
Visual Transfer for Reinforcement Learning via Wasserstein Domain Confusion

Josh Roy*

Department of Computer Science
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912
joshnroy@gmail.com

George Konidaris

Department of Computer Science
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

Abstract

We introduce Wasserstein Adversarial Proximal Policy Optimization (WAPPO), a novel algorithm for visual transfer in Reinforcement Learning that explicitly learns to align the distributions of extracted features between a source and target task. WAPPO approximates and minimizes the Wasserstein-1 distance between the distributions of features from source and target domains via a novel Wasserstein Confusion objective. WAPPO outperforms the prior state-of-the-art in visual transfer and successfully transfers policies across Visual Cartpole and two instantiations of 16 OpenAI Procgen environments.

1 Introduction

Deep Reinforcement Learning (RL) has enabled agents to autonomously solve difficult, long horizon problems such as Atari games from pixel inputs [1, 2]. In high risk domains such as robotics and autonomous vehicles, RL agents lack the ability to learn from their mistakes without destroying equipment or harming humans. Instead, it would be preferable to train in simulated domains and transfer to the real world. However, Deep model-free Reinforcement Learning agents trained on one environment often fail on environments that require solving the same underlying problem but different visual input [3, 4]. When transferring from a simulated source domain to a real-world target domain, this is known as the reality gap [5, 6, 7]. More generally, this challenge is known as generalization in Reinforcement Learning and is studied by transferring between simulated domains [3, 4, 8, 9, 10].

The main reason for such difficulty in generalization is the tendency of deep networks to overfit to a single task [8, 9, 3, 11]. For example, an agent that learns to balance the cartpole depicted on the left of Figure 1 will fail to generalize to the cartpole on the right due to visual differences alone. In deep supervised learning, this can be addressed by smoothing the learned function using methods such as data augmentation [12], dropout [13], and regularization [14]. However, these methods are insufficient for generalization in Deep Reinforcement Learning [3]. Unlike supervised learning, where all datapoints are drawn from the same underlying distribution, the problem of transferring between differing RL tasks is akin to that of supervised domain adaptation where datapoints from source and target tasks are drawn from different distributions [15, 16, 17].

Previous work such as Domain Randomization or Meta-Learning takes a brute force approach to this problem, training on many source domains before fine tuning on the target domain for 0 or k episodes, referred to as zero-shot or k -shot transfer, respectively. These methods require a large number of source domains before they can transfer or adapt to the target domain. Domain Randomization learns a representation sufficient to solve all source domains, implicitly aligning the distributions of features extracted from each domain. It then assumes the features extracted from the target domain will fall

*joshnroy.github.io

into a similar distribution [6, 18, 19]. Some recent work has attempted to more explicitly align the feature distributions across domains but assumes access to pairwise correlations of states across domains [20, 21, 22]. Other work relies upon style-transfer networks to “translate” target domain states to source domain states before processing [23]. This adds additional computational complexity during both training and inference and relies upon the quality of the translation network. Further work attempts to learn the causal structure underlying such a family of visual Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), leading to a causal representation independent of domain and successful transfer [24]. Both translation and causal approaches require modeling of variables unrelated to the task given, leading to additional complexity [23, 24].

We introduce an algorithm that explicitly learns to align the distributions of extracted features between a source and target task without adding additional computation during inference or assuming access to pairwise correlations of observations. By simultaneously training an RL agent to solve a source task and minimize the distance between distributions of extracted features from the source and target domains, our algorithm enables seamless transfer to the target domain. Specifically, we train an adversary network to approximate the Wasserstein-1 distance (Earth Mover’s Distance) between the distributions of features from source and target tasks, and an RL agent to minimize this distance via a novel Wasserstein Confusion objective while solving the source task [25]. The Wasserstein-1 distance between distributions can be intuitively described as the effort required to align two probability distributions by transporting their mass [26]. As shown in [25], minimizing this distance allows adversarial alignment methods to succeed where other distance metrics such as Jensen-Shannon divergence fail. Our algorithm outperforms the prior state-of-the-art in visual transfer and successfully transfers policies across Visual Cartpole, a visual variant of the standard cartpole task where colors are changed across domains [27], and two varieties of 16 OpenAI Procgen environments [4].

2 Background and Related Work

Reinforcement Learning is concerned with sequential decision making [1]: an RL agent exists within a world (environment) and must take an action a based on some information about the world (state) s . This causes the environment to provide the agent with the next state s' and a reward r . The agent’s goal is to learn a policy π mapping states to actions that maximizes the expected sum of rewards $\mathbb{E}[\sum_t \gamma^t r_t]$, where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is a discount factor that weights the importance of short and long term rewards. Return is defined as the sum of cumulative rewards. The interactions between the agent and the environment are modeled as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) defined as a 5-tuple (S, A, T, R, γ) where S is the set of states, A is the set of actions, T is a function mapping from state and action to next state, R is a function mapping from state and action to reward, and γ is the discount factor.

