Towards robust and domain agnostic reinforcement learning competitions: MineRL 2020

William Hebgen Guss WGUSS@{OPENAI.COM,CS.CMU.EDU}
Stephanie Milani SMILANI@CS.CMU.EDU
Nicholay Topin NTOPIN@CS.CMU.EDU
Brandon Houghton BRANDON@OPENAI.COM
Sharada Mohanty MOHANTY@AICROWD.COM

Andrew Melnik ANDREW.MELNIK.PAPERS@GMAIL.COM
Augustin Harter AHARTER@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Benoit Buschmaas BBUSCHMAAS@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Bjarne Jaster BJASTER@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Christoph Berganski CBERGANSKI@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Dennis Heitkamp DHEITKAMP@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Marko Henning MHENNING@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Helge Ritter HELGE@TECHFAK.UNI-BIELEFELD.DE
Chengjie Wu WUCJ19@MAILS.TSINGHUA.EDU.CN
Xiaotian Hao XIAOTIANHAO@TJU.EDU.CN
Yiming Lu LUYM19@MAILS.TSINGHUA.EDU.CN
Hangyu Mao MAOHANGYU1@HUAWEI.COM
Yihuan Mao MAOYH20@MAILS.TSINGHUA.EDU.CN
Chao Wang WANGCHAO358@HUAWEI.COM
Michal Opanowicz MICHAL.OPANOWICZ@GMAIL.COM
Anssi Kanervisto ANSSK@UEF.FI
Yanick Schraner YANICK.SCHRANER@FHNW.CH
Christian Scheller CHRISTIAN.SCHELLER@FHNW.CH
Xiren Zhou XZ2754@COLUMBIA.EDU
Lu Liu LIU@PLATOAPP.COM
Daichi Nishio DNISH240@GMAIL.COM
Toi Tsuneda TTSUNEDA@CSL.EC.T.KANAZAWA-U.AC.JP
Karolis Ramanauskas KAROLIS.RAM@GMAIL.COM
Gabija Juceviciute G.JUCEVICIUTE@GMAIL.COM

arXiv:2106.03748v1 [cs.LG] 7 Jun 2021

Abstract

Reinforcement learning competitions have formed the basis for standard research benchmarks, galvanized advances in the state-of-the-art, and shaped the direction of the field. Despite this, a majority of challenges suffer from the same fundamental problems: participant solutions to the posed challenge are usually domain-specific, biased to maximally exploit compute resources, and not guaranteed to be reproducible. In this paper, we present a new framework of competition design that promotes the development of algorithms that overcome these barriers. We propose four central mechanisms for achieving this end: submission retraining, domain randomization, desemantization through domain obfuscation, and the

© W.H. Guss *et al.*

limitation of competition compute and environment-sample budget. To demonstrate the efficacy of this design, we proposed, organized, and ran the MineRL 2020 Competition on Sample-Efficient Reinforcement Learning. In this work, we describe the organizational outcomes of the competition and show that the resulting participant submissions are reproducible, non-specific to the competition environment, and sample/resource efficient, despite the difficult competition task.

Keywords: Reinforcement learning competitions, Minecraft, Sample Efficiency, Imitation Learning

1. Introduction

Deep reinforcement learning has emerged as a compelling solution to a wide range of problems in machine learning. Techniques from this field have been successfully applied to a number of difficult domains such as real-time video games (Berner et al., 2019; Vinyals et al., 2019b), complicated control and scheduling problems, real-world robotic manipulation tasks, and self-driving. The success of deep reinforcement learning (RL) has been accompanied by an increase in RL competitions spanning a number of domains and difficult open problems (Guss et al., 2019; Perez-Liebana et al., 2019; Koppejan and Whiteson, 2009). As competitions mature, they form the basis for benchmarks used throughout the community (Machado et al., 2018; Bellemare et al., 2013). Typically, competitions focus on a core problem with current RL algorithms or domain(s) not yet readily solved by current methods, and challenge competitors to train agents (using competitor resources) to solve domain(s). These agents are then submitted to an evaluation platform and ranked based on final performance.

Despite this common format for research benchmarks, a number of issues have become apparent. In competitions where only final trained agents are submitted, the algorithmic underpinnings of submissions become difficult to reproduce: winning solutions are often trained with a disproportionately larger compute resource budget to that of other competitors (Guss et al., 2019); competitors often choose to train on a specific set of environment seeds and benefit greatly from large-scale hyperparameter searches, making reimplementation and broader use more difficult (Khetarpal et al., 2018); and training code is sometimes not shared when only inference code is submitted, preventing validation of the algorithmic claims of the submission and allowing the submission to be trained using hard-coded, engineered features or action and reward shaping (Houghton et al., 2020). Furthermore, competitions tied to a specific unrandomized domain can fail to yield direct algorithmic advancements, as the most successful methods commonly overfit to and exploit the specific structure of the problem. Similarly, multi-year competitions reward increases in domain knowledge exploitation, reducing the role of algorithmic novelty. For domains of specific real-world importance, such as robotics or self-driving, the task solution has greater utility than any resulting secondary algorithmic advancements. However, there is a large gap between domain-specific submissions to RL competitions on video-game or artificial domains and their downstream utility in the research community.

To address these problems, we proposed, organized, and ran the MineRL 2020 Competition on Sample Efficient Reinforcement Learning using Human Priors (Guss et al., 2021). Our competition utilized several novel mechanisms for yielding robust and domain agnostic submissions, including observation and action space obfuscation, submission retraining,

domain randomization, and environment interaction limits. In this paper, we present the general methodologies and design principles that comprise the competition structure and describe the resulting top-performing submissions. Section 2 provides a general background for the problem settings that motivate the competition. In Section 3, we give an overview of the competition, including its design, central task, rules, and resources provided. In Section 4, the top teams describe the approaches used in their submissions. Thereafter, in Section 5 we discuss the organizational outcomes of our competition with respect to our goal of robust, reproducible, and high quality solutions. Finally, we position the MineRL competition in the context of other concurrent and past RL competitions in Section 6 and discuss challenges and opportunities for future work in Section 7.

