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Abstract

Quality diversity (QD) is a growing branch of stochastic optimization research that studies the problem of generating an archive of solutions that maximize a given objective function but are also diverse with respect to a set of specified measure functions. However, even when these functions are differentiable, QD algorithms treat them as “black boxes”, ignoring gradient information. We present the differentiable quality diversity (DQD) problem, a special case of QD, where both the objective and measure functions are first order differentiable. We then present MAP-Elites via Gradient Arborescence (MEGA), a DQD algorithm that leverages gradient information to efficiently explore the joint range of the objective and measure functions. Results in two QD benchmark domains and in searching the latent space of a StyleGAN show that MEGA significantly outperforms state-of-the-art QD algorithms, highlighting DQD’s promise for efficient quality diversity optimization when gradient information is available. Source code is available at [https://github.com/icaros-usc/dqd](https://github.com/icaros-usc/dqd).

1 Introduction

We introduce the problem of differentiable quality diversity (DQD) and propose the MAP-Elites via Gradient Arborescence (MEGA) algorithm as the first DQD algorithm.

Unlike single-objective optimization, quality diversity (QD) is the problem of finding a range of high quality solutions that are diverse with respect to prespecified metrics. For example, consider the problem of generating realistic images that match as closely as possible a target text prompt “Elon Musk”, but vary with respect to hair and eye color. We can formulate the problem of searching the latent space of a generative adversarial network (GAN) [24] as a QD problem of discovering latent codes that generate images maximizing a matching score for the prompt “Elon Musk”, while achieving a diverse range of measures of hair and eye color, assessed by visual classification models [47]. More generally, the QD objective is to maximize an objective $f$ for each output combination of measure functions $m_i$.

While our example problem can be formulated as a QD problem, all current QD algorithms treat the objective $f$ and measure functions $m_i$ as a black box. This means, in our example problem, current QD algorithms fail to take advantage of the fact that both $f$ and $m_i$ are end-to-end differentiable neural networks. Our proposed differentiable quality diversity (DQD) algorithms leverage first-order derivative information to significantly improve the computational efficiency of solving a variety of QD problems where $f$ and $m_i$ are differentiable.

To solve DQD, we introduce the concept of a gradient arborescence. Like gradient ascent, a gradient arborescence makes greedy ascending steps based on the objective $f$. Unlike gradient ascent, a gradient arborescence encourages exploration by branching via the measures $m_i$.

Our work makes four main contributions. 1) We introduce and formalize the problem of differentiable quality diversity (DQD). 2) We propose two DQD algorithms: Objective and Measure Gradient
MAP-Elites via Gradient Arborescence (OMG-MEGA), an algorithm based on MAP-Elites [13], which branches based on the measures \( m_i \) but ascends based on the objective function \( f \); and Covariance Matrix Adaptation MEGA (CMA-MEGA) which is based on the CMA-ME [18] algorithm, and which branches based on the objective-measure space but ascends based on maximizing the QD objective (Fig. 1). Both algorithms search directly in measure space and leverage the gradients of \( f \) and \( m_i \) to form efficient parameter space steps in \( \theta \).

3) We show in three different QD domains (the linear projection, the arm repertoire, and the latent space illumination (LSI) domains), that DQD algorithms significantly outperform state-of-the-art QD algorithms that treat the objective and measure functions as a black box. 4) We demonstrate how searching the latent space of a StyleGAN [33] in the LSI domain with CMA-MEGA results in a diverse range of high-quality images.

2 Problem Definition

**Quality Diversity.** The quality diversity (QD) problem assumes an objective \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) in an \( n \)-dimensional continuous space \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( k \) measures \( m_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) or, as a joint measure, \( m : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k \). Let \( S = m(\mathbb{R}^n) \) be the measure space formed by the range of \( m \). For each \( s \in S \) the QD objective is to find a solution \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( m(\theta) = s \) and \( f(\theta) \) is maximized.