Model-free Deep RL uses neural networks to predict both the value (expected future reward) of a state and the optimal action to take. Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) is a state-of-the-art model-free policy gradient algorithm for Deep RL [28]. It parameterizes a policy $\pi_\theta(a|s)$ and a value function $V_\theta(s)$ that share the majority of their weights, splitting after the “feature extraction” section of the network. The value network is trained to minimize the mean square error $\mathcal{L}_{\text{value}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (V(s) - R)^2$, where R is the return. The policy network is trained to minimize $\mathcal{L}_{\text{policy}} = -\mathbb{E}_t[\min(r_t(\theta) \hat{A}_t, \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_t)]$, where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ is the empirical expected value at timestep t , $\hat{A}_t$ is the empirical advantage at timestep t , $r(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(a_t|s_t)}$ is the ratio of taking action a_t given state s_t between the current and previous policies, and ϵ is a small hyperparameter. The two function approximators are trained jointly, and their combined loss is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{policy}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{value}}$.

2.1 Transfer in Reinforcement Learning

Transfer in Reinforcement Learning has been a topic of interest far before the recent advent of Deep Neural Networks and Deep Reinforcement Learning. Work on transfer is separated into questions of dynamics, representation, and goals with environments differing in their states, actions, transition function, or reward function, respectively [29, 30]. A policy that transfers perfectly is one that trains on a source MDP and achieves target reward equivalent to that of an agent trained on a target MDP.

The most popular approach in k -shot transfer for RL is Meta Reinforcement Learning. These methods optimize a Deep RL agent’s parameters such that it can rapidly learn any specific task selected from a set of tasks. Specifically, the agent first trains on n source tasks and then trains on the $n + 1$ th task

for k episodes before measuring performance on the $n + 1$ th task [31, 32]. While Meta RL is an interesting and relevant field of study, it requires the ability to fine tune by training in target domains.

Domain Randomization is the most popular approach to zero-shot transfer in RL. In Domain Randomization, an RL agent trains on a set of n source tasks, implicitly learning a representation and policy sufficient to transfer to zero-shot transfer to the $n + 1$ th task [6, 18, 19]. For successful transfer, all $n + 1$ tasks must be drawn from the same distribution. Furthermore to enable this implicit learning, n is required to be sufficiently large that the agent is unable to memorize domain-specific policies.

Some work directly addresses dynamics transfer [33, 34, 35] by parameterizing the transition function of an MDP and learning a conditional policy that can transfer between such tasks. Other work generates a curriculum to learn generalizable policies that can adapt to MDPs with differing dynamics [36]. This work is complementary to WAPPO which focuses on appearance-based transfer.

2.2 Visual Transfer in Reinforcement Learning

Visual transfer takes place within a family $\mathcal{M}$ of related Block MDPs $M \in \mathcal{M}$ each defined by a 6-tuple $(S, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}, p, q, R)$ where S is an unobserved state space, $\mathcal{A}$ is an action space, $\mathcal{X}$ is an observation space, $p(s'|s, a)$ is a transition distribution over the next state s' based on the previous state s and action a , $q(x|s)$ is an emission function that represents the probability of an observation x based on a hidden state s , and $R(s, a)$ is a reward function that maps from a state and action to a reward [37, 24]. The emission function q and the observation space $\mathcal{X}$ are the only quantities that change across Block MDPs within a family. Block MDPs are similar to POMDPs but have emission functions rather than observations functions [37, 38]. Both functions both map from hidden states to observations but emission functions generate observations that are definitionally Markov [37].

To transfer across different visual domains, Robust Domain Randomization (RDR) [20] aims to learn a domain-agnostic representation by training an agent to solve n source domains while minimizing the Euclidian distance between internal representations across domains. It then attempts to zero-shot transfer the $n + 1$ th domain. This method shows success in tasks where the background color is the only varied property, but the visual randomization of complex tasks such as OpenAI Procgen [4] is far higher. When the training data contains pairs of samples with the same semantic content in each domain, minimizing the Euclidian distance will align the distributions of representations for each domain. Without paired data, this will incorrectly align samples with different hidden states, leading to unreliable representations. Similar works from Gupta et al. and Tzeng et al. learn a pairing between source and domain images and minimize paired distance, aligning the feature distributions across domains [21, 22]. However, these methods assume a pairing of images across domains exists within the data given to the agent, which is unlikely to occur by chance in complex visual domains.

Other work uses causal inference to learn Model-Irrelevance State Abstractions (MISA) [24] for transfer between Block MDPs. MISA successfully transfers between RL tasks with low-dimensional states and visual imitation learning tasks with changing background color [24] but not visual RL tasks. Since this algorithm relies upon reconstructing observations, it must model factors that may not be relevant to the task. In visual tasks, MISA minimizes mean squared error between observations and reconstructions, which is demonstrated to ignore small objects due to their low effect on the error signal [39]. In visual RL, small objects such as the player character are essential to solving the task.

Work in supervised domain adaptation [40] and style transfer [41, 42, 43] translates images to different “styles” such as those of famous painters by training Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) to map from an input image to a semantically equivalent but stylistically different output image. VR Goggles for Robots [23] aims to transfer RL policies across visually differing domains by using a style transfer network to translate target domain images into the source domain. This enables an RL agent trained in the source domain to act in the target domain but adds additional computational and algorithmic complexity during inference time and relies heavily upon the success of the style-transfer network [23] as the policy does not train on translated images. As the style transfer network minimizes the mean absolute error and mean squared error between real and generated images, it prioritizes modeling factors that utilize a higher number of pixels. In complex visual RL tasks, important factors, such as the player character, occupy a small number of pixels and receive low priority [39]. While style-transfer adds computational complexity and relies upon image reconstruction, other work in GANs and supervised domain transfer aligns distributions without these drawbacks.