2. Background

2.1. The sample *in*efficiency problem

Many of the most celebrated successes of machine learning, such as AlphaStar (Vinyals et al., 2019a), AlphaGo (Silver et al., 2017), OpenAI Five (Berner et al., 2019), and their derivative systems (Silver et al., 2018), utilize deep RL to achieve human or super-human level performance in sequential decision-making tasks. These improvements to the state-of-the-art have thus far required exponentially increasing computational power (Amodei and Hernandez, 2018), which is largely due to the number of environment-samples required for training. These growing computational requirements prohibit many in the AI community from improving these systems and reproducing state-of-the-art results. Additionally, the application of many reinforcement learning techniques to real-world challenges, such as self-driving vehicles, is hindered by the raw number of required samples.

A variety of approaches have been proposed towards the goal of sample efficiency, including learning a model of the environment (Buckman et al., 2018), leveraging AutoRL to perform efficient hyperparameter optimization (Franke et al., 2020), and incorporating domain information in the form of human priors and demonstrations (Dubey et al., 2018; Pfeiffer et al., 2018). In our competition we encourage the use of any techniques that improve the sample efficiency of RL algorithms without using domain-specific hard-coding.

2.2. Generalization

The development of RL algorithms that can generalize is of great importance to the research community (Zhang et al., 2018; Cobbe et al., 2019; Malik et al., 2021). There are various notions of generalization, but it is broadly defined as the ability of an agent to learn desired behavior and perform well in similar environments. Through our competition, we want to promote the development of algorithms that generalize across different domains and tasks, such as those with different state and action spaces.

2.3. Minecraft

The central competition task, `ObtainDiamond`, is set in the Minecraft domain. Minecraft is a popular and compelling environment for the development of reinforcement (Oh et al., 2016; Shu et al., 2017; Tessler et al., 2017) and imitation learning methods because of the unique challenges it presents. Notably, the procedurally-generated world is composed of

discrete blocks that allow modification. Over the course of gameplay, players change their surroundings by gathering resources and constructing structures. Since Minecraft is a 3D, first-person, embodied domain and the agent's surroundings are varied and dynamic, it presents many of the same challenges as real-world robotics domains, like determining a good representation of the environment and planning over long time horizons.

3. Competition Overview

In line with its previous iteration (Guss et al., 2019; Milani et al., 2020), the MineRL 2020 Competition challenges teams to submit reproducible (Houghton et al., 2020) training code for an agent that can solve a complex, long time-horizon task with robustness to environment domain-shift under a strict sample and computational budget. We describe the competition design in Section 3.1, including the mechanisms we implemented to ensure the development of robust and sample efficient learning algorithms. The primary competition task is the MineRL `ObtainDiamond` environment, which we detail in Section 3.2. We summarize the rules of the competition in Section 3.3. Our methodology for evaluating submitted algorithms is explained in Section 3.4. To assist participants with developing their learning algorithms, we provide them with a number of important resources, including a set of reinforcement learning and imitation learning baselines, which we describe in Section 3.5.

3.1. Competition Design

The MineRL Competition is designed to promote the development of robust, domain agnostic, and sample efficient algorithms for solving complex, long time-horizon tasks with sparse rewards using human priors.

Reproducibility and Sample Efficiency. To yield sample efficient algorithms, we provide participants with the 60 million frame `MineRL-v0` human demonstration dataset (Guss* et al., 2019) of the competition task. These samples allow the use of imitation learning techniques, which can drastically reduce the number of resources and samples required to solve complex tasks. Gathering expert demonstrations is practical for many RL environments, so this approach can be applied in many competitions.

To further ensure reproducibility and sample efficiency, we retrain participant submissions during Round 2. In addition, to directly address the problem of disproportionate and limited access to computing resources across the AI research community, we deliberately limit the hardware available for training; this further enables the democratization of AI research and the development of novel AI techniques with a low-barrier to reproduction. In Round 1, participants develop and train a learning algorithm on the environment using a fixed hardware and compute budget (1 NVIDIA P100 GPU for 4 days) and a fixed number of environment samples (8,000,000 frames or approximately 114 hours of game time). This compute budget was chosen as it represents an upper bound on consumer hardware; to democratize access to reinforcement and imitation learning research, constraining compute to within a reasonable consumer range is crucial. The competitors then submit their trained agent to the competition evaluator, where it is evaluated with a fixed set of holdout seeds and compared to other submissions. All participants with a non-zero score progress to Round 2. In this round, competitors submit only their training code to the evaluator,




Figure 1: The action and observation space obfuscation mechanism; a randomized autoencoder trained to encode the entire mixed discrete-continuous observation and action space into a compact ball with which participants' models interact. This obfuscation prevents action shaping and feature engineering and enables domain randomization during Round 2.

after which it is run from scratch using the hardware, compute, and sample limits. This retraining procedure ensures that the submissions obey the competition limits on compute and samples.

Robustness and Domain Agnosticism. Preventing domain specific solutions is a difficult task. As in the previous iteration of the MineRL Competition , during Round 2, the environment and dataset is randomized (textures are remapped, action effects are randomized, and game dynamics are changed), thus penalizing submissions which rely on domain specific strategies and feature engineering. Despite this mechanism in last year's competition, participants leveraged small, shaped subpolicies. These subpolicies were not robust to domain shifts because they depended on the semantics of the environment.

In this year's competition, we introduce a novel obfuscation scheme that prevents domain specific hard-coding. Specifically, we learn a random, volume-preserving embedding that takes semantically-labeled actions and observations (e.g., crafting or inventory items) and obfuscates them into feature vectors. This scheme is agnostic to the environment, as algorithms trained to solve environments with this vector observation and action space can be immediately retrained against a different environment given a corresponding embedding of the new environment's action and state spaces.

