

Reinforcement Learning With Sparse-Executing Actions via Sparsity Regularization¹

Jing-Cheng Pang^{1,2}, Tian Xu^{1,2}, Shengyi Jiang³, Yu-Ren Liu¹, Yang Yu^{1,2,†}

Abstract—Reinforcement learning (RL) has made remarkable progress in many decision-making tasks, such as Go, game playing, and robotics control. However, classic RL approaches often presume that all actions can be executed an infinite number of times, which is inconsistent with many decision-making scenarios in which actions have limited budgets or execution opportunities. Imagine an agent playing a gunfighting game with limited ammunition. It only fires when the enemy appears in the correct position, making shooting a sparse-executing action. Such sparse-executing action has not been considered by classic RL algorithms in problem formulation or effective algorithms design. This paper attempts to address sparse-executing action issues by first formalizing the problem as a Sparse Action Markov Decision Process (SA-MDP), in which certain actions in the action space can only be executed for limited amounts of time. Then, we propose a policy optimization algorithm called Action Sparsity REgularization (ASRE) that gives each action a distinct preference. ASRE evaluates action sparsity through constrained action sampling and regularizes policy training based on the evaluated action sparsity, represented by action distribution. Experiments on tasks with known sparse-executing actions, where classical RL algorithms struggle to train policy efficiently, ASRE effectively constrains the action sampling and outperforms baselines. Moreover, we present that ASRE can generally improve the performance in Atari games, demonstrating its broad applicability.

Index Terms—Reinforcement Learning, Sparse-executing Action, Sparsity Evaluation, Constrained Action Sampling, Reward Regularization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning (RL) has proven effective in solving a variety of decision-making problems, including Go [1; 2], game playing [3; 4; 5; 6], and robotics control [7; 8; 9; 10]. In RL, an agent interacts with the environment and collects samples to optimize a policy. Abundant RL algorithms have been proposed to achieve




Fig. 1. We investigate the *sparse action* setting, in which agents must execute some actions sparsely due to restricted budgets or chances. Figures present two examples of sparse action tasks. **Left:** In the BattleCity game, the firing action should be sparsely executed owing to the restricted number of missiles, the budget of which is 3 in this case. **Right:** While playing football, the football player repeatedly passes the ball, dribbles, and moves before finding a good shot chance.

such policy optimization [11; 12; 13; 14]. These classic RL algorithms frequently assume that all actions can be executed an infinite number of times. For example, they assume that the agent can move or fire unlimitedly while playing video games.

However, this assumption in classic RL methods is inconsistent with many real-world scenarios in which budgets or opportunities for executing specific actions are limited, i.e., decision-making under constrained resources [15; 16; 17; 18; 19]. For instance, in an air combat task: the pilot fires sparsely [20] due to the limited missiles and tactical purposes. Such sparse action execution results from two constraints imposed by the inherent characteristics of the tasks. One is the hard constraint that the budgets for executing such actions are limited. The second is the soft constraint that frequent execution of the action results in poor rewards, e.g., frequent trading of the stock results in high transaction costs. In this paper, we name such actions as *sparse action*, as shown in Fig.1. Certain action instances have elicited attention and have been researched independently [15; 16; 21; 22]. However, there has never been a method generally solving all of these problems.

On the other hand, classic RL algorithms often explore all actions equally, such as exploration via ϵ -greedy [23; 24; 25], which executes actions randomly with probability, and max-entropy [12; 26], which tries to increase the

¹ National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, Nanjing, 210023, China. Email: {pangjc, xut, liuyr}@lamda.nju.edu.cn, yuy@nju.edu.cn ² Polixir Technologies, Nanjing, 210000, China. ³ Department of Computer Science, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China. Email: shengyi.jiang@outlook.com

[†] Yang Yu is the corresponding author.

policy entropy. However, in sparse action tasks, such exploration mechanisms ignore the sparsity nature of these tasks. They might sample sparse actions early or excessively, making it difficult to acquire high-quality data. Consider air combat as an example: before engaging the opponent, the classic exploration mechanism, e.g., ϵ -greedy, fires due to random action sampling. Such exploration on firing wastes the budgets of missiles and leads to ineffective sample collection.

This paper systematically studies the sparse action problem in RL. First, we define RL problems with sparse actions by introducing the Sparse-Action Markov Decision Process (SA-MDP). Compared to the standard Markov Decision Process, the SA-MDP takes into account the restriction on action execution number, i.e., in SA-MDP, some actions in the action space could only be executed for a limited number of times in every episode. In addition, we propose policy optimization algorithm by using the sparsity of tasks. Our method, Action Sparsity REGularization (ASRE), considers the action sparsity from two perspectives: (1) evaluating action sparsity by constraining action sampling during the exploration phase and (2) regularizing the policy learning using evaluated sparsity information during the training phase. Explicitly speaking, ASRE selects one action when exploring the environment and constrains its sampling for a number of episodes. Action sparsity is evaluated based on the agent’s performance when this action is constrained sampling. When training policy, ASRE regularizes the policy learning with evaluated action sparsity, represented by action distribution. We derive a regularized Bellman operator and prove its monotonicity and contractility. By repeatedly applying the Bellman operator, the algorithm finally converges to obtaining the regularized optimal value function.

Our contributions are as follows: We highlight sparse action in RL, which has drawn many concerns in previous works while needing a unified study. In addition, we formulate the sparse action problem with SA-MDP and present an effective policy optimization algorithm ASRE for policy learning in sparse action problems. In contrast to the classic exploration mechanism in RL treating all actions equally, we propose that each action can be explored with different preferences. Our experiments show that the evaluated sparsity of different actions tends to vary. These intuitively sparse-executing actions (such as the shooting action in a football game) are truly evaluated to have a high sparsity. Moreover, except for tasks with explicit sparse action, we also demonstrate that our approach outperforms the classic RL algorithm in common RL tasks, such as Atari.

II. RELATED WORK

This section first discusses prior research on sparse action tasks, followed by two areas closely related to our topic: constraining action sampling reinforcement learning & regularization-based reinforcement learning.

A. Sparse Action Tasks

There is a rich literature on studying executing sparse action in a particular circumstance [19; 27; 28; 29; 30]. Scenarios well-known to people include stock trading [30], football playing [19; 27], air combat [29], and other decision-making scenarios with limited resources [31; 32], e.g., flyer distribution and money allocation [18]. These works study the characteristics of a particular sparse action and present an action execution rule combined with a specific task. Fire Control Model [16] evaluates the critical aspect of firing a missile (e.g., missile flightpath, firing position) and develops specific firing criteria. Stock Market Decision [15] explains how to purchase and sell stocks using historical stock data. [18] designs the Serial Dictatorship Mechanism for resource allocation. VTS—Football [17] develops a shot model to assess and track football shots. In contrast to above works focusing on specific task, our work provides a unified learning framework that generalizes these decision-making problems with sparse action.