2.3 Adversarial Distribution Alignment

Prior work in GANs [44] shows that adversarial methods can align arbitrary distributions of data. Specifically, given samples drawn from a “real” distribution P_r a GAN learns a mapping from noise sampled from a Gaussian distribution P_z to samples from a “fake” distribution P_f . It jointly trains an adversary network to classify samples as real or fake and a generator network to “fool” the adversary, minimizing the Jensen-Shannon divergence (JS divergence) between the distributions [44].

Some domain adaptation methods in supervised learning uses a GAN-like adversary to align a classifier’s internal representations across domains and solve the supervised classification analogue of visual transfer in RL [15, 16, 17]. They each introduce and minimize different distribution alignment objectives based on minimizing the classification accuracy of the adversary network [17, 15].

GAN-like adversarial algorithms align distributions but are unstable and prone to failures such as mode collapse [25]. Furthermore, minimizing the JS divergence between two distributions has been shown to fail in certain cases, such as aligning two uniform distributions on vertical lines [25]. Wasserstein GANs solve both of these problems by changing the adversarial classifier into an adversarial critic f that estimates the Wasserstein-1 distance $W(P_r, P_f)$ between real and fake distributions P_r and P_f [25]. Minimizing Wasserstein-1 distance is more stable and empirically shown to avoid mode collapse [25]. Though directly estimating the Wasserstein-1 distance is infeasible [25], the Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality [45] provides a reparameterization that is directly computable. The gradient of the generator G with weights θ is defined as $\nabla_{\theta} W(P_r, P_f) = -E_{z \sim P_z} [\nabla_{\theta} f(G(z))]$.

3 Wasserstein Adversarial Proximal Policy Optimization

Our novel algorithm Wasserstein Adversarial Proximal Policy Optimization (WAPPO) transfers from any source task M_s to any target task M_t where both M_t, M_s are Block MDPs drawn from a family $\mathcal{M}$. For any two such tasks, the observation spaces $\mathcal{X}_s, \mathcal{X}_t$ and emission functions q_s, q_t are different, but the hidden state space S , action space $\mathcal{A}$, transition function p , and reward function R are identical. The Visual Cartpole environments shown in Figure 1 illustrate difference in emission function; the source domain has a green cart and pole as on a pink background and blue track while the target domain has a brown cart with a green pole on a green background and yellow track. However, both environments are defined by the same hidden states (position of the cart and pole), actions (push the cart left or right), rewards (+1 for keeping the pole upright at each timestep), and transitions (simulation of physics). Furthermore, the optimal policy that balances the pole is solely a function of the hidden states representing the position of the cart and pole and not of the colors of the objects.




Figure 1: Example Visual Cartpole Source Domain (Left) and Target Domain (Right). The two domains contain the same hidden states, actions, rewards, and transitions but differ in their emission functions resulting in differing observations.

In model-free Deep RL, the agent does not learn the state of its MDP. Instead, by learning a policy that maximizes its reward, the agent implicitly learns a representation function h_{θ} parameterized by the first few layers of the RL network that maps from observations $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to internal representations $\tau \in \mathfrak{R}$. In the Block MDPs defined above, an optimal policy depends solely on the hidden state space S . Thus, an optimal representation function h^* will map observations $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to internal representations $\tau \in \mathfrak{R}$ that contain no more information than their corresponding hidden states.

Similarly, there exist optimal representation functions h_s^*, h_t^* for source and target tasks $M_s, M_t \in \mathcal{M}$. Since the hidden state spaces of M_s, M_t are identical, the optimal policies and representation spaces $\mathfrak{R}_s, \mathfrak{R}_t$ are identical. Thus, there exists a representation function $h_{(s,t)}^*$ that maps from both $\mathcal{X}_s$ and $\mathcal{X}_m$ to a representation space $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}_s = \mathfrak{R}_t$ that is sufficient to solve both source and target tasks.

The goal of Wasserstein Adversarial PPO is to learn a representation function $h_{\theta,(s,t)}$ that approximates the optimal representation function $h_{(s,t)}^*$. It is given the ability to train within M_s and access a buffer of observations sampled from M_t . Note that the observations from M_t are not paired with observations from M_s and are not sequential. Further, WAPPO does not have access to rewards from M_t . Given that Block MDPs M_s, M_t both belong to the family $\mathcal{M}$, they share hidden states, transition function, and reward function but differ in observations. Therefore, an agent with a domain-agnostic representation will be able to learn a policy in M_s and transition seamlessly to M_t . We define the representation function h_θ as the first few layers of the RL network with parameters θ . To learn a domain-agnostic representation, Wasserstein Adversarial PPO jointly learns to solve M_s while using an adversarial approach to align the distributions of representations from M_s and M_t .