However, we note that \( \mathbb{R}^k \) is continuous, and an algorithm solving the quality diversity problem would require infinite memory to store all solutions. Thus, QD algorithms in the MAP-Elites [40, 13] family approximate the problem by discretizing \( S \) via a tessellation method. Let \( T \) be the tessellation of \( S \) into \( M \) cells. We relax the QD objective to find a set of solutions \( \theta_i \), \( i \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \), such that each \( \theta_i \) occupies one unique cell in \( T \). The occupants \( \theta_i \) of all \( M \) cells form an archive of solutions. Each solution \( \theta_i \) has a position in the archive \( m(\theta_i) \), corresponding to one out of \( M \) cells, and an objective function \( f(\theta_i) \).

The objective of QD can be rewritten as follows, where the goal is to maximize the objective value for each cell in the archive:

\[
\max \sum_{i=1}^{M} f(\theta_i)
\]  

(1)

**Differentiable Quality Diversity.** We define the differentiable quality diversity (DQD) problem, as a QD problem where both the objective \( f \) and measures \( m_i \) are first-order differentiable.

3 Preliminaries

We present several state-of-the-art derivative-free QD algorithms. Our proposed DQD algorithm MEGA builds upon ideas from these works, while introducing measure and objective gradients into the optimization process.

**MAP-Elites and MAP-Elites (line).** MAP-Elites [13, 40] first tessellates the measure space \( S \) into evenly-spaced grid cells. The upper and lower bounds for \( m \) are given as input to constrain \( S \) to a finite region. MAP-Elites first samples solutions from a fixed distribution \( \theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I) \), and populates an initial archive after computing \( f(\theta) \) and \( m(\theta) \). Each iteration of MAP-Elites selects...
We observe that MAP-Elites samples a cell \( \theta \) with fixed-variance \( \sigma \) isotropic Gaussian noise: \( \theta' = \theta + \sigma \mathcal{N}(0, I) \). Each new candidate solution \( \theta' \) is then evaluated and added to the archive if \( \theta' \) discovers a new cell or improves an existing cell. The algorithm continues to generate solutions for a specified number of iterations.

Later work introduced the Iso+LineDD operator [56]. The Iso+LineDD operator samples two archive solutions \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_j \), then blends a Gaussian perturbation with a noisy interpolation given hyperparameters \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \): \( \theta' = \theta_i + \sigma_1 \mathcal{N}(0, I) + \sigma_2 \mathcal{N}(0, I)(\theta_i - \theta_j) \). In this paper we refer to MAP-Elites with an Iso+LineDD operator as MAP-Elites (line).

**CMA-ME.** Covariance Matrix Adaptation MAP-Elites (CMA-ME) [13] combines the archiving mechanisms of MAP-Elites with the adaptation mechanisms of CMA-ES [28]. While MAP-Elites creates new solutions by perturbing existing solutions with fixed-variance Gaussian noise, CMA-ME maintains a full-rank Gaussian distribution \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \) in parameter space \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Each iteration of CMA-ME samples \( \lambda \) candidate solutions \( \theta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \), evaluates each solution, and updates the archive based on the following rule: if there is a previous occupant \( \theta_p \) at the same cell, we compute \( \Delta_i = f(\theta_i) - f(\theta_p) \), otherwise if the cell is empty we compute \( \Delta_i = f(\theta_i) \). We then rank the sampled solutions by increasing improvement \( \Delta_i \), with an extra criteria that candidates discovering new cells are ranked higher than candidates that improve existing cells. We then update \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \) with the standard CMA-ES update rules based on the improvement ranking. CMA-ME restarts when all \( \lambda \) solutions fail to change the archive. On a restart we reset the Gaussian \( \mathcal{N}(\theta_i, I) \), where \( \theta_i \) is an archive solution chosen uniformly at random, and all internal CMA-ES parameters. In the supplemental material, we derive, for the first time, a natural gradient interpretation of the CMA-ME’s improvement ranking mechanism, based on previous theoretical work on CMA-ES [2].