Shown in Figure 1, we obtain this embedding with careful considerations of injectivity and surjectivity. Let $X \subset A$ be some bounded action/observation space (discrete or continuous), P_X be the default sampling distribution for that space (often uniform). Let Z be some bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into which we wish to obfuscate X. In the MineRL Competition, $Z = [-1, 1]^n$ where n is the length of the obfuscated feature vector. Let $d_X(u, v)$ be a natural reconstruction metric for X (normed difference squared for continuous X, and cross entropy for discrete X). Let $g_\theta : A \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^n \to A$ be encoder and decoder networks. We train these maps to encode the original observation/action space X respecting the bounds of the space by minimizing reconstruction loss while maintaining

that $g_\theta(X) \subset Z$ and $f_\theta(Z) \subset X$; that is, we define our reconstruction loss as

$$L_X(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{y \sim P_X}[d_X(f_\theta(g_\theta(y)), y) + \texttt{Hinge}(g_\theta(y), Z)] \\ + \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathsf{Unif}(Z)}[\texttt{Hinge}(f_\theta(z), X)]$$

where $\texttt{Hinge}(u, V)$ is a hinge loss which is zero when u is in V and piecewise linear, increasing otherwise. For example, for Z, a simple box space, $\texttt{Hinge}(z, [-1, 1]^n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \texttt{ReLu}(|z_i| - 1)$. This loss accomplishes two goals: when the competitors use Z as an action space, they are approximately guaranteed to have a valid action $f_\theta(z)$ in X when sampling within the bounds of Z. Furthermore, the reconstruction loss ensures that all possible actions in X can be taken by finding a point in Z. Likewise, when using Z as an observation space, all observations in the unobfuscated action space X are approximately guaranteed to be contained inside of Z. Therefore, competitors can appropriately normalize their observations in Z. It is important that Z is of the same or higher dimensionality than X so there is certain to be a minimizer θ^*. In the MineRL Competition, both action and observation space embeddings were trained with $\dim(Z) = 64$ to an error of at most `1e-12`; we chose this space as it was of high enough dimension to embed the observation and action space but of low enough dimension that reinforcement learning algorithms converge within the compute budget.

3.2. Task

The primary task of the competition is `ObtainDiamond`. Agents begin at a random position on a randomly-generated Minecraft map with no items in their inventory. Completing the task consists of controlling an embodied agent to obtain a single diamond, which can only be accomplished by navigating the complex item hierarchy of Minecraft. The learning algorithm has direct access to a 64x64 pixel point-of-view observation from the perspective of the embodied agent, as well as a set of discrete observations of the agent's inventory for every item required for obtaining a diamond. The action space is the Cartesian product of continuous view adjustment (turning and pitching), binary movement commands (left/right, forward/backward), and discrete actions for placing blocks, crafting items, smelting items, and mining/hitting enemies. An agent receives reward once per episode for reaching a set of milestones of increasing difficulty that form a set of prerequisites for the full task. Table 1 depicts the full reward structure.

Progress towards solving the `ObtainDiamond` environment under strict sample complexity constraints lends itself to the development of sample-efficient–and therefore more computationally accessible–sequential decision-making algorithms. In particular, because we maintain multiple versions of the dataset and environment for development, validation, and evaluation, it is difficult to engineer domain-specific solutions to the competition challenge. The best performing techniques must explicitly implement strategies that efficiently leverage human priors across general domains.

3.3. Rules

Due to the unique competition paradigm, we provide a strict set of rules to ensure high-quality submissions. We prohibit teams from manually engineering the reward function,

action space, and observation space. For example, we permit curiosity rewards but not bonus rewards for encountering specific objects; we allow a learned hierarchical controller but not one that switches between policies based on manually-specified conditions; we allow agents to act every even-numbered timestep based on the previous two observations but prohibit the application of manually specified edge detectors to the observation. Furthermore, we require that competitors' code make no semantic reference to the environment. To encourage reproducible submissions, we require entries to the competition to be open: teams must reveal most details of their method, including the source code. Moreover, the competition features two sets of tracks, each of which have distinct rules. The RL + IL Track features methods that leverage both samples from the environment and human demonstrations, while algorithms in the IL-only Track must only use imitation learning with no access to the environment — except for during evaluation.

3.4. Evaluation

Submission Platform. The submissions for the competition were evaluated using AIcrowd, which has been used in numerous RL benchmarks (**?**Juliani et al., 2019; Mohanty et al., 2020), and allows for the much needed flexibility when designing complex benchmarks. Participating teams independently develop their solutions using Git repositories provided by AIcrowd. The repositories include simple configurations specifying the expected software runtime. They also have a prescribed structure to enable clear specifications of code entry points for different phases of evaluation. Participants submit to the benchmark by releasing Git tags, which trigger the evaluation workflow. The workflow then builds a Docker image with the submitted code repository, which is automatically orchestrated on a scalable Kubernetes cluster. During evaluation, the evaluators provide real-time feedback on the progress of the evaluation and submission-specific metrics to the participants. If a submission fails, participants can debug their submission using the readily-available logs. To avoid data leak, care is taken to ensure that logs are not made available for sensitive phases of the evaluation. On successful completion of the evaluation workflow, the evaluators update the scores, and any generated assets on the competition leaderboard.

Metrics. When models are submitted in Round 1 and after they are trained by organizers in Round 2, participants are evaluated on the average score of their model over 200 episodes. Scores are computed as the sum of the milestone rewards (shown in Table 1) achieved by the agent in a given episode. Ties are broken by the number of episodes required to achieve the last milestone.