Specifically, Wasserstein Adversarial PPO trains on a dataset D defined as $\{(x_s, x_t, a_s, r_s)_1, \dots, (x_s, x_t, a_s, r_s)_m\}$ where m is the length of the dataset, $x_s \in \mathcal{X}_s$ is an observation from the source MDP, $x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t$ is an observation from the target MDP, a_s is an action from the source MDP, and r_s is a reward from the source MDP. Note that x_s, a_s, r_s correspond to the same timestep from the source MDP: the agent takes action a_s from state x_s , receives reward r_t , and transitions to the next state. x_t does not correspond to the same timestep as the other variables. Instead, it is drawn randomly from a buffer of observations from the target MDP. WAPPO uses the output of an intermediate layer, denoted by $h_\theta(x)$ as a latent representation τ of the observation x . To enforce that this latent representation x is agnostic to domain, WAPPO approximates h^* by minimizing the Wasserstein-1 distance between the distributions of $h_\theta(x_s)$ and $h_\theta(x_t)$.

Similar to supervised adversarial domain adaptation algorithms [15, 16, 17], WAPPO consists of two networks: the RL network and the adversary network shown in Figure 5 in the Appendix. The RL network learns a latent representation which is used to compute the best next action and the value of each observation. This latent representation should be identical across source and target domain. The adversary network takes the latent representation as input and is trained to distinguish between source and target tasks. The policy network both maximizes performance on the source task and minimizes the adversary’s ability to identify the domain. Specifically, the RL network minimizes

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{WAPPO}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{Conf}},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}$ is the PPO loss and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Conf}}$ is the loss term that maximally confuses the critic and aligns the distributions of source and target observations.

The Wasserstein GAN [25] approximates the Wasserstein distance between real and fake distributions using a neural network. Additionally, it defines a derivative for this distance that is used in optimizing the loss term for the generator, demonstrating higher stability than the standard GAN loss.

While the Wasserstein GAN loss term seems to align exactly with $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Conf}}$, it has one key difference. It assumes that one distribution is fixed, which is not true of domain adaptation. The goal of domain adaptation is to align two distributions both parameterized by θ . Specifically, we wish to align the distribution of extracted features from the source domain $P_s^{h_\theta}$ with the extracted features of the target domain $P_t^{h_\theta}$. Note that it is not possible to directly sample from $P_s^{h_\theta}, P_t^{h_\theta}$. Instead, we sample from these distributions by first sampling from the distribution of observations, P_s, P_t and then mapping to the representation by applying h_θ . Thus, the Wasserstein distance is defined as

$$W(P_s, P_t) = E_{x \sim P_s}[f(h_\theta(x))] - E_{x \sim P_t}[f(h_\theta(x))], \quad (1)$$

where f is the adversarial critic and the gradient is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta W(P_s, P_t) &= \nabla_\theta [E_{x \sim P_s}[f(h_\theta(x))] - E_{x \sim P_t}[f(h_\theta(x))]] \\ &= \nabla_\theta E_{x \sim P_s}[f(h_\theta(x))] - \nabla_\theta E_{x \sim P_t}[f(h_\theta(x))] \end{aligned}$$

$$\nabla_\theta W(P_s, P_t) = E_{x \sim P_s}[\nabla_\theta f(h_\theta(x))] - E_{x \sim P_t}[\nabla_\theta f(h_\theta(x))]. \quad (2)$$

Moving the gradient inside the expectation is shown to be correct in the proof of Theorem 3 of [25].

4 Experimental Results

We validate our novel Wasserstein Confusion loss term and WAPPO algorithm on 17 environments: Visual Cartpole and both the easy and hard versions of 16 OpenAI Procgen environments. To evaluate

the ability of the Wasserstein Confusion loss term to align distributions of features across environment and enable successful transfer, we examine how an RL agent trained using WAPPO on a source domain performs on a target domain. For each environment evaluated, the agent trains using WAPPO with full access to the source domain and a buffer of observations from the target domain. The agent does not have access to rewards from the target domain. We compare WAPPO’s transfer performance with that of three baselines: PPO, PPO with the feature matching loss as described by Robust Domain Randomization, the prior state of the art for feature alignment in RL [20], and PPO with VR Goggles, the prior state of the art for domain adaptation in RL [23].

Robust Domain Randomization originally trains on n source domains while matching their features before attempting to transfer zero-shot to the target domain. It’s main contribution is a feature alignment loss term. By minimizing this term and aligning the distributions of features extracted from the n source domains, it hopes that the distribution of features from the target domain will also be aligned. We directly evaluate RDR’s ability to match distributions of features by training an RL agent on one source domain and evaluating on one target domain while minimizing it’s feature alignment loss using observations from each domain. As in the zero-shot setting, the agent’s performance on the target domain is proportional to the alignment of features from source and target domains. Furthermore, this enables a direct comparison between the feature alignment loss used in Domain Randomization and our feature alignment loss, Wasserstein Confusion.

VR Goggles trains an RL agent on the source domain and a style-transfer network between target and source domain [23]. During evaluation on the target domain, it translates images to the style of the source domain before applying the RL agent’s trained policy. As VR Goggles utilizes a pre-trained source agent rather than a new RL algorithm, we report the target performance on Figures 2a, 3, and 4 as a horizontal line. We use the baseline PPO agent as the pre-trained source agent.