### 4 Algorithms

We present two variants of our proposed MEGA algorithm: OMG-MEGA and CMA-MEGA. We form each variant by adapting the concept of a gradient arborescence to the MAP-Elites and CMA-ME algorithms, respectively. Finally, we introduce a third algorithm, OG-MAP-Elites, which operates only on the gradients of the objective, as a baseline.

**OMG-MEGA.** We first derive the Objective and Measure Gradient Map-Elites via Gradient Arborescence (OMG-MEGA) algorithm from MAP-Elites.

First, we observe how gradient information could benefit a QD algorithm. Note that the QD objective is to explore the measure space, while maximizing the objective function \( f \). We observe that maximizing a linear combination of measures: \( \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j m_j(\theta) \), where \( c \) is a \( k \)-dimensional vector of coefficients, enables movement in a \( k \)-dimensional measure space. Adding the objective function \( f \) to the linear sum enables movement in an objective-measure space. Maximizing \( g \) with a positive coefficient of \( f \) results in steps that increasing \( f \), while the direction of movement in the measure space is determined by the sign and magnitude of the coefficients \( c_j \).

\[
g(\theta) = |c_0| f(\theta) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j m_j(\theta) \tag{2}
\]

We can then derive a direction function that perturbs a given solution \( \theta \) based on the gradient:

\[
\nabla g(\theta) = |c_0| \nabla f(\theta) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j \nabla m_j(\theta) .
\]

We incorporate the direction function \( \nabla g \) to derive a gradient-based MAP-Elites variation operator.

We observe that MAP-Elites samples a cell \( \theta_i \) and perturbs the occupant with Gaussian noise: \( \theta' = \theta_i + \sigma \mathcal{N}(0, I) \). Instead, we sample coefficients \( c \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_g I) \) and update:

\[
\theta' = \theta_i + |c_0| \nabla f(\theta_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} c_j \nabla m_j(\theta_i) \tag{3}
\]

The value \( \sigma_g \) acts as a learning rate for the gradient step. To balance the contribution of each function, we normalize each gradient. Other than our new gradient-based operator, OMG-MEGA is identical to MAP-Elites.
CMA-MEGA. Next, we derive the Covariance Matrix Adaptation MAP-Elites via Gradient Arborescence algorithm from CMA-ME. Fig. 1 shows an overview of the algorithm.

First, we note that we sample $c$ in OMG-MEGA from a fixed-variance Gaussian. However, it would be beneficial to select $c$ based on how $c$, and the subsequent gradient step on $\theta$, improve the QD objective defined in equation [1]

We frame the selection of $c$ as an optimization problem with the objective of maximizing archive improvement. We model a distribution of coefficients $c$ as a $k + 1$-dimensional Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. Given a $\theta$, we can sample $c \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, compute $\theta'$ via Eq. [3] and adapt $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ towards the direction of maximum increase of the QD objective.

We follow an evolution strategy approach to model and dynamically adapt the sampling distribution of coefficients $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. We sample a population of $\lambda$ coefficients from $c_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ and generate $\lambda$ solutions $\theta_i$. We then compute $\Delta_i$ from CMA-ME’s improvement ranking for each candidate solution $\theta_i$. By updating $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with CMA-ES update rules for the ranking $\Delta_i$, we dynamically adapt the distribution of coefficients $c$ to maximize increase of the QD objective.

Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode for CMA-MEGA. In line [3] we evaluate the current solution and compute an objective value $f$, a vector of measure values $m$, and gradient values. As we dynamically adapt the coefficients $c$, we normalize the objective and measure gradients (line [4]) for stability. Because the measure space is tessellated, the measures $m$ place solution $\theta$ into one of the $M$ cells in the archive. We then add the solution to the archive (line [5]), if the solution discovers an empty cell in the archive, or if it improves an existing cell, identically to MAP-Elites.