Milestone	Reward	Milestone	Reward
log	1	furnace	32
planks	2	stone_pickaxe	32
stick	4	iron_ore	64
crafting_table	4	iron_ingot	128
wooden_pickaxe	8	iron_pickaxe	256
stone	16	diamond	1024

Table 1: Rewards for sub-goals and main goal (diamond) for `Obtain Diamond`.

3.5. Resources

In addition to providing the `MineRL-v0` dataset (Guss* et al., 2019), we give participants an open-source Github repository with starting code, including an OpenAI Gym template interface, a data-loader, a Docker container, and the code for the solutions created by last year's top participants. We also provide participants with a set of four state-of-the-art




Figure 2: Maximum item score for each team over the evaluation episodes in Round 2.

Baselines		Round 1		Round 2	
Name	**Score**	**Team Name**	**Score**	**Team Name**	**Score**
SQIL	2.94	HelloWorld	19.84	cit-ec.de	72.51
DQFD	2.39	NoActionWasted	16.48	HelloWorld	39.55
Rainbow	0.42	michal_opanowicz	9.29	michal_opanowicz	13.29
PDDDQN	0.11	CU-SF	6.47	NoActionWasted	12.79
		cit-ec.de	6.40	Rabbits	5.16
		NuclearWeapon	4.34	MajiManji	2.49
		murarinCraft	3.61	BeepBoop	1.97
		RL4LYFE	3.39		
		porcupines	3.35		

Table 2: Scores of the baselines (left) and the best-performing submissions from Round 1 (middle) and Round 2 (right).

baselines that they could readily submit. Implemented by the organizers from Preferred Networks, these baselines consist of Soft-Q Imitation Learning, (SQIL) (Reddy et al., 2020), Deep-Q From Demonstrations (DQfD) (Hester et al., 2018), Rainbow Deep-Q Networks (Rainbow) (Hessel et al., 2018), and Prioritized Dueling Double Deep Q-Networks (PDDDQN) (Schaul et al., 2015; Van Hasselt et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2016). The baselines all used K-means clustering (MacQueen et al., 1967; Lloyd, 1982) to discretize the action space.

4. Solutions

We provide an overview of the submissions made by the participants of our competition. In Section 4.1, we describe the performance of the submissions and how they compare to the performance of submissions to the 2019 competition. The remaining sections summarize the techniques used by the competitors in their submissions.

4.1. Submission Performance Overview

The conditions surrounding the competition and the changes to the competition itself proved to make the competition more challenging for the competitors compared to last year. Although this year's competition enjoyed participation from more teams than last year's (95 vs. 47), there were fewer submissions overall (513 vs. 662). We believe that this decrease in submissions is in part due to the global pandemic. Teams still performed well:

in Round 1, 36 teams achieved a non-zero score, and 17 of these teams outperformed the best-performing baseline, SQIL. In Round 2, seven teams achieved a non-zero score and some teams performed even better than they did in Round 1.

Table 2 shows the scores of the best-performing submissions from both rounds of the 2020 competition. The average scores of the top nine competitors in the 2020 competition were 8.13 for Round 1 and 16.42 for Round 2. In contrast, the average scores of the top nine competitors in the 2019 competition were 31.77 for Round 1 and 25.84 for Round 2. Surprisingly, the standard deviation of the top nine scores from Round 1 of 2020 was smaller than the standard deviation of the top nine scores from Round 1 of 2019 (5.72 and 10.22, respectively). This finding may be due to the overlap of techniques used by the competitors: at least four of the top nine competitors in the 2020 competition leveraged a similar K-means clustering of the action space. Figure 2 depicts the maximum item score for each team over the evaluation episodes in Round 2. Although no team obtained a diamond, many of the top teams progressed quite far along the item hierarchy.

4.2. Team 1: `cit-ec.de`

Overall, team `cit-ec.de` placed fifth in Round 1 (score of 6.40) and first in Round 2 (score of 72.510). They also placed first in the RL + IL track. In Round 1, they competed in the IL-only track, but they switched to the RL + IL Track in Round 2. Inspired by the recent success of cognitive science research (Melnik et al., 2018b; König et al., 2018) and its applications in artificial intelligence systems (Melnik et al., 2019; Konen et al., 2019; Bach et al., 2020; Melnik et al., 2018a; Harter et al., 2020; Schilling and Melnik, 2018), their approach aims to learn to detect object-centric representations from pixels (Simonyan et al., 2013) using rewarding signals of interaction with the environment.

Depicted in Figure 3 (top), they train a U-Net model to generate masks over reward-related objects in images. This approach enables the training of the U-Net model without explicit label information. Instead, they perform this training in a contrastive fashion with image pairs using an adversarial scheme employing the critic score gradient with respect to the mask operation. The pair consists of two images, where the first has a high and the second a low critic value. Training with such pairs enables the U-Net to produce masks that decrease the critic value in the first image and increase the critic value in the second image when transferring pixels in the masked segment from the first to the second image. The critic learns to estimate the expected-reward value of an image observation using experience replay buffer collected from human player demonstrations. As shown in Figure 3 (bottom), this approach of training the U-Net model showed encouraging results of segmentation of rewarding objects in the competition (Melnik et al., 2021).

4.3. Team 2: `HelloWorld`




Figure 4: `HelloWorld`'s method.