Each experiment’s performance is reported across multiple trials with identical random seeds across algorithms. Visual Cartpole and Procgen Easy are evaluated across 5 trials and Procgen Hard is evaluated across 3 trials. There is one source domain and one target domain per trial.

4.1 Visual Cartpole

We first demonstrate performance on a simple environment, Visual Cartpole, a variant on the standard Cartpole environment [27] where observations are RGB images of the Cartpole rather than position and velocity. Color of the cart, pole, background, track, and axle are varied across domains, converting the original MDP into a family of Block MDPs where different emission functions correspond to different colors. A sample source and target environment are shown in Figure 1.

As shown in Figure 2a, Wasserstein Adversarial PPO far outperforms both PPO and PPO using RDR’s feature matching loss. As shown in Figure 2b, the target features extracted by both PPO and RDR lie within a very small subset of their corresponding source features. This dense clustering implies that the target features are not expressive compared to the source features, leading to low transfer performance. When using Wasserstein Adversarial PPO, the target features are clustered at similar density with the source features, demonstrating their distributional alignment and leading to higher reward. The density plots in Figure 2b are generated by reducing the features space to 2 dimensions via Principle Component Analysis (PCA) [46] and estimating a density via Gaussian kernel density estimation [47]. While VR Goggles outperforms WAPPO and the other algorithms in Visual Cartpole, it does not in complex visual environments such as Procgen [4]. VR Goggles is able to perform well in Visual Cartpole as the background color is the only visual distraction and the cartpole system occupies a majority of the visual observation. We do not visualize distributions of features for VR Goggles as it operates on the observation space rather than the image space.

4.2 OpenAI Procgen

The remaining 16 environments are from OpenAI’s Procgen Benchmark [4]. This benchmark originally provides agents n source domains to train on and tests their generalization to a different target domain. The domains differ according to their emission functions, dynamics, and states. As this work focuses on visual domain adaptation in Reinforcement Learning, we modify the environments such that each environment is a family of Block MDPs. All domains in a particular environment have identical state spaces, transition functions, and reward functions but unique emission functions. This decouples the different types of transfer and solely focuses on evaluating visual transfer. As in Visual




Figure 2: Visual Cartpole Training Graph (a) and Feature Distributions (b): Solid and dashed lines indicate source and target reward, respectively. Green indicates WAPPO, pink indicates PPO, blue indicates RDR, and orange indicates VR Goggles. Shading shows standard deviation across 5 trials. Gray and purple indicate source and target features, respectively. WAPPO has both higher target reward and better alignment of source and target features than other methods.

Cartpole, we train the agent in one source domain with access to observations from the target domain and test the agent’s performance on the target domain. The environments vary in the difficulty of both the source task and generalizing to a new domain. Chaser, Heist, Maze, and Miner revolve around navigating in 2-dimensional mazes of varying size. This is a difficult task for model-free deep RL agents as they cannot plan a path between maze locations and causes difficulty for all of the agents evaluated [48]. Furthermore, there are two different instantiations of each environment: an easy version and a hard version. The easy version of each game has less variation across all factors, such as colors, layouts, and goal locations [4]. In certain games, the easy version provides additional hints to the agent that simplify the task, such as an arrow pointing in the direction of the goal.

We report both the reward on each task and the normalized return across all tasks. Normalized return is calculated by averaging the normalized return on each task $R_{\text{norm}} = (R - R_{\min}) / (R_{\max} - R_{\min})$, where R is the vector of rewards and $R_{\min}, R_{\max}$ are the minimum and maximum returns for each environment as defined by [4]. Note that the minimum and maximum return for each environment are defined by their theoretical limits rather than the minimum and maximum performance of any algorithm. This quantity measures the overall source and target performance for each algorithm.

As shown in Figure 3, WAPPO’s target performance exceeds that of the other three algorithms in 14 of the 16 easy environments. In Coinrun and Chaser, the target performance of all algorithms approximately matches their training performance, demonstrating the environments’ lack of transfer difficulty. In Chaser, WAPPO’s performance exceeds that of Robust Domain Randomization and matches that of PPO. In Coinrun, WAPPO matches the performance of RDR and exceeds PPO.

These results are mirrored in the hard versions of the Progen environments, as shown in Figure 4. WAPPO’s target performance exceeds that of the other algorithms in 12 of the 16 hard environments. On Plunder, Chaser, and Leaper, WAPPO matches the performance of PPO and outperforms other algorithms. Chaser has minimal visual variation, allowing all algorithms match their source and target performance. On Maze, WAPPO performs worse than PPO but better than other visual transfer algorithms. Maze tests an agent’s ability to solve mazes and has few visual differences across domains. Maze solving is difficult for model-free Deep RL agents due to their lack of ability to plan a path between locations [48]. As shown in Figures 3 and 4, WAPPO’s normalized return on easy and hard Progen environments far exceeds that of prior algorithms, demonstrating its superior ability to generalize to a target domain. Furthermore, aligning source and target distributions allows WAPPO to ignore distracting visual details in the source domain and achieve higher source domain reward.




Figure 3: Procgen (Easy) Training Graph. Solid lines and dashed lines indicate source and target reward, respectively. Green indicates WAPPO, blue indicates PPO, pink indicates RDR, and orange indicates VR Goggles. WAPPO matches or outperforms the other algorithms across all environments.