We then use the gradient information to compute a step that maximizes improvement of the archive. In lines [6]-[12] we sample a population of $\lambda$ coefficients from a multi-variate Gaussian retained by CMA-ES, and take a gradient step for each sample. We evaluate each sampled solution $\theta'_i$, and compute the improvement $\Delta_i$ (line [11]). As in CMA-ME, we specify $\Delta_i$ as the difference in the objective value between the sampled solution $\theta_i$ and the existing solution, if one exists, or as the absolute objective value of the sampled solution if $\theta_i$ belongs to an empty cell.

In line [13], we rank the sampled gradients $\nabla_i$, based on their respective improvements. As in CMA-ME, we prioritize exploration of the archive by ranking first by their objective values all samples that discover new cells, and subsequently all samples that improve existing cells by their difference in improvement. We then use the ranking to compute the ascending gradient step as a linear combination of the gradients (line [14]), following the recombination weights from CMA-ES.

In line [15], CMA-ES adapts the multi-variate Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, as well as internal search parameters $p$, from the improvement ranking of the coefficients. In the supplemental material, we provide a natural gradient interpretation of the improvement ranking rules of CMA-MEGA, where we show that the coefficient distribution of CMA-MEGA approximates natural gradient steps of maximizing a modified QD objective.

CMA-MEGA (Adam). We add an Adam-based variant of CMA-MEGA, where we replace line [15] with an Adam gradient optimization step.

OG-MAP-Elites. To show the importance of taking gradient steps in the measure space, as opposed to only taking gradient steps in objective space and directly perturbing the parameters, we derive a variant of MAP-Elites as a baseline based off the recently proposed Policy Gradient Assisted Map-Elites (PGA-ME) algorithm. PGA-ME combines a Gaussian variation operator with a policy gradient operator only on the objective. Note that we cannot compare directly against PGA-ME as the algorithm specializes for reinforcement learning. Instead, we simplify PGA-ME to optimize a vanilla objective gradient called Objective-Gradient MAP-Elites (OG-MAP-Elites). Each iteration of OG-MAP-Elites samples $\lambda$ solutions $\theta_i$ from the archive. Each $\theta_i$ is perturbed with Gaussian noise to form a new candidate solution $\theta'_i = \theta_i + \sigma \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. OG-MAP-Elites evaluates the solution and updates the archive, exactly as in MAP-Elites. However, OG-MAP-Elites takes one additional step: for each $\theta'_i$, the algorithm computes $\nabla f(\theta'_i)$, forms a new solution $\theta''_i = \theta'_i + \eta \nabla f(\theta'_i)$ with an objective gradient step, and evaluates $\theta''_i$. Finally, we update the archive with all solutions $\theta'_i$ and $\theta''_i$.
Algorithm 1 Covariance Matrix Adaptation MAP-Elites via Gradient Aborecence (CMA-MEGA)

CMA-MEGA \((evaluate, \theta_0, N, \lambda, \eta, \sigma_g)\)

**input**: An evaluation function \(evaluate\) which computes the objective, the measures, gradients of the objective and measures, an initial solution \(\theta_0\), a desired number of iterations \(N\), a branching population size \(\lambda\), a learning rate \(\eta\), and an initial step size for CMA-ES \(\sigma_g\).

**result**: Generate \(N\lambda\) solutions storing elites in an archive \(A\).

1. Initialize solution parameters \(\theta\) to \(\theta_0\), CMA-ES parameters \(\mu = 0\), \(\Sigma = \sigma_g I\), and \(\rho\), where we let \(\rho\) be the CMA-ES internal parameters.

for \(iter \leftarrow 1\) to \(N\) do
  2. \(f, \nabla f, m, \nabla m \leftarrow evaluate(\theta)\)
  3. \(\nabla f \leftarrow \text{normalize}(\nabla f), \nabla m \leftarrow \text{normalize}(\nabla m)\)
  4. update_archive(\(\theta, f, m\))
  5. for \(i \leftarrow 1