B. Constraining Action Sampling RL

Constraining action sampling is a technique for improving the exploration efficiency of RL algorithms by preventing agents from sampling particular actions. Constraining action sampling is essential for sparse action tasks as the budgets or chances for executing specific actions are limited. Earlier works constrain action sampling via manually constructing prohibited state-action pairings. Action masking [33; 34] offers a knowledge-based pruning approach for limited action execution in RL, which masks the invalid actions. Nevertheless, action masking necessitates knowledge of the tasks. It may impede the performance of the policy owing to necessary action constraints. CSRL [35] incorporates prior domain knowledge as constraints/restrictions on the RL policy. They create numerous alternative policy constraints to preserve resilience in the face of the misspecification of individual constraints while capitalizing on advantageous constraints. An alternative method for constraining action sampling is to infer policy constraints from demonstrations [36; 37; 38] and then constrain action sampling according to the policy constraints. [39] attempts to make decisions that depend only on a small number of simple state attributes. GPS [40] makes

use of differential dynamic programming to provide appropriate guiding samples for policy search. In contrast to prior studies, which constrain sampling by needing explicitly established policy constraints or demonstrations, ASRE constrains sampling by lowering the likelihood of action execution, as detailed in Section IV.

C. Regularization-based RL

RL algorithms employing regularization as a central component have demonstrated exceptional performance. Here, we will merely cover reward regularization related to our method. Max-entropy regularization is a well-known example of the incentive regularization approach. A well-known example of reward regularization is max-entropy regularization, which employs an entropy term to encourage exploration [26; 12]. Specifically, max-entropy RL techniques [41; 42] also add a policy entropy term to the reward function, in addition to the origin reward from the environment. The rationale behind this method is to improve the randomness of the policy in order to explore additional states and actions. Recent research [43; 44] demonstrates that Tsallis entropy regularization is also helpful in policy learning. RAC [45] illustrates that several traditional functions (such as the cosine/exp function) can be utilized as practical regularization functions in RL. Different from these works using various entropy terms or classic functions, the regularization in ASRE is based on the evaluated action sparsity, which is described in full in Section IV.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In RL, the decision-making tasks are usually formulated as Markov Decision Process (MDP) [46; 47], which can be described as a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \gamma, d_0)$. Here \mathcal{S} is the state space. \mathcal{A} is the finite action space where $\mathcal{A} = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{|\mathcal{A}|-1}\}$. P denotes the transition probability and r denotes the reward function. γ is the discount factor that determines the weights of future rewards, and d_0 specifies the initial state distribution. A (stationary) policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ is a mapping from state space to the probability space over action space. The agent interacts with the environment as follows: at time step t , the agent observes a state s_t from the environment and executes an action $a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)$, then the agent receives a reward $r(s_t, a_t)$ and transits to the next state $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$.

The objective is to optimize a policy when certain actions in the action space are sparsely executed. Many factors might cause the sparse execution of actions, such as limited budgets or limited chances. In order to unify this class of problems, we call that these actions can

only be executed for a limited number of times and propose *Sparse-Action MDP* (SA-MDP) to formalize such a setting.

Definition 1 (Sparse-Action MDP). *Given a MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \gamma, d_0)$, we define Sparse-Action MDP $\mathcal{M}_{SA} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \gamma, d_0, K)$ by introducing action execution number limitation $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$. In Sparse-Action MDP, there is at least one action that could only be executed for at most K times during one episode, i.e., $\exists a \in \mathcal{A}$, such that for any trajectory τ , $\sum_t \mathbb{I}(a_t^\tau = a) \leq K$, where a_t^τ denotes the action executed at timestep t in trajectory τ .*

Note that although SA-MDP has sparse actions, it is algorithm agnostic regarding which actions are sparse-executing. Given a policy π , the value function is defined as the expected cumulative rewards it receives when starting with state s and executing actions following π :

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{+\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \mid s_0 = s, a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t) \right].$$

Correspondingly, the state-action value function is defined as the expected cumulative rewards, starting with state s , taking action a , and executing the following actions according to policy π .

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V^\pi(s')]. \quad (1)$$

It is clear that an important connection between $V^\pi(s)$ and $Q^\pi(s, a)$ is shown as follows.

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [Q^\pi(s, a)]. \quad (2)$$

Then we define the optimal value function and state-action value function, $V^*(s) = \max_{a \sim \pi} Q^\pi(s, a)$, $Q^*(s, a) = \max_{\pi} Q^\pi(s, a)$. $V^*(s)$ and $Q^*(s, a)$ also hold the connection shown in Eq.(1) and Eq.(2). The optimal policy π^* can be a deterministic policy which acts greedily with Q^* (i.e., $\pi^*(s) = \operatorname{argmax}_a Q^*(s, a)$).

Given a policy $\pi \in \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, the associated Bellman operator \mathcal{T}^π is defined as, for any function $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{T}^\pi Q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\substack{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a) \\ a' \sim \pi(\cdot|s')}} [Q(s', a')].$$

From Eq.(1) and Eq.(2), we have that $Q^\pi(s, a)$ is the fixed point of \mathcal{T}^π (i.e., $\mathcal{T}^\pi Q^\pi = Q^\pi$). We can define the Bellman optimality operator \mathcal{T}^* based on the Bellman operator. For any function $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{T}^* Q = \max_{\pi} \mathcal{T}^\pi Q$. It is known that $Q^*(s, a)$ is the fixed point of \mathcal{T}^* and \mathcal{T}^* is a γ -contraction with respect to the infinity norm (i.e., $\forall Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S} \times$




Fig. 2. Overall workflow of ASRE, which comprises two parts: sparsity evaluation in the exploration phase and sparsity regularization in the training phase.

$\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\|\mathcal{T}^*Q_1 - \mathcal{T}^*Q_2\|_\infty \leq \gamma\|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\infty$). With these properties, (approximate) value iteration repeatedly applies the Bellman optimality operator to attain the optimal state-action value function [48; 49].

IV. METHOD

This section describes our approach to sparse action problems, which we refer to as ASRE. ASRE’s central insight is to treat each action differently based on its sparsity. In the exploration phase, ASRE specifically evaluates action sparsity via constrained action sampling. ASRE regularizes policy learning with evaluated action sparsity during the training phase. Fig.2 depicts the overall ASRE workflow. Two key components of ASRE, namely sparsity evaluation via constraining sampling and policy optimization with sparsity regularization, will be discussed in the following two subsections, followed by a subsection that summarizes the entire training procedure of the ASRE algorithm.

A. Sparsity evaluation via constraining sampling

ASRE is initially unaware of any information regarding action sparsity. Our central premise for evaluating action sparsity is that an action has a higher sparsity if executing it sparsely improves performance (i.e., higher reward). Based on this concept, ASRE first selects an action and then observes the performance of the policy when constraint sampling the selected action. Here, two crucial issues arise: how to choose the action to be evaluated and how to constrain action sampling.