Figure 4: Procgen (Hard) Training Graph. Solid lines and dashed lines indicate source and target reward, respectively. Green indicates WAPPO, blue indicates PPO, pink indicates RDR, and orange indicates VR Goggles. WAPPO matches or outperforms the other algorithms across all environments except Maze which primarily tests path planning ability rather than visual transfer.

5 Conclusion

We address the difficulty in transferring a learned policy across differing visual environments by explicitly learning a representation sufficient to solve both source and target domains. Previous approaches have added additional inference-time complexity [23], relied upon pairwise observations [21, 22], or ignored fine details by relying upon image reconstruction losses [23, 24]. We have introduced a new method, WAPPO, that does not. Instead, it uses a novel Wasserstein Confusion objective term to force the RL agent to learn a mapping from visually distinct domains to domain-agnostic representations, enabling state-of-the-art domain adaptation performance in Reinforcement Learning. We validate WAPPO on 17 visual transfer environments where our agent both achieves higher reward in the target MDP and better matches distributions of representations across domains.

Broader Impact

Wasserstein Adversarial PPO will enable RL agents to better train in simulation and successfully be applied to real-world scenarios. This transfer will be especially useful in fields such as robotics and autonomous vehicles. Thus, it inherits the broader impacts of Reinforcement Learning as a whole and those of work that makes RL more practical. By increasing the generalization of trained RL policies, Wasserstein Adversarial PPO works toward enabling robots to help humans in daily life, ranging from aiding elders in their homes to making autonomous deliveries. This also furthers the applicability of RL in fields such as factory/warehouse automation and disaster robotics by enabling RL agents to transfer across different environments. Although Wasserstein Adversarial PPO enables Deep RL to be applied in a wider variety of domains, it does not solve safety guarantees inherent to the use of Neural Networks. Specifically, there is no guarantee that a Deep RL agent (trained with or without the Wasserstein Confusion objective) will act correctly in all situations. As this may lead to undesirable behavior, we expect WAPPO to be utilized in systems that contain other safety mechanisms. These mechanisms include but are not restricted to power and force limiting, automatic breaking, and compliant robotic arms [49, 50]. WAPPO’s contributions are complimentary to that of current and future safety mechanisms. When both used in the same system, safety mechanisms will detect and prevent failure cases and WAPPO will enable successful transfer to real-world scenarios.

References

- [1] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [2] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [3] Karl Cobbe, Oleg Klimov, Chris Hesse, Taehoon Kim, and John Schulman. Quantifying generalization in reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1282–1289, 2019.
- [4] Karl Cobbe, Christopher Hesse, Jacob Hilton, and John Schulman. Leveraging procedural generation to benchmark reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01588*, 2019.
- [5] Fereshteh Sadeghi, Alexander Toshev, Eric Jang, and Sergey Levine. Sim2real viewpoint invariant visual servoing by recurrent control. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4691–4699, 2018.
- [6] Josh Tobin, Rachel Fong, Alex Ray, Jonas Schneider, Wojciech Zaremba, and Pieter Abbeel. Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 23–30. IEEE, 2017.
- [7] Fereshteh Sadeghi and Sergey Levine. Cad2rl: Real single-image flight without a single real image. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04201*, 2016.
- [8] Chiyuan Zhang, Oriol Vinyals, Remi Munos, and Samy Bengio. A study on overfitting in deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.06893*, 2018.
- [9] Niels Justesen, Ruben Rodriguez Torrado, Philip Bontrager, Ahmed Khalifa, Julian Togelius, and Sebastian Risi. Illuminating generalization in deep reinforcement learning through procedural level generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.10729*, 2018.
- [10] Arthur Juliani, Ahmed Khalifa, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Jonathan Harper, Ervin Teng, Hunter Henry, Adam Crespi, Julian Togelius, and Danny Lange. Obstacle tower: A generalization challenge in vision, control, and planning. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2684–2691. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [11] Rachit Dubey, Pulkit Agrawal, Deepak Pathak, Tom Griffiths, and Alexei Efros. Investigating human priors for playing video games. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1349–1357, 2018.
- [12] Patrice Y Simard, David Steinkraus, John C Platt, et al. Best practices for convolutional neural networks applied to visual document analysis. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*, volume 3, 2003.