Team `HelloWorld` placed first in Round 1 (score of 19.840) and second in Round 2 (score of 39.55). They competed in the RL + IL track. Shown in Figure 4, their approach splits each episode into several stages based on accumulated rewards. They train one policy for each stage of the episode to enable each subpolicy to capture different information towards different goals. They train




Figure 3: `cit-ec.de`'s method. **Top:** First phase (highlighted in red): Image **A** (high critic value) passes through the U-Net, forming a mask **M**. Second phase: the mask **M** is used to merge image **A** (high critic value) with image **B** (low critic value) resulting in image **X** (masked parts of **A** replaced with **B**) and image **Y** (masked parts of **A** injected in **B**). Images **A**, **B**, **X**, and **Y** are then passed through the encoder and critic. The losses penalize differences in critic values for image pairs **A** : **Y**, and **B** : **X**. Mask-size loss prevents a trivial solution when **M** takes the full image. **Bottom:** Segmentation results: The U-Net model learns to segment tree trunks without any label information but only from reward signals. It generalizes well between different positive and negative reward scenarios. The first row shows the input images, the second row shows the masked segments of the input images, and the third row shows the U-Net generated masks.

a meta-policy to select a subpolicy for execution at each timestep. For each subpolicy, they select the best algorithm from all of the tested ones, including behavioral cloning, BCQ (Fujimoto et al., 2019), SQIL, DQfD, POfD (Kang et al., 2018), and Rainbow. They find that SQIL incorporated with self-imitation avoids performance drop during training. Finally, their solution consists of other key components to make their approach more robust and generalizable, including pretraining agents on simpler environments, leveraging auxiliary tasks (e.g., predicting future state), and applying state augmentation (Yarats et al., 2021).

4.4. Team 3: `michal_opanowicz`

Team `michal_opanowicz` achieved third place in Round 1 (score of 9.290) and Round 2 (score of 13.290). However, this team achieved first place overall in the IL-only track. They use imitation learning, in which the problem is framed as a classification task where the agent predicts the human player's action at each environment step. To produce discrete labels for this task, they quantize the actions using K-means with 120 clusters. During evaluation, they randomly sample the actions from the cluster means with the network's prediction used as a probability distribution.




Figure 5: The percentage of runs in which `michal_opanowicz`'s agent collected a given item.

For visual processing, they use the ResNet (He et al., 2015) architecture with FixUp initialization (Zhang et al., 2019), that was proposed for this task in a MineRL 2019 submission (Amiranashvili et al., 2020). They process non-visual observations with a fully connected layer with ReLU activation and concatenate it with the ResNet outputs. They are then processed by a LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) and two fully connected layers to produce the final prediction. Notably, they add the LSTM inputs to its outputs to form a residual connection similar to ResNets. They train the network on 100-step sequences of observation-action pairs, with the final LSTM state in a sequence used as the initial state for the next sequence. Figure 5 shows an analysis of their algorithm's performance. In most runs, their agent obtains either a crafting table or a stick.

4.5. Team 4: `NoActionWasted`

Team `NoActionWasted` competed in the IL-only track. Overall, they achieved second place in Round 1 and fourth in Round 2 (scores of 16.48 and 12.79, respectively). Depicted in Figure 6, their system consists of a ResNet-LSTM network (Espeholt et al., 2018) trained to predict human actions. They found that directly training agents on the obfuscated actions was not successful, so they discretized the action space into 150 clusters with K-means. This step was crucial to obtain good initial behavior. When using a lower amount of clusters, some rare but important actions are not represented. Instead of fixing the frame-skip parameter, they train the network to predict it as an action parameter , which provides significant benefit for agents in the Minecraft domain, as many tasks require repeating the same action multiple times, and it reduces the perceived episode length.




Figure 6: `NoActionWasted`'s architecture.

They filter the dataset to only include successful games, which consistently improved the performance. They fine-tune the system with IMPALA (Espeholt et al., 2018). Following their submission last year (Scheller et al., 2020), they pair this algorithm with extensive

experience replay (Lin, 1992), clipping advantages to promote exploitation of good behavior, and CLEAR (Rolnick et al., 2018) to combat catastrophic forgetting. Crucially, they find that large batch sizes were crucial for stability during the RL fine tuning.

4.6. Team 5: `Rabbits`

Team Rabbits achieved fifth place in Round 2 (score of 5.16). Although they competed in both tracks, their highest-performing submission was from their RL + IL track submission. For their approach in both tracks, they split the overall task into 10 subtasks based on reward, transforming it into a hierarchical learning problem. They use a task-classification network to determine which of the 10 reward stages the agent is currently in. The task-classification network only takes the state vector as input. To learn the subtasks, they use 10 separate Q networks. For the IL-only track submission(s), they employ Regularized Behavior Cloning (RBC) (Piot et al., 2014) on the demonstration data. They train each Q network separately, stopping when the TD error no longer decreases. For their RL + IL submission(s), they apply RBC as the starting point for RL. The RL algorithm they use is a variant of SQIL: they set the reward in expert replay buffer to be half of the reward of the corresponding task, except for the steps that obtain the sparse reward.

4.7. Team 6: `MajiManji`

Team `MajiManji` achieved sixth place in Round 2 (score: 5.16). They participated in the RL + IL track. Their approach uses hierarchical offline reinforcement learning. Outlined in Figure 7, they decompose the high-level task of mining a diamond into a set of subtasks, and train a separate CQL agent (Kumar et al., 2020) for each subtask. To determine these subtasks, they use a label encoder that maps cumulative reward to a label. The high-level policy leverages the subtask label to select the low-level policies. In the environments ending with "VectorObf", which have both POV images and vectors as states, they use ATC (Stooke et al., 2020) to extract features only from the POV images.




Figure 7: Overview of `MajiManji`'s architecture.

They apply a K-means algorithm to the action space for each subtask. In addition, they construct a "necessary action space". An action is added to this action space when the total number of times it is performed is few, but it is performed in most episodes. Since the low-level policies may not learn to do these necessary actions, the high-level policy chooses a necessary action randomly with low probability ϵ. In the future, they plan to find how to weight important demonstrations with no reward and few samples.