(Fig.2, 1) Select action to be evaluated. It is not straightforward to select an action for evaluation, as the random selection is inefficient because not all actions require constrained sampling. On the other hand, selecting the action based on the sparsity evaluated thus far may overlook other actions and result in a suboptimal choice. This problem can be viewed as the classical trade-off between exploration and exploitation, which naturally lends itself to modeling as a non-stationary bandit problem [50]. Each action is treated as a bandit arm, and the discounted reward policy receives for the constraining sampling action as the bandit is the reward. ASRE uses the Discounted Upper Confidence Bounds (D-UCB) algorithm [51; 52] to select action to be evaluated:

$$a_i = \arg \max_a \left(\mu(a) + c \sqrt{\frac{\log t(\tilde{\gamma})}{N_t(\tilde{\gamma}, a)}} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\mu(a)$ is the estimated mean reward of the arm a . $c > 0$, $N_t(\tilde{\gamma}, a)$ denotes the discounted number of times a is selected, $t(\tilde{\gamma}) = \sum_{i=0}^{|\mathcal{A}|-1} N_t(\tilde{\gamma}, a_i)$ denotes the total discounted number of selections, and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the discounted factor parameter of D-UCB.

(Fig.2, 2) Constrain action sampling. Constraining action sampling is an important technique in ASRE, with two effects: (1) reducing action sampling to avoid wasting budgets or opportunities to execute sparse actions, and (2) assisting in evaluating action sparsity. Given an action a_i and a value function $Q(s, a)$, ASRE constrains sampling a_i via executing the behavior policy $\tilde{\pi}_{a_i}$:

$$\tilde{\pi}_{a_i}(a|s) \propto d_i(a) \exp(Q(s, a)), \quad (4)$$

where $d_i(\cdot) = \left(\frac{1-\delta}{|\mathcal{A}|-1}, \dots, \delta, \dots, \frac{1-\delta}{|\mathcal{A}|-1} \right)$ is an action distribution assigning a small probability $\delta < \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|}$ to a_i and an identical probability of $\frac{1-\delta}{|\mathcal{A}|-1}$ to the other actions. The behavior policy can be viewed as a variant of Boltzmann policy [53]. It reduces the probability of executing a_i , thus constraining action sampling. After sampling with $\tilde{\pi}$ for N episodes, statistical data of D-UCB, i.e., $\mu(a_i)$, $t(\tilde{\gamma})$, $N_t(\tilde{\gamma}, a_i)$, get updated with the mean episodic reward of N episodes. See Section 1.2 in [52] about the detailed update rule of D-UCB.

(Fig.2, 3) Sparsity distribution. Until now, action sparsity has been represented by $\mu(a)$: a larger $\mu(a)$ indicates higher action sparsity. ASRE transforms $\mu(a)$ to *sparsity distribution* $\tilde{p}(\cdot)$ using a Softmax function over the negative value of $\mu(a)$:

$$\tilde{p}(a_i) \propto \exp(-\mu(a_i)). \quad (5)$$

The sparsity distribution is a distribution over the action space. It intuitively assigns different probabilities to actions based on the evaluated action sparsity.

B. Policy Optimization under Sparsity Regularization

The previous section describes how ASRE evaluates action sparsity and acquires sparsity distribution. This section describes how ASRE employs sparsity distribution to enhance policy learning.

(Fig.2, 4) Sparsity regularization. ASRE optimizes a regularized objective with an explicit constraint to the sparsity distribution:

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{+\infty} \gamma^t (r(s_t, a_t) - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s_t), \tilde{p}(\cdot))) \mid d_0, \pi \right], \quad (6)$$

where D_{KL} denotes Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence. Different from the objective of SAC [26; 12], ASRE uses a regularized policy with the sparsity distribution that reflects a distinct preference for each action. To optimize the objective, ASRE searches for the regularized optimal policy, as shown in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 (Regularized Optimal Policy). *Given regularized optimal value function $Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)$, the regularized optimal policy π_{Ω}^* can be obtained by*

$$\pi_{\Omega}^*(a|s) \propto \tilde{p}(a) \exp \left(\frac{Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)}{\lambda} \right). \quad (7)$$

We refer readers to Appendix A1 for a comprehensive derivation of Proposition 1. Eq.(7) shows that the sparsity distribution acts directly on the probability distribution of the policy, which partially determines the policy distribution based on the evaluated action sparsity.

One outstanding problem is obtaining regularized optimal value functions $Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)$. This is accomplished by ASRE's use of the regularized Bellman optimality operator proposed in Proposition 2. See Appendix A2 for detailed proof.

Proposition 2 (Regularized Bellman Optimality Operator). *Under the regularized objective shown in Eq.(6), the regularized Bellman optimality operator \mathcal{T}_{Ω}^* is defined as, for any function $Q : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right],$$

and then Q_{Ω}^* is the **fixed point** of \mathcal{T}_{Ω}^* .

Algorithm 1 Action Sparsity REgularization (ASRE)

- 1: **Input:** episode number N for evaluating action sparsity, the stepsize η_{θ} , and the Polyak update stepsize η_{pol} .
 - 2: Initialize Q-functions Q_{θ} , target Q-functions $Q_{\bar{\theta}}$, replay buffer D and parameters of D-UCB.
 - 3: **while** task not done **do**
 - 4: // Sparsity evaluation
 - 5: **for** every N episodes **do**
 - 6: Select an action to be evaluated with Eq.(3).
 - 7: **for** each environment step **do**
 - 8: Interact with the environment with $\tilde{\pi}$ (Eq.(4)) and store the transitions to D .
 - 9: // Sparsity regularization
 - 10: Sample batch data from D , update the Q-function: $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta_{\theta} \hat{V}_{\theta} J(\theta)$.
 - 11: Update the target network parameters: $\bar{\theta} \leftarrow \eta_{\text{pol}} \theta + (1 - \eta_{\text{pol}}) \bar{\theta}$.
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: Update the statistical data of D-UCB and the sparsity distribution \tilde{p} .
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **end while**
-

C. Practical Algorithm

This section provides a summary of the ASRE practical training procedure as shown in Algorithm 1. Overall, we optimize our regularized objective in an off-policy manner: The agent collects samples in the environments to update the Q-function parameterized with θ . When exploring environment, ASRE first selects an action a_i using confidence bound (Eq.(3)), and then collects samples following behavior policy (Eq.(4)) that constrains sampling a_i for N episodes. The parameters of D-UCB are then updated with the mean episodic reward.

With samples collected from the environments, ASRE repeatedly applies regularized Bellman optimality operator on the Q function Q_{θ} to obtain the optimal regularized state-action value function:

$$Q_{\theta}^{k+1}(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_{\theta}^k(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right]. \quad (8)$$

To complete the above update, ASRE maintains a replay buffer $D = \{(s_i, a_i, r_i, s'_i)\}_{i=1}^m$. The target is to minimize the following empirical risk:

$$J(\theta) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^m (Q_{\theta}(s_i, a_i) - y)^2,$$

where $y = r_i + \gamma \lambda \log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_{\bar{\theta}}(s'_i, a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right)$ and $\bar{\theta}$ are the target parameters updated by the Polyak averaging [54].