- [13] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1929–1958, 2014.
- [14] Andrew Y Ng. Feature selection, l_1 vs. l_2 regularization, and rotational invariance. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, page 78, 2004.
- [15] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Adversarial discriminative domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7167–7176, 2017.
- [16] Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario Marchand, and Victor Lempitsky. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2096–2030, 2016.
- [17] Eric Tzeng, Judy Hoffman, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Simultaneous deep transfer across domains and tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4068–4076, 2015.
- [18] OpenAI: Marcin Andrychowicz, Bowen Baker, Maciek Chociej, Rafal Jozefowicz, Bob McGrew, Jakub Pachocki, Arthur Petron, Matthias Plappert, Glenn Powell, Alex Ray, et al. Learning dexterous in-hand manipulation. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 39(1):3–20, 2020.
- [19] Ilge Akkaya, Marcin Andrychowicz, Maciek Chociej, Mateusz Litwin, Bob McGrew, Arthur Petron, Alex Paino, Matthias Plappert, Glenn Powell, Raphael Ribas, et al. Solving rubik’s cube with a robot hand. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07113*, 2019.
- [20] Reda Bahi Slaoui, William R Clements, Jakob N Foerster, and Sébastien Toth. Robust domain randomization for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10537*, 2019.
- [21] Abhishek Gupta, Coline Devin, YuXuan Liu, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Learning invariant feature spaces to transfer skills with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.02949*, 2017.
- [22] Eric Tzeng, Coline Devin, Judy Hoffman, Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, Sergey Levine, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Adapting deep visuomotor representations with weak pairwise constraints. In *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics XII*, pages 688–703. Springer, 2020.
- [23] Jingwei Zhang, Lei Tai, Peng Yun, Yufeng Xiong, Ming Liu, Joschka Boedecker, and Wolfram Burgard. Vr-goggles for robots: Real-to-sim domain adaptation for visual control. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(2):1148–1155, 2019.
- [24] Amy Zhang, Clare Lyle, Shagun Sodhani, Angelos Filos, Marta Kwiatkowska, Joelle Pineau, Yarín Gal, and Doina Precup. Invariant causal prediction for block mdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06016*, 2020.
- [25] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223, 2017.
- [26] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J Guibas. The earth mover’s distance as a metric for image retrieval. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 40(2):99–121, 2000.
- [27] Greg Brockman, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. Openai gym. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540*, 2016.
- [28] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [29] Matthew E Taylor and Peter Stone. Transfer learning for reinforcement learning domains: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Jul):1633–1685, 2009.
- [30] Alessandro Lazaric. Transfer in reinforcement learning: a framework and a survey. In *Reinforcement Learning*, pages 143–173. Springer, 2012.
- [31] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1126–1135. JMLR. org, 2017.
- [32] Alex Nichol and John Schulman. Reptile: a scalable metalearning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2:2, 2018.

- [33] Taylor W Killian, Samuel Daulton, George Konidaris, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Robust and efficient transfer learning with hidden parameter markov decision processes. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6250–6261, 2017.
- [34] Finale Doshi-Velez and George Konidaris. Hidden parameter markov decision processes: A semiparametric regression approach for discovering latent task parametrizations. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 2016, page 1432, 2016.
- [35] Jiayu Yao, Taylor Killian, George Konidaris, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Direct policy transfer via hidden parameter markov decision processes. In *Proceedings of the Lifelong Learning: A Reinforcement Learning Approach Workshop*, 2018.
- [36] Siddharth Mysore, Robert Platt, and Kate Saenko. Reward-guided curriculum for robust reinforcement learning.
- [37] Simon Du, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Nan Jiang, Alekh Agarwal, Miroslav Dudik, and John Langford. Provably efficient rl with rich observations via latent state decoding. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1665–1674, 2019.
- [38] George E Monahan. State of the art—a survey of partially observable markov decision processes: Theory, models, and algorithms. *Management Science*, 28(1):1–16, 1982.
- [39] Junhyuk Oh, Xiaoxiao Guo, Honglak Lee, Richard L Lewis, and Satinder Singh. action-conditional video prediction using deep networks in atari games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2863–2871, 2015.
- [40] Judy Hoffman, Eric Tzeng, Taesung Park, Jun-Yan Zhu, Phillip Isola, Kate Saenko, Alexei Efros, and Trevor Darrell. Cycada: Cycle-consistent adversarial domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1989–1998, 2018.
- [41] Jun-Yan Zhu, Taesung Park, Phillip Isola, and Alexei A Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2223–2232, 2017.
- [42] Yongcheng Jing, Yezhou Yang, Zunlei Feng, Jingwen Ye, Yizhou Yu, and Mingli Song. Neural style transfer: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 2019.
- [43] Leon A Gatys, Alexander S Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. A neural algorithm of artistic style. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.06576*, 2015.
- [44] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.
- [45] Cédric Villani. *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [46] Svante Wold, Kim Esbensen, and Paul Geladi. Principal component analysis. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 2(1-3):37–52, 1987.
- [47] David W Scott. *Multivariate Density Estimation: Theory, Practice, and Visualization*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- [48] Aviv Tamar, Yi Wu, Garrett Thomas, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. Value iteration networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2154–2162, 2016.
- [49] Tanya M Anandan. Safety and control in collaborative robotics. 2013.
- [50] Philip Koopman and Michael Wagner. Autonomous vehicle safety: An interdisciplinary challenge. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 9(1):90–96, 2017.
- [51] Ishaan Gulrajani, Faruk Ahmed, Martin Arjovsky, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron C Courville. Improved training of wasserstein gans. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5767–5777, 2017.
- [52] Prafulla Dhariwal, Christopher Hesse, Oleg Klimov, Alex Nichol, Matthias Plappert, Alec Radford, John Schulman, Szymon Sidor, Yuhuai Wu, and Peter Zhokhov. Openai baselines. <https://github.com/openai/baselines>, 2017.
- [53] Lasse Espeholt, Hubert Soyer, Remi Munos, Karen Simonyan, Vlad Mnih, Tom Ward, Yotam Doron, Vlad Firoiu, Tim Harley, Iain Dunning, et al. Impala: Scalable distributed deep-rl with importance weighted actor-learner architectures. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1407–1416, 2018.