4.8. Team 7: `BeepBoop`

Team `BeepBoop` achieved twelfth place in Round 1 (score: 3.110) and seventh in Round 2 (score: 1.970). In Round 1, they participated in the RL + IL track, where they simply used the SQIL baseline. For Round 2, they participated in both tracks. Their RL + IL track

submission was designed with the goal of improving the DQfD baseline. First, they improved data preparation: since their agent never reached the later stages of the challenge, they only use the data from the earlier stages of the `ObtainDiamond` and `ObtainIronPickaxe` environments, as measured by cumulative rewards. They also included the full TreeChop dataset. Second, they focused on improving the action space representation. They use K-means clustering with a large number of clusters to cluster the action space to ensure that the agent could access all necessary actions. For their IL-only track submission, they used behavioral cloning with the ResNet-50 network architecture (He et al., 2015). For the labels, they used the centroids of K-means clustered obfuscated actions. They apply the same data preparation and action space modification techniques as in the RL+IL track submission.

5. Discussion

Promoting the development of sample-efficient, domain agnostic, and reproducible RL algorithms is crucial in translating the research advances of RL into complex, real-world settings. In this section, we discuss the extent to which the design principles behind the MineRL competition have accomplished this goal.

Successes. As the results of Section 4 illustrate, the submissions to the competition are general and successful in the face of the competition constraints. Competitors submitted sample-efficient algorithms that made substantial progress towards the difficult `ObtainDiamond` task with a mere 8,000,000 frames from the environment. Further, despite the domain randomization in Round 2, many of the top algorithms from Round 1 also achieved impressive scores in Round 2. The submissions that performed well in Round 2 were those which were robust to domain-shift, and because the organizers retrained submissions from scratch in Round 2, those successful submissions were also certifiably reproducible and resource-efficient. Unlike the previous iteration of the MineRL Competition, the addition of the action/observation obfuscation technique completely prevented teams from action shaping and feature engineering, leading to the emergence of a very common action-simplification technique: K-means clustering of the expert action space.

Limitations. In its current form, the competition is limited to the Minecraft domain. Although domain randomization and action space obfuscation prevent the introduction of some inductive biases into the participants' algorithms, competitors still expect to be faced with the broader game mechanics of Minecraft. This domain knowledge ultimately manifests itself in the particular algorithmic structure of participants' submissions (e.g., in the choice of hierarchical methods). A natural next step to promote more domain agnostic methods is to expand the scope of the competition to include a training step against a different domain using the autoencoder-based technique proposed in Section 3.1. This step would ensure submissions developed for the `ObtainDiamond` task could succeed in an auxiliary domain. An additional limitation of the competition design is that the obfuscation of the observation space does not include the pixel observation subspace. Although this choice decreases the scope of research outcomes in the competition, it directly promotes research towards algorithms that learn from pixels, a current and crucial challenge in deep RL.

6. Related Work

Previous competitions (Juliani et al., 2019) focused on a variety of aspects of RL, such as the multi-agent setting (Gao et al., 2019; Perez-Liebana et al., 2019; Mohanty et al., 2020) or practical applications (Marot et al., 2020). In most of these competitions, the focus is not on generalization. Instead, the goal is to develop a trained agent that performs well on a given domain. Consequently, winning submissions often relied on hand-engineered features and stemmed from the use of large amounts of computational resources to optimize the submission for the specific task. Competitions that have promoted the development of general RL algorithms do not perform action or observation obfuscation and either focus on generalization across a variety of tasks with shared objects, textures, and actions (Nichol et al., 2018) or utilize the approach of having hold-out test tasks (Cartoni et al., 2020).

To our knowledge, no previous competition has explicitly encouraged the use of imitation learning alongside RL. Previous imitation learning competitions (Diodato et al., 2019) concentrate on the prediction setting (e.g., predicting a vehicle's speed given sensor inputs), which is reflected in their evaluation metrics. However, our evaluation metrics are more reflective of the sequential decision-making setting in which our competition takes place. Although some top solutions to previous competitions leveraged imitation learning (Meisheri et al., 2019), the use of imitation learning alongside reinforcement learning was not explicitly promoted. In contrast, we encourage the use of imitation learning by providing participants with a large dataset of human demonstrations and introducing a second track to the competition where competitors must only use the dataset to train their algorithms.

7. Conclusion

We ran the 2020 MineRL Competition on Sample Efficient Reinforcement Learning Using Human Priors in order to promote the development of general, sample efficient reinforcement learning and imitation learning algorithms. We described the competition, highlighting changes to the rules and structure from the 2019 version of the competition. We summarized the performance of the submissions and contrasted this performance with the performance from last year. We described the approaches of the top seven teams from Round 2. We concluded by discussing the benefits and limitations of our approach.

Acknowledgments

We thank AIcrowd for hosting the competition evaluator and providing tireless hours of support in ensuring that competitors could submit their solutions. We especially thank Shivam Khandelwal for his help in developing the competition starter-kit and providing constant assistance to the organizers and the participants during the competition. We would like to thank Ansii Kanervisto for his continual and detailed responses in the competition Discord. In addition, we would like to acknowledge our sponsor Preferred Networks for providing a rich set of baselines in their new framework PFRL. We thank Microsoft Research and the Artificial Intelligence Journal for their generous sponsorship of competition compute (for retraining and evaluation), of compute grants enabling the participation of underrepresented groups, and of NeurIPS registrations for competitors. Finally, we would like to acknowledge Microsoft Research and NVIDIA for providing prizes for the competition.

References

Artemij Amiranashvili, Nicolai Dorka, Wolfram Burgard, Vladlen Koltun, and Thomas Brox. Scaling imitation learning in minecraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.02701*, 2020.

Dario Amodei and Danny Hernandez. https://blog.openai.com/ai-and-compute/, May 2018. URL https://blog.openai.com/ai-and-compute/.

Nicolas Bach, Andrew Melnik, Malte Schilling, Timo Korthals, and Helge Ritter. Learn to move through a combination of policy gradient algorithms: Ddpg, d4pg, and td3. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, Optimization, and Data Science*, pages 631–644. Springer, 2020.