Finally, the regularized optimal policy can be directly obtained as analyzed in Eq.(7):

$$\pi(a|s) \propto \tilde{p}(a) \exp \left(\frac{Q_{\theta}(s, a)}{\lambda} \right).$$

V. THEORETICAL IDENTIFICATION

This section presents some theoretical properties of the proposed regularized Bellman operator, which justifies the feasibility of ASRE. For simplicity, we treat any $Q, \mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a vector whose size is $|\mathcal{S}| \cdot |\mathcal{A}|$. We first show the monotonicity and contraction of \mathcal{T}_{Ω}^* .

Proposition 3. *The regularized Bellman optimality operator satisfies the following properties:*

- *Monotonicity: for any $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_1 \geq Q_2$, $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_1 \geq \mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_2$,*
where \geq means element-wise greater or equal.
- *Contraction: for any $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\|\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_1 - \mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_2\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_{\infty}$.*

See the Appendix for detailed proof. Proposition 3 indicates that the proposed regularized Bellman optimality operator is monotonic and contractional. Consequently, we can obtain the regularized optimal value function by repeatedly applying this operator.

Adding the regularization term to the original objective, like all regularization-based RL methods, modifies the original SA-MDP and the corresponding optimal value function. Such a disparity is quantified by Proposition 4.

Proposition 4 (Value Discrepancy). *Let π_{Ω}^* denote the regularized optimal policy and $V^{\pi_{\Omega}^*}$ denote the value of π_{Ω}^* evaluated in the original SA-MDP. The prior probabilities on sparse action in each prior distribution are $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k\}$. Then we have that, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$*

$$V^{\pi_{\Omega}^*}(s) \geq V^*(s) - \frac{C}{1-\gamma},$$

where $C = \lambda \max_a \log(1/\tilde{p}(a))$.

See the Appendix for the proofs. Proposition 4 indicates that λ and \tilde{p} govern the value discrepancy. This conclusion provides guidelines for hyper-parameter selection: setting a small λ or inducing a small value of $\max_a \log(1/\tilde{p}(a))$ would make the regularized optimal policy maintain the optimality in the original SA-MDP.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we empirically evaluate ASRE to address the following questions: (1) How does ASRE perform compared to classic RL algorithms in sparse action tasks (Section VI-A), (2) How does sparsity evaluation and sparsity regularization work during the training? (Section VI-B and VI-D) and (3) Can ASRE generalize to more general RL tasks? (Section VI-C)

A. Experiments on sparse action tasks

We first introduce three sparse action tasks in our experiments, as shown in Fig.3. According to human knowledge, all of these tasks involve sparse action, i.e., the buying/selling actions in Stock, the firing action in Gunplay, and the shooting action in Football.

- **Stock:** Stock is constructed from real-world tick-level price and volume data on stocks in the Chinese A-share market, in which the agent earns a profit by buying at a low price and selling at a high price and can take one action of [buy, sell, no-op] at each decision step.
- **Gunplay:** The agent scores by a shoot at the moving target. Hitting different targets yields different magnitudes of reward. This task is based on the Atari game “Carnival-ram-v0” in Gym benchmark [55]. In origin, the agent in the Carnival task is unlimited to shoot so long as task time is not used up, whereas it is a sparse action task when bullet capacity is limited. In the experiments, bullet capacity is limited to 5. The observation space is \mathbb{R}^{128} . Available actions include [no-op, fire, left, right, fire-left, fire-right].
- **Football:** Football task is from HFO benchmark [56]. The agent controls a football offender to score under the defense by a defender and a goalkeeper, controlled by the champion AI in 2012 RoboCup [57]. The agent receives a reward of +1 when scoring and -1 when (1) losing possession of the ball, (2) running out of time, or (3) the ball is out of bounds. At each decision step, the agent may execute one of five high-level built-in actions: [no-op, go to the ball, move, dribble, shoot].

We compare ASRE with multiple RL baselines: **DQN** [23] and **SAC** that explore with ϵ -greedy and max-entropy mechanism, respectively. In our experiments, DQN employs various practical techniques [58], including double Q, prioritized replay buffer, dueling network, and noisy layers. **PPO** [11] explores using a stochastic policy and has been demonstrated to be effective in



Fig. 3. Visualization of three sparse action tasks used in our experiments. (a) Stock: the agent buys/sells stock to earn profit. (b) Gunplay: the agent moves to the right and left while shooting at a moving target. (c) Football: the agent attempts to score while defended by a defender and goalkeeper.




Fig. 4. Training curves of different policy optimization algorithms in diverse sparse action tasks. The x-axis represents the number of interaction steps, and the y-axis represents episodic reward. Shaded areas represent standard deviation across five runs.

a variety of RL tasks [59]. In addition, we introduce **DQN(Prior)**, a variant of DQN that penalizes the agent with a reward of 0.1 when executing these known sparse actions. DQN(Prior) can be viewed as a baseline with prior knowledge of action sparsity, but note that ASRE is agnostic to any information about action sparsity.

Fig.4 depicts the training curves of various RL algorithms on sparse action tasks. Overall, ASRE agent can effectively complete three sparse action tasks and outperforms all baselines. We observe that ASRE learns faster in Stock and Gunplay, where sparse actions occupy a large portion of the action space, and achieves a higher final score in Football. DQN gains little ground in the Gunplay and Football tasks and converges to a low score in Stock. This is because *epsilon*-greedy exploration randomly explores all actions and wastes budgets for executing sparse action, making it unsuitable for solving sparse action tasks. SAC performs better than DQN but also stops improving at low reward, indicating that it is difficult for max-entropy exploration to efficiently learn how to execute sparse action. In the Football task, PPO achieves comparable performance to ASRE. In contrast, in Stock and Gunplay, PPO’s score is significantly lower than ASRE’s. PPO

also outperforms DQN and SAC in Gunplay and Football, demonstrating that stochastic exploration is more effective in sparse action tasks than max-entropy and ϵ -greedy. DQN(Prior) attains low scores on all three tasks. This result indicates that simply adding a negative reward is not an effective way to learn how to make decision-making in sparse action tasks.

B. Training process of ASRE

The preceding subparagraph suggests that ASRE can effectively train policy in sparse action tasks. In this subsection, we study how ASRE works by demonstrating the sparsity evaluation and constraining action sampling.

Sparsity evaluation. Fig.5(a) depicts the sparsity distribution evaluated during training for three sparse action tasks. Lower action probability (cold tone in the figure) reflects greater action sparsity in sparsity distribution. Overall, the action sparsity evaluated is consistent with human intuition regarding tasks. For instance, in Stock, buy/sell actions are considered to be in high sparsity, as frequently buying/selling induces high transaction fees. ASRE can rapidly evaluate the action sparsity in the very early training stage. The evaluated sparsity distribution is nearly stable throughout the entire training process.