- [54] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [55] Tijmen Tieleman and Geoffrey Hinton. Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *COURSERA: Neural Networks for Machine Learning*, 4(2):26–31, 2012.
- [56] Andrew L Maas, Awni Y Hannun, and Andrew Y Ng. Rectifier nonlinearities improve neural network acoustic models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 30, page 3, 2013.

Appendix

Algorithm

The goal of the RL network is to simultaneously minimize the PPO loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{RL}}$ and the confusion loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Conf}}$. It samples observations, actions, and rewards from the source environment and observations from the target environment. It then computes and minimizes these losses. f is a function that approximates the Wasserstein distance between the source observation and target observation distributions. Thus, it should be trained to convergence for every update of the RL network. As in Wasserstein GAN, it is optimized for n_{critic} steps for each update of the RL network. This process is outlined in Algorithm 1. Note that we use the weight clipping method defined in [25] rather than the gradient penalty method defined in [51] to directly test the effect of the novel Wasserstein Confusion loss term. We believe that combining Wasserstein Confusion with gradient penalty is a promising direction for future work.

Algorithm 1: Wasserstein Adversarial PPO

```

for  $t = 0, \dots, n_{\text{timesteps}}$  do
  for  $j = 0, \dots, n_{\text{critic}}$  do
    Sample  $\{\mathbf{s}_{s,i}\}_{i=1}^m \sim P_s$  a batch from the source domain
    Sample  $\{\mathbf{s}_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m \sim P_t$  a batch from the target domain buffer
     $\tilde{\partial}_w \leftarrow \nabla_w [\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(h_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{s,i})) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(h_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{t,i}))]$ 
     $w \leftarrow w + \alpha \times \text{RMSProp}(w, \tilde{\partial}_w)$ 
  end
  Sample  $\{\mathbf{s}_{s,i}, a_{s,i}, r_{s,i}\}_{i=1}^m \sim P_s$  a batch from the source domain
  Sample  $\{\mathbf{s}_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^m \sim P_t$  a batch from the target domain buffer
   $\tilde{\partial}_\theta \leftarrow \nabla_\theta [-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(h_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{s,i})) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(h_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{t,i})) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{RL}}(\mathbf{s}_{s,1}, a_{s,1}, r_{s,1}, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{s,m}, a_{s,m}, r_{s,m})]$ 
   $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \times \text{RMSProp}(\theta, \tilde{\partial}_\theta)$ 
end

```

Implementation Details




Figure 5: Network architecture. Layers are represented as rounded rectangles. Blue indicates use in training the RL policy, orange indicates use in training the critic, and green indicates use in training both. Note that the network architecture mirrors that of domain confusion and randomization but is modified to work with Reinforcement Learning rather than Supervised Learning [17, 15, 16]. The combination of the green and blue networks is identical in architecture to the IMPALA network used to benchmark the Procgen Environments and mirrors that used in Robust Domain Randomization [4, 20]. Only the green and blue networks were used when measuring the performance of PPO and Robust Domain Randomization.

There are four algorithms that we implement: PPO, Robust Domain Randomization, VR Goggles, and WAPPO. All four are built off of PPO [28]. We use the high quality, open source implementation of PPO provided by OpenAI Baselines [52]. Furthermore, we use the neural architecture and learning rate provided by [4] as a baseline. This architecture consists of the CNN component from the IMPALA network [53], which is shared between the policy and value prediction components of PPO. The value and policy networks then branch and each have one fully connected layer which outputs the policy or value, respectively. As in [4], we use a learning rate of 5×10^{-4} . We evaluated with both the Adam Optimizer [54] and the RMSProp Optimizer [55] but find negligible difference.

For PPO, Robust Domain Randomization, and VR Goggles, the network does not have an adversary. As such, we used the green and blue sections depicted in Figure 5 to train the PPO agent used in both these algorithms. The VR Goggles training process is the same as that used in [23]. Specifically, we collect a dataset of 2000 source domain images and 2000 target domain images and train the VR Goggles translation network with a learning rate of 2×10^{-4} for 50 epochs. As in [23], we found no performance gain when using a larger dataset or training for more epochs. As [23] does not provide an implementation, we re-implement this method by adding their novel shift loss to the open source CycleGAN implementation [41]. For Robust Domain Randomization, we implement the regularization loss and use a regularization weight of 10 and as described in [20].

For WAPPO, we use the entire network depicted in Figure 5. The green and blue sections are optimized according to the PPO loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{PPO}}$ and the green and orange sections are optimized according to the Wasserstein Confusion loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Conf}}$. Similarly to [25], we take 5 gradient steps of the adversary network per step of the RL network. The adversarial critic network is made of 8 dense layers of width 512, separated by Leaky ReLU [56] activation function.

Observations Across Visual Domains

Two different domains for each of the OpenAI Procgen environment are depicted in Figure 6. To evaluate the transfer performance of an algorithm, it is trained on one domain and evaluated on the other. Note that Figure 6 shows one transfer task for each environment but the results in Figures 2a, 3, and 4 are evaluated across multiple trials.




Figure 6: Observations from each of the 16 Procgen Environments. Two different domains are shown for each environment.