other businessman was born in tulsa?</td>
<td>(filter in all_rows ['tulsa'] r.hometown-str) Find rows with ‘tulsa’ matched in column ‘hometown’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(filter in v0 ['william stuart price'] r.name-str) Drop rows with ‘william stuart price’ matched in the value of column ‘name’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(hop v1 r.name-str) Output the value of column ‘name’ of v1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Example programs generated by a trained model.

C Analysis of Sampling from Inside and Outside Memory Buffer

In the following we give theoretical analysis of the distributed sampling approaches. For the purpose of the analysis we assume binary rewards, and exhaustive exploration, that the buffer $B^+ = B$ contains all the high reward samples, and $B^- = A - B$ contains all the non-rewarded samples. It provides a general guidance of how examples should be allocated on the experiences and whether to use baseline or not so that the variance of gradient estimations can be minimized. In our work, we take the simpler approach to not use baseline and leave the empirical investigation to future work.

C.1 Variance: baseline vs no baseline

Here we compare baseline strategies based on the variances of gradients when applying stratified sampling estimator to policy gradient.

Assume $\sigma^2_+ = Var_{a \sim \pi_+^\theta(a)} [\nabla \log \pi(a)]$ and $\sigma^2_- = Var_{a \sim \pi_-^\theta(a)} [\nabla \log \pi(a)]$ are the variance of the gradient of the log likelihood inside and outside the buffer. If we don’t use a baseline, the optimal sampling strategy is to only sample from $B^+$. The variance of the gradient estimation is

$$\text{Var}[\nabla C_{ER}] \approx \pi_\theta(B)^2 \sigma^2_+$$

(9)

If we use a baseline $b = \pi_\theta(B)$ and apply optimal sampling allocation (Section C.2), then the variance is

$$\text{Var}[\nabla C_{ER}]_b \approx \pi_\theta(B)^2 (1 - \pi_\theta(B))^2 (\sigma^2_+ + \sigma^2_-)$$

(10)
We can prove that both of these estimators reduce the variance for the gradient estimation. To compare
the two, we can see that the ratio of the variance with and without baseline is
\[
\frac{\text{Var}[\nabla O_{\text{ER}}_b]}{\text{Var}[\nabla O_{\text{ER}}]} = (1 + \frac{\sigma_-^2}{\sigma_+^2})(1 - \pi_{\theta}(B))^2
\] (11)
So using baseline provides lower variance when \(\pi_{\theta}(B) \approx 1.0\), which roughly corresponds to the later
stage of training, and when \(\sigma_-\) is not much larger than \(\sigma_+\); it is better to not use baselines when
\(\pi_{\theta}(B)\) is not close to 1.0 or when \(\sigma_-\) is much larger than \(\sigma_+\).

C.2 Optimal Sample Allocation

Given that we want to apply stratified sampling to estimate the gradient of REINFORCE with
baseline\(^2\), here we show that the optimal sampling strategy is to allocate the same number of samples
to \(B^+\) and \(B^-\).

Assume that the gradient of log likelihood has similar variance on \(B^+\) and \(B^-\):
\[
\text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^-}(a)[\nabla \log \pi_{\theta}(a)] \approx \text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^+}(a)[\nabla \log \pi_{\theta}(a)] = \sigma^2
\] (12)
The variance of gradient estimation on \(B^+\) and \(B^-\) are:
\[
\text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^+}(a)[(1 - \pi_{\theta}(B^+))\nabla \log \pi_{\theta}(a)] = (1 - \pi_{\theta}(B^+))^2 * \sigma^2
\]
\[
\text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^-}(a)[(-\pi_{\theta}(B^+))\nabla \log \pi_{\theta}(a)] = \pi_{\theta}(B^+)^2 * \sigma^2
\] (13)
When performing stratified sampling, the optimal sample allocation is to let the number of samples
from a stratum be proportional to its probability mass times the standard deviation \(P_i \sigma_i\). In other
words, the more probability mass and the more variance a stratum has, the more samples we should
draw from a stratum. So the ratio of the number of samples allocated to each stratum under the
optimal sample allocation is
\[
\frac{k^+}{k^-} = \frac{\pi_{\theta}(B^+)}{\pi_{\theta}(B^-)} \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^+}(a)}{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\theta}^-}(a)}}
\] (14)
Using equation\(^13\) and \(\pi_{\theta}(B^-) = 1 - \pi_{\theta}(B^+)\), we can see that
\[
\frac{k^+}{k^-} = 1
\] (15)
So the optimal strategy is to allocate the same number of samples to \(B^+\) and \(B^-\).