Fig. 5. Sparsity evaluation and constraining action sampling during the training process. **(a):** Sparsity evaluation during the training process. Each row represents the probability of one action in sparsity distribution. **(b):** Frequency of executing sparse action during the entire exploration stage. The frequency is calculated as (number of executing sparse action) / (number of total decision steps). **(c):** Snapshot of the shooting point of different agents.

In conjunction with the results of the previous section’s experiments, the minute change in sparsity distribution does not hinder policy learning. In Gunplay, three actions involving shooting and no-op are evaluated as having a low probability. In contrast, actions involving moving right/left are preferred. In football, ASRE suggests that shoot and no-op are in high sparsity, while the sparsity of dribble action is lowest.

Constraining action sampling. The objective of ASRE is to evaluate action sparsity via constrained action sampling. Fig.5(b) shows the frequency of sparse action execution by various algorithms throughout the entire exploration phase. Contrary to SAC and DQN, the constraining action sampling technique in ASRE can reduce the frequency of executing sparse action. SAC and DQN agents execute buying/selling actions at greater than 60% of decision steps, which is a high-frequency trading operation in the Stock task. ASRE agent only trades at less than 10% of decision steps, correspondingly. This result demonstrates that ASRE effectively addresses the issue of sampling sparse action excessively that plagues traditional RL methods. Besides, we record the shooting point of ASRE, DQN and SAC agents while exploring in the Football task at 200k training timesteps, shown in Fig.5(c). When interacting with the environment, DQN and SAC agents consume shooting opportunities when

being far from the objective, making them more difficult to collect high-quality samples. Contrary to the DQN/SAC agents, the ASRE agent can take the ball closer to the goal and shoot from more advantageous areas due to more careful sparse action execution caused by constraining action sampling.

C. Experiments in Atari games

Atari is an RL benchmark that provides a variety of games, such as shooting, expedition, fighting, car racing, and more, as shown in Fig.7. We compare ASRE with DQN (with four implementation techniques [58]: double Q, prioritized replay buffer, dueling network, and noisy layers) in 59 Atari games on the Gym platform, with vector observation of \mathbb{R}^{128} , and action space of \mathbb{R}^6 or \mathbb{R}^{18} . The agent is trained for 4M timesteps and then evaluated for 100 episodes in each experiment. The normalized ASRE over DQN scores in 59 Atari games are displayed in Fig. 6. In 38 of the evaluation tasks, ASRE performs better than DQN. This finding demonstrates that action sparsity is a significant factor in enhancing the learning algorithm’s performance and that, in addition to RL tasks with sparse actions, ASRE can also be applied to more general RL tasks.




Fig. 6. Comparison of ASRE with DQN in 59 Atari games. The normalized scores are calculated as (ASRE score - random score) / (DQN score - random score). ASRE outperforms DQN on 38 of the evaluation Atari games.




Fig. 7. Snapshots of some of the Atari games.

D. Ablation Studies

Sparsity regularization. In order to assess the efficiency of sparsity regularization, we conduct an ablation study. The training curve for ASRE with and without sparsity regularization (i.e., updating Q function and deriving optimal policy without sparsity distribution regularization) is shown in Fig.8. It is clear from our observations that ASRE does not learn much without sparsity regularization, and the training curve almost remains horizontal. This result highlights the significance of sparsity regularization in ASRE.




Fig. 8. Ablation study of sparsity regularization. The blue curve denotes the training curve of ASRE without sparsity regularization.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT MAGNITUDES OF REGULARIZATION COEFFICIENT (λ). EACH DATA IS AVERAGED OVER THE EPISODIC REWARD OF THE LAST 5 CHECKPOINTS. THE NUMBER AFTER \pm IS THE STANDARD DEVIATION OVER 5 RANDOM SEEDS.

λ \ Task	Stock	Gunplay	Football
0.005	4.28 ± 0.41	3.24 ± 0.36	0.50 ± 0.08
0.01	4.72 ± 0.37	4.41 ± 0.79	0.57 ± 0.07
0.05	2.75 ± 0.39	2.46 ± 0.15	-0.09 ± 0.06
0.2	-0.04 ± 0.23	0.46 ± 0.08	-0.84 ± 0.04

Regularization coefficient λ . The final score of the ASRE agent trained with various regularization coefficient magnitudes λ is shown in Tab.I. We observe that ASRE works well when λ is low. In general, $\lambda = 0.01$ is a good parameter for all environments, and larger λ will result in a reduction in performance. This is because a large λ causes the policy learning to be overly dependent on the sparsity distribution and expose it to bad policy. When λ is getting smaller (see $\lambda = 0.005$), the policy learning depends less on the evaluated action sparsity, and there is a slight decline in the agent's performance.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper highlights sparse-executing action in RL. Classical RL algorithms are unaware of the sparsity nature of sparse action and are unable to explore and learn efficiently. To solve this problem, we put forth SAMDP to formalize sparse action RL tasks and propose ASRE algorithm, which evaluates action sparsity via constraining action sampling and then uses the evaluated

action sparsity to train policy. Experiments on various RL tasks present that ASRE can efficiently evaluate action sparsity and constrain action sampling. Moreover, we demonstrate how our method can effectively optimize policy in both Atari games and sparse action tasks.

To our knowledge, this is the first work to systematically study sparse-executing actions in RL. While ASRE can effectively complete RL tasks with sparse action, there are still some limitations. In this paper, ASRE is designed for discrete action as it is nontrivial to evaluate the sparsity of continuous actions. As much as possible, we would like to extend ASRE to cases with continuous action space, e.g., by utilizing a neural network to approximate the sparsity distribution. Moreover, the sparsity distribution, which directly affects policy learning, changes every N episodes, which may be a volatile factor for policy training. Additionally, the sparsity distribution, which directly affects policy learning, changes every N episodes, which may be a volatile factor for policy training. Finally, the behavior policy in ASRE may differ significantly from the current policy, rendering the samples for policy learning wholly off-policy. A future direction to improve ASRE is to resolve the problem of off-policy sample collection by utilizing current policy to interact with the environment on some of the exploration episodes. We hope that future work can explore these intriguing questions and continue improving the stability and applicability of training RL agents that considers action sparsity.

APPENDIX

A. Omitted Proofs

1) Proof of Proposition 1:

Proof. Under the regularized objective defined by Eq.(6), the regularized value functions are defined as:

$$Q_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s')], \quad (9)$$

$$V_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [Q_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)),$$

The regularized optimal value functions and the regularized optimal policy are $V_{\Omega}^*(s) = \max_{\pi} V_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s)$, $Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a) = \max_{\pi} Q_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s, a)$, and $\pi_{\Omega}^* = \arg\max_{\pi} V_{\Omega}^{\pi}(s)$, respectively. V_{Ω}^* and Q_{Ω}^* also hold the connection in Eq.(9) [60].

We can obtain that $\forall s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\pi_{\Omega}^*(\cdot|s) = \arg\max_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \right\}.$$

Differentiate the right side with respect to $\pi(a|s)$ and let the derivative equal zero, we obtain that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a) - \lambda \log \left(\frac{\pi^*(a|s)}{\tilde{p}(a)} \right) - \lambda = 0.$$

Solving this formula yields

$$\pi_{\Omega}^*(a|s) \propto \tilde{p}(a) \exp \left(\frac{Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)}{\lambda} \right).$$

□

2) Proof of Proposition 2:

Proof. In Appendix A1, we show that

$$Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_{\Omega}^*(s')], \text{ with}$$

$$V_{\Omega}^*(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_{\Omega}^*(\cdot|s)} [Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{\Omega}^*(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)).$$

Substitute $\pi_{\Omega}^*(a|s)$ with $\tilde{p}(a) \exp \left(\frac{Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)}{\lambda} \right)$ and we obtain that

$$V_{\Omega}^*(s) = \lambda \log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a)}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right).$$

Then we have that

$$Q_{\Omega}^*(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_{\Omega}^*(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right],$$

which shows that Q_{Ω}^* is the fixed point of \mathcal{T}_{Ω}^* .

□

3) Proof of Proposition 3:

Proof. We first prove the monotonicity. For any $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_1 \geq Q_2$, for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, we prove that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_1(s, a) \geq \mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q_2(s, a).$$

Recall that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}^* Q(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \lambda \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right].$$

Since $Q_1 \geq Q_2$ and $\lambda > 0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} [\exp(Q_1(s', a')/\lambda)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} [\exp(Q_2(s', a')/\lambda)].$$

From the monotonicity of the logarithm function, we show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_1(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{a' \sim \tilde{p}(\cdot)} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Q_2(s', a')}{\lambda} \right) \right] \right) \right].$$

Then it is direct to obtain that for any $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) \geq \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a)$.

Next we prove that \mathcal{T}_Ω^* is a γ -contraction. For any $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\|\mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1 - \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2\|_\infty = \max_{(s,a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}} |\mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a)|$. Given $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$, without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) \geq \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a)$. Then we have $|\mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a)| = \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a)$. Let $\pi_1(\cdot|s) = \operatorname{argmax}_\pi \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [Q_1(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \right\}$.

and $\pi_2(\cdot|s) = \operatorname{argmax}_\pi \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)} [Q_2(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \right\}$. Then we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) &= r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_1(s')], \text{ with} \\ V_1(s) &= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_1(\cdot|s)} [Q_1(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_1(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a) &= r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_2(s')], \text{ with} \\ V_2(s) &= \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_2(\cdot|s)} [Q_2(s, a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_2(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_1(s, a) - \mathcal{T}_\Omega^* Q_2(s, a) \\ &= \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} [V_1(s') - V_2(s')] \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_2(\cdot|s')} [Q_1(s', a')] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_2(\cdot|s'), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) - V_2(s') \right] \\ &= \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim P(\cdot|s, a), a \sim \pi_2(\cdot|s')} [Q_1(s', a') - Q_2(s', a')] \\ &\leq \gamma \|Q_1 - Q_2\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (1) holds since

$$V_1(s') = \max_\pi \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi(\cdot|s')} [Q_1(s', a)] - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s'), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \right\}.$$

Thus, we prove that the regularized Bellman optimality operator is a γ -contraction. \square

4) Proof of Proposition 4:

Proof. First, we show that for any policy π and state s ,

$$0 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \leq \max_a \log(1/\tilde{p}(a)).$$

The first inequality holds as KL divergence is non-negative. For the second inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) \log(\pi(a|s)) + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) \log(1/\tilde{p}(a)) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) \log(1/\tilde{p}(a)) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \max_a \log(1/\tilde{p}(a)). \end{aligned}$$

Inequality (1) holds from the non-negativity of entropy. Inequality follows as $0 \leq \pi(a|s) \leq 1, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $C = \lambda \max_a \log(1/\tilde{p}(a))$. Then we show that for any policy π ,

$$V^\pi(s) - \frac{C}{1-\gamma} \leq V_\Omega^\pi(s) \leq V^\pi(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (10)$$

By definition, we have

$$V_\Omega^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t (r(s_t, a_t) - \lambda D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s_t), \tilde{p}(\cdot))) \mid s_0 = s \right].$$

It is direct to show that $V_\Omega^\pi(s) \leq V^\pi(s)$. Furthermore, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} V_\Omega^\pi(s) &= V^\pi(s) - \lambda \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t D_{\text{KL}}(\pi(\cdot|s_t), \tilde{p}(\cdot)) \mid s_0 = s \right] \\ &\geq V^\pi(s) - \frac{C}{1-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we show the sub-optimality of π_Ω^* .

$$V^{\pi_\Omega^*}(s) \stackrel{(1)}{\geq} V_\Omega^{\pi_\Omega^*}(s) \stackrel{(2)}{\geq} V_\Omega^{\pi^*}(s) \stackrel{(3)}{\geq} V^{\pi^*} - \frac{C}{1-\gamma} = V^* - \frac{C}{1-\gamma}.$$

Inequality (1) and (3) follow Eq.(10). Inequality (2) holds as π_Ω^* is the regularized optimal policy. Therefore, we finish the proof. \square

B. More Experimental Results

ASRE is a regularized-based RL method that proposes to explore according to action sparsity. We conduct experiments comparing ASRE to regularization-based baselines and exploration RL method: Sparse Deep Q Networks (SDQN [44]) and Regularized Actor Critic (RAC [45]) are RL methods that regularize reward functions with various regularizers. Their regularizers include Tsallis entropy ($\frac{1}{2}(1-x)$), exp function ($\exp(1) - \exp(x)$) and cos function ($\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}x)$). Fig.9 shows the comparisons between ASRE and regularization-based methods. These common regularizers do not consider the sparsity of the

TABLE II
A SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISON RESULTS BETWEEN ASRE AND BASELINE RL METHODS IN THREE SPARSE ACTION TASKS. EACH DATA IS AVERAGED OVER THE EPISODIC REWARD OF THE LAST FIVE CHECKPOINTS.

task \ method	ASRE	PPO	SAC	DQN	ICM	SDQN	RAC-exp	RAC-cos	RAC-tsallis
Stock	4.721	0.256	0.720	0.0	-1.173	-1.332	-0.104	-0.186	-0.540
Gunplay	4.408	2.758	1.562	-0.584	1.915	0.807	0.397	0.441	0.772
Football	0.568	0.418	-1.0	-0.995	-0.965	-0.946	-1.000	-0.996	-1.000




Fig. 9. Training curves of ASRE and regularization-based RL methods in sparse action tasks.

actions. Therefore, they are not helpful to improve policy learning.

We also compare ASRE to Intrinsic Curiosity Module (ICM [61]), a classic exploration technique in RL. Fig.10 shows the comparison result. In terms of policy improvement speed and final score, ICM is unable to efficiently learn in sparse action tasks. This is because the curiosity-based method focuses on the exploration of unseen states, which also ignores the sparsity property of sparse action and wastes the budget for executing sparse action. This result demonstrates that the curiosity-based exploration technique widely employed in the current RL community is ineffective for sparse action tasks.




Fig. 10. Training curves of ASRE and ICM.

We summarize the comparison results between ASRE and all baselines in Tab.II. In sparse action tasks, ASRE can outperform all these RL baselines that have been widely applied to various RL tasks.

C. Implementation Details

Our algorithm ASRE is implemented based on *stable-baselines* [62]. All baseline algorithms are implemented

in stable-baselines and other well-verified open-source code repositories. In our experiments, every reported result is evaluated in the environment for 40 episodes and averaged over five runs. Tab.III presents the hyper-parameters of ASRE and other baselines used in our experiments. All sparse action tasks are built following SA-MDP. The action execution number limitation K is 30, 5, and 4 for Stock, Gunplay, and Football, respectively, while Atari games are built under common MDP.

TABLE III
HYPER-PARAMETERS IN THE EXPERIMENTS.

Hyper-parameter	Value
ASRE	
λ	0.01
c in D-UCB	0.5
$\tilde{\gamma}$ in D-UCB	0.99
batch size	256
learning rate	0.001
buffer size	400000
Q network	Adam, [256,128], relu
N for sparsity evaluation	30
target smoothing ratio	0.005
δ for constraining sampling	$1/(8 A)$
DQN	
batch size	256
learning rate	0.001
buffer size	400000
Q network	Adam, [256,128], relu
practical tricks [1]	double, noise layer
practical tricks [2]	dueling, prioritized
SAC	
batch size	256
learning rate	0.001
target smoothing ratio	0.005
buffer size	400000
regularization coef	0.05
Q-network	Adam, [256,128], relu
PPO	
clip ratios	0.2
epochs	10
batch size	1200
sample number per update	12000
learning rate	0.0003
policy network	Adam, [256,128], relu
value network	Adam, [256,128], relu

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Silver, J. Schrittwieser, K. Simonyan, I. Antonoglou, A. Huang, A. Guez, T. Hubert, L. Baker, M. Lai, A. Bolton, Y. Chen, T. P. Lillicrap, F. Hui, L. Sifre, G. van den Driessche, T. Graepel, and D. Hassabis, “Mastering the game of go without human knowledge,” *Nat.*, vol. 550, no. 7676, pp. 354–359, 2017.
- [2] —, “Mastering the game of go without human knowledge,” *Nat.*, vol. 550, no. 7676, pp. 354–359, 2017.
- [3] M. Jeon, J. Lee, and S. Ko, “Modular reinforcement learning for playing the game of tron,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 63 394–63 402, 2022.
- [4] K. Zhao, J. Song, Y. Luo, and Y. Liu, “Research on game-playing agents based on deep reinforcement learning,” *Robotics*, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 35, 2022.
- [5] R. Liu, H. Guo, X. Ji, Y. Yu, Z. Pang, Z. Xiao, Y. Wu, and T. Lu, “Efficient reinforcement learning for starcraft by abstract forward models and transfer learning,” *IEEE Trans. Games*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 294–307, 2022.
- [6] R. Liu, Z. Pang, Z. Meng, W. Wang, Y. Yu, and T. Lu, “On efficient reinforcement learning for full-length game of starcraft II,” *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, vol. 75, pp. 213–260, 2022.
- [7] A. H. Tan, F. P. Bejarano, Y. Zhu, R. Ren, and G. Nejat, “Deep reinforcement learning for decentralized multi-robot exploration with macro actions,” *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 272–279, 2023.
- [8] Á. Belmonte-Baeza, J. Lee, G. Valsecchi, and M. Hutter, “Meta reinforcement learning for optimal design of legged robots,” *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 12 134–12 141, 2022.
- [9] S. Gangapurwala, M. Geisert, R. Orsolino, M. F. Fallon, and I. Havoutis, “RLOC: terrain-aware legged locomotion using reinforcement learning and optimal control,” *IEEE Trans. Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 2908–2927, 2022.
- [10] N. Rudin, H. Kolvenbach, V. Tsounis, and M. Hutter, “Cat-like jumping and landing of legged robots in low gravity using deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Trans. Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 317–328, 2022.
- [11] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, “Proximal policy optimization algorithms,” 2017.
- [12] T. Haarnoja, A. Zhou, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, “Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor,” in *ICML*, 2018.
- [13] T. P. Lillicrap, J. J. Hunt, A. Pritzel, N. Heess, T. Erez, Y. Tassa, D. Silver, and D. Wierstra, “Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning,” in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [14] R. S. Sutton, D. A. McAllester, S. Singh, and Y. Mansour, “Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation,” in *NIPS*, 1999.
- [15] L.-J. Ji, Z. Zhang, and T. Guo, “To buy or to sell: Cultural differences in stock market decisions based on price trends,” *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 399–413, 2008.
- [16] X. Wang, X. Wang, X. Lei, G. Gao, and J. Du, “Research on fire control modeling problems of UAV swarms’ air combat under the decoys influence,” in *ICCAIS*, 2021.
- [17] A. Mujika, D. Oyarzun, J. Zalba, A. Ardanza, M. Arizaleta, S. García, and A. Ortiz, “VTS | football - tracking and analysing football shots,” in *icSPORTS*, 2015.
- [18] L. Li, L. Sun, C. Weng, C. Huo, and W. Ren, “Spending money wisely: Online electronic coupon allocation based on real-time user intent detection,” in *CIKM*, 2020.
- [19] G. Huang, Z. Lan, and G. Huang, “Football players’ shooting posture norm based on deep learning in sports event video,” *Sci. Program.*, vol. 2021, pp. 1 552 096:1–1 552 096:7, 2021.
- [20] X. Zhang, G. Liu, C. Yang, and J. Wu, “Research on air confrontation maneuver decision-making method based on reinforcement learning,” *Electronics*, vol. 7, no. 11, p. 279, 2018.
- [21] G. Anzer and P. Bauer, “A goal scoring probability model for shots based on synchronized positional and event data in football (soccer),” *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, vol. 3, no. 29, p. 644475, 2021.
- [22] T. L. Meng and M. Khushi, “Reinforcement learning in financial markets,” *Data*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 110–110, 2019.
- [23] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu, J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. A. Riedmiller, A. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, S. Petersen, C. Beattie, A. Sadik, I. Antonoglou, H. King, D. Kumaran, D. Wierstra, S. Legg, and D. Hassabis, “Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning,” *Nat.*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [24] A. Brim, “Deep reinforcement learning pairs trading with a double deep q-network,” in *CCWC*, 2020.
- [25] V. Mnih, K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, A. A. Rusu,

- J. Veness, M. G. Bellemare, A. Graves, M. A. Riedmiller, A. Fidjeland, G. Ostrovski, S. Petersen, C. Beattie, A. Sadik, I. Antonoglou, H. King, D. Kumaran, D. Wierstra, S. Legg, and D. Hassabis, "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning," *Nat.*, vol. 518, no. 7540, pp. 529–533, 2015.
- [26] T. Haarnoja, H. Tang, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Reinforcement learning with deep energy-based policies," in *ICML*, 2017.
- [27] M. Habibullah, M. A. M. Islam, N. B. Alam, and F. Ahmed, "Player performance profiling for penalty shootouts in football using video analysis," in *ICCA*, 2020.
- [28] X. Li, G. Chen, P. Amyotte, F. Khan, and M. Alaud-din, "Vulnerability assessment of storage tanks exposed to simultaneous fire and explosion hazards," *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.*, vol. 230, p. 108960, 2023.
- [29] P. Ruther, M. Strohal, and P. Stütz, "Conceptual approach for optimizing air-to-air missile guidance to enable valid decision-making," in *SIMULTECH*, 2022.
- [30] C. Zhang, N. N. A. Sjarif, and R. B. Ibrahim, "Decision fusion for stock market prediction: A systematic review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 81 364–81 379, 2022.
- [31] E. Kim, H. Choi, H. Kim, J. Na, and H. Lee, "Optimal resource allocation considering non-uniform spatial traffic distribution in ultra-dense networks: A multi-agent reinforcement learning approach," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 20 455–20 464, 2022.
- [32] C. Liu, L. Huang, and Z. Dong, "A two-stage approach of joint route planning and resource allocation for multiple uavs in unmanned logistics distribution," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 113 888–113 901, 2022.
- [33] S. Huang and S. Ontañón, "A closer look at invalid action masking in policy gradient algorithms," in *FLAIRS*, 2022.
- [34] D. Ye, Z. Liu, M. Sun, B. Shi, P. Zhao, H. Wu, H. Yu, S. Yang, X. Wu, Q. Guo, Q. Chen, Y. Yin, H. Zhang, T. Shi, L. Wang, Q. Fu, W. Yang, and L. Huang, "Mastering complex control in MOBA games with deep reinforcement learning," in *AAAI*, 2020.
- [35] T. Mu, G. Theodorou, D. Arbour, and E. Brunskill, "Constraint sampling reinforcement learning: Incorporating expertise for faster learning," in *AAAI*, 2022.
- [36] R. Noothigattu, D. Bouneffouf, N. Mattei, R. Chandra, P. Madan, K. R. Varshney, M. Campbell, M. Singh, and F. Rossi, "Teaching AI agents ethical values using reinforcement learning and policy orchestration," in *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [37] A. Balakrishnan, D. Bouneffouf, N. Mattei, and F. Rossi, "Using multi-armed bandits to learn ethical priorities for online AI systems," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 63, no. 4/5, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [38] M. E. Taylor, H. B. Suay, and S. Chernova, "Integrating reinforcement learning with human demonstrations of varying ability," in *AAMAS*, 2011.
- [39] M. Petrik and R. Luss, "Interpretable policies for dynamic product recommendations," in *UAI*, 2016.
- [40] S. Levine and P. Abbeel, "Learning neural network policies with guided policy search under unknown dynamics," in *NeurIPS*, 2014.
- [41] A. Srivastava and S. M. Salapaka, "Parameterized mdps and reinforcement learning problems - A maximum entropy principle-based framework," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 9339–9351, 2022.
- [42] F. Ding and Y. Xue, "X-MEN: guaranteed xormaximum entropy constrained inverse reinforcement learning," in *UAI*, 2022.
- [43] J. Choy, K. Lee, and S. Oh, "Sparse actor-critic: Sparse tsallis entropy regularized reinforcement learning in a continuous action space," in *UR*, 2020.
- [44] K. Lee, S. Choi, and S. Oh, "Sparse markov decision processes with causal sparse tsallis entropy regularization for reinforcement learning," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1466–1473, 2018.
- [45] W. Yang, X. Li, and Z. Zhang, "A regularized approach to sparse optimal policy in reinforcement learning," in *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [46] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*, ser. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 1994.
- [47] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, "Reinforcement learning: An introduction," *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1054–1054, 1998.
- [48] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Neuro-dynamic programming*, ser. Optimization and neural computation series. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [49] R. Munos, "Error bounds for approximate value iteration," in *AAAI*, 2005.
- [50] Y. Gur, A. Zeevi, and O. Besbes, "Stochastic multi-armed-bandit problem with non-stationary rewards," in *NeurIPS*, 2014.
- [51] L. Kocsis and C. Szepesvári, "Discounted ucb," in *PASCAL Challenges Workshop*, 2006.
- [52] A. Garivier and E. Moulines, "On upper-confidence bound policies for non-stationary bandit problems," 2008.

- [53] N. Cesa-Bianchi, C. Gentile, G. Neu, and G. Lugosi, “Boltzmann exploration done right,” in *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [54] B. T. Polyak and A. B. Juditsky, “Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging,” *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 838–855, 1992.
- [55] G. Brockman, V. Cheung, L. Pettersson, J. Schneider, J. Schulman, J. Tang, and W. Zaremba, “Openai gym,” 2016.
- [56] M. Hausknecht, P. Mupparaju, S. Subramanian, S. Kalyanakrishnan, and P. Stone, “Half field of-fense: An environment for multiagent learning and ad hoc teamwork,” in *AAMAS ALA Workshop*, 2016.
- [57] H. Akiyama and T. Nakashima, “HELIOS2012: robocup 2012 soccer simulation 2d league champion,” in *ARIS*, 2012.
- [58] M. Hessel, J. Modayil, H. van Hasselt, T. Schaul, G. Ostrovski, W. Dabney, D. Horgan, B. Piot, M. G. Azar, and D. Silver, “Rainbow: Combining improvements in deep reinforcement learning,” in *AAAI*, 2018.
- [59] L. Engstrom, A. Ilyas, S. Santurkar, D. Tsipras, F. Janoos, L. Rudolph, and A. Madry, “Implementation matters in deep RL: A case study on PPO and TRPO,” in *ICLR*, 2020.
- [60] M. Geist, B. Scherrer, and O. Pietquin, “A theory of regularized markov decision processes,” in *ICML*, 2019.
- [61] D. Pathak, P. Agrawal, A. A. Efros, and T. Darrell, “Curiosity-driven exploration by self-supervised prediction,” 2017.
- [62] A. Hill, A. Raffin, M. Ernestus, A. Gleave, A. Kanervisto, R. Traore, P. Dhariwal, C. Hesse, O. Klimov, A. Nichol, M. Plappert, A. Radford, J. Schulman, S. Sidor, and Y. Wu, “Stable baselines,” 2018.