Marc G Bellemare, Yavar Naddaf, Joel Veness, and Michael Bowling. The arcade learning environment: An evaluation platform for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:253–279, 2013.

Christopher Berner, Greg Brockman, Brooke Chan, Vicki Cheung, Przemyslaw Debiak, Christy Dennison, David Farhi, Quirin Fischer, Shariq Hashme, Chris Hesse, et al. Dota 2 with large scale deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06680*, 2019.

Jacob Buckman, Danijar Hafner, George Tucker, Eugene Brevdo, and Honglak Lee. Sample-efficient reinforcement learning with stochastic ensemble value expansion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01675*, 2018.

Emilio Cartoni, Francesco Mannella, Vieri Giuliano Santucci, Jochen Triesch, Elmar Rueckert, and Gianluca Baldassarre. Real-2019: Robot open-ended autonomous learning competition. In *NeurIPS 2019 Competition and Demonstration Track*, pages 142–152. PMLR, 2020.

Karl Cobbe, Oleg Klimov, Chris Hesse, Taehoon Kim, and John Schulman. Quantifying generalization in reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1282–1289, 2019.

Michael Diodato, Yu Li, Manik Goyal, and Iddo Drori. Winning the ICCV 2019 learning to drive challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10318*, 2019.

Rachit Dubey, Pulkit Agrawal, Deepak Pathak, Thomas L Griffiths, and Alexei A Efros. Investigating human priors for playing video games. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.10217*, 2018.

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 *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1407–1416, 2018.

Jörg KH Franke, Gregor Köhler, André Biedenkapp, and Frank Hutter. Sample-efficient automated deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01555*, 2020.

Scott Fujimoto, David Meger, and Doina Precup. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2052–2062. PMLR, 2019.

Chao Gao, Pablo Hernandez-Leal, Bilal Kartal, and Matthew E Taylor. Skynet: A top deep rl agent in the inaugural pommerman team competition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.01360*, 2019.

William H. Guss, Cayden Codel*, Katja Hofmann*, Brandon Houghton*, Noboru Kuno*, Stephanie Milani*, Sharada Mohanty*, Diego Perez Liebana*, Ruslan Salakhutdinov*, Nicholay Topin*, Manuela Veloso*, and Phillip Wang*. The MineRL competition on sample efficient reinforcement learning using human priors. In *The 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Competition Track*, 2019.

William H. Guss*, Brandon Houghton*, Nicholay Topin, Phillip Wang, Cayden Codel, Manuela Veloso, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. MineRL: A large-scale dataset of Minecraft demonstrations. In *The 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.

William H Guss, Mario Ynocente Castro, Sam Devlin, Brandon Houghton, Noboru Sean Kuno, Crissman Loomis, Stephanie Milani, Sharada Mohanty, Keisuke Nakata, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, et al. The minerl 2020 competition on sample efficient reinforcement learning using human priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11071*, 2021.

Augustin Harter, Andrew Melnik, Gaurav Kumar, Dhruv Agarwal, Animesh Garg, and Helge Ritter. Solving physics puzzles by reasoning about paths. In *1st NeurIPS workshop on Interpretable Inductive Biases and Physically Structured Learning*, 2020.

Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1512.03385, 2015.

Matteo Hessel, Joseph Modayil, Hado Van Hasselt, Tom Schaul, Georg Ostrovski, Will Dabney, Dan Horgan, Bilal Piot, Mohammad Azar, and David Silver. Rainbow: Combining improvements in deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.

Todd Hester, Matej Vecerik, Olivier Pietquin, Marc Lanctot, Tom Schaul, Bilal Piot, Dan Horgan, John Quan, Andrew Sendonaris, Ian Osband, et al. Deep q-learning from demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.

Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Comput.*, 9 (8), 1997.

Brandon Houghton, Stephanie Milani, Nicholay Topin, William Guss, Katja Hofmann, Diego Perez-Liebana, Manuela Veloso, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Guaranteeing reproducibility in deep learning competitions. In *The 23rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, Challenges in Machine Learning (CiML) Workshop*, 2020.

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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01378*, 2019.

Bingyi Kang, Zequn Jie, and Jiashi Feng. Policy optimization with demonstrations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2469–2478. PMLR, 2018.

Khimya Khetarpal, Zafarali Ahmed, Andre Cianflone, Riashat Islam, and Joelle Pineau. Re-evaluate: Reproducibility in evaluating reinforcement learning algorithms. 2018.

Kai Konen, Timo Korthals, Andrew Melnik, and Malte Schilling. Biologically-inspired deep reinforcement learning of modular control for a six-legged robot. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation Workshop on Learning Legged Locomotion Workshop,(ICRA) 2019, Montreal, CA, May 20-25, 2019*, 2019.

Peter König, Andrew Melnik, Caspar Goeke, Anna L Gert, Sabine U König, and Tim C Kietzmann. Embodied cognition. In *2018 6th International Conference on Brain-Computer Interface (BCI)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2018.

Rogier Koppejan and Shimon Whiteson. Neuroevolutionary reinforcement learning for generalized helicopter control. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, pages 145–152, 2009.

Aviral Kumar, Aurick Zhou, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04779*, 2020.

Long-Ji Lin. Self-improving reactive agents based on reinforcement learning, planning and teaching. *Machine learning*, 8(3-4):293–321, 1992.

S. Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982. doi: 10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489.

Marlos C Machado, Marc G Bellemare, Erik Talvitie, Joel Veness, Matthew Hausknecht, and Michael Bowling. Revisiting the arcade learning environment: Evaluation protocols and open problems for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61: 523–562, 2018.

James MacQueen et al. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. 1967.

Dhruv Malik, Yuanzhi Li, and Pradeep Ravikumar. When is generalizable reinforcement learning tractable? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00300*, 2021.

Antoine Marot, Isabelle Guyon, Benjamin Donnot, Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, Patrick Panciatici, Mariette Awad, Aidan O'Sullivan, Adrian Kelly, and Zigfried Hampel-Arias. L2rpn: Learning to run a power network in a sustainable world neurips2020 challenge design. 2020.

Hardik Meisheri, Omkar Shelke, Richa Verma, and Harshad Khadilkar. Accelerating training in pommerman with imitation and reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04947*, 2019.

Andrew Melnik, Sascha Fleer, Malte Schilling, and Helge Ritter. Modularization of end-to-end learning: Case study in arcade games. In *32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018), Workshop on Causal Learning*, 2018a. URL https://arxiv.org/pdf/1901.09895.pdf.

Andrew Melnik, Felix Schüler, Constantin A Rothkopf, and Peter König. The world as an external memory: the price of saccades in a sensorimotor task. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience*, 12:253, 2018b.

Andrew Melnik, Lennart Bramlage, Hendric Voss, Federico Rossetto, and Helge Ritter. Combining causal modelling and deep reinforcement learning for autonomous agents in minecraft. 2019.

Andrew Melnik, Augustin Harter, Christian Limberg, and Helge Ritter. Critic-guided learning to segment rewarding objects in first-person views. In *NeurIPS 2020 Competition Track: The 2020 MineRL Competition on Sample Efficient Reinforcement Learning using Human Priors*, 2021. URL https://rebrand.ly/MineRLUNet.

Stephanie Milani, Nicholay Topin, Brandon Houghton, William H Guss, Sharada P Mohanty, Keisuke Nakata, Oriol Vinyals, and Noboru Sean Kuno. Retrospective analysis of the 2019 MineRL competition on sample efficient reinforcement learning. *Proceedings of the NeurIPS 2019 Competition and Demonstration Track*, 2020.

Sharada Mohanty, Erik Nygren, Florian Laurent, Manuel Schneider, Christian Scheller, Nilabha Bhattacharya, Jeremy Watson, Adrian Egli, Christian Eichenberger, Christian Baumberger, et al. Flatland-rl: Multi-agent reinforcement learning on trains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.05893*, 2020.

Alex Nichol, Vicki Pfau, Christopher Hesse, Oleg Klimov, and John Schulman. Gotta learn fast: A new benchmark for generalization in rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03720*, 2018.

Junhyuk Oh, Valliappa Chockalingam, Satinder Singh, and Honglak Lee. Control of memory, active perception, and action in Minecraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09128*, 2016.

Diego Perez-Liebana, Katja Hofmann, Sharada Prasanna Mohanty, Noburu Kuno, Andre Kramer, Sam Devlin, Raluca D Gaina, and Daniel Ionita. The multi-agent reinforcement learning in Malmö (MARLÖ) competition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08129*, 2019.

Mark Pfeiffer, Samarth Shukla, Matteo Turchetta, Cesar Cadena, Andreas Krause, Roland Siegwart, and Juan Nieto. Reinforced imitation: Sample efficient deep reinforcement learning for mapless navigation by leveraging prior demonstrations. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 3(4):4423–4430, 2018.

Bilal Piot, Matthieu Geist, and Olivier Pietquin. Boosted and reward-regularized classification for apprenticeship learning. In *Proceedings of the 2014 international conference on Autonomous agents and multi-agent systems*, pages 1249–1256, 2014.

Siddharth Reddy, Anca D. Dragan, and Sergey Levine. SQIL: imitation learning via reinforcement learning with sparse rewards. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30*, 2020.

David Rolnick, Arun Ahuja, Jonathan Schwarz, Timothy P Lillicrap, and Greg Wayne. Experience replay for continual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.11682*, 2018.

Tom Schaul, John Quan, Ioannis Antonoglou, and David Silver. Prioritized experience replay. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.

Christian Scheller, Yanick Schraner, and Manfred Vogel. Sample efficient reinforcement learning through learning from demonstrations in minecraft. In *NeurIPS 2019 Competition and Demonstration Track*, pages 67–76, 2020.

Malte Schilling and Andrew Melnik. An approach to hierarchical deep reinforcement learning for a decentralized walking control architecture. In *Biologically Inspired Cognitive Architectures Meeting*, pages 272–282. Springer, 2018.

Tianmin Shu, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Hierarchical and interpretable skill acquisition in multi-task reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07294*, 2017.

David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang, Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550(7676):354–359, 2017.

David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, et al. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*, 362, 2018.

Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6034*, 2013.

Adam Stooke, Kimin Lee, Pieter Abbeel, and Michael Laskin. Decoupling representation learning from reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.08319*, 2020.

Chen Tessler, Shahar Givony, Tom Zahavy, Daniel J Mankowitz, and Shie Mannor. A deep hierarchical approach to lifelong learning in minecraft. In *The 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.

Hado Van Hasselt, Arthur Guez, and David Silver. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. 2016.

Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M. Czarnecki, Michael Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyong Chung, David H. Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in StarCraft II using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 2019a.

Oriol Vinyals, Igor Babuschkin, Wojciech M Czarnecki, Michaël Mathieu, Andrew Dudzik, Junyoung Chung, David H Choi, Richard Powell, Timo Ewalds, Petko Georgiev, et al. Grandmaster level in starcraft ii using multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 575 (7782):350–354, 2019b.

Ziyu Wang, Tom Schaul, Matteo Hessel, Hado Hasselt, Marc Lanctot, and Nando Freitas. Dueling network architectures for deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2016.

Denis Yarats, Ilya Kostrikov, and Rob Fergus. Image augmentation is all you need: Regularizing deep reinforcement learning from pixels. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

Amy Zhang, Nicolas Ballas, and Joelle Pineau. A dissection of overfitting and generalization in continuous reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.07937*, 2018.

Hongyi Zhang, Yann N. Dauphin, and Tengyu Ma. Fixup initialization: Residual learning without normalization. *CoRR*, abs/1901.09321, 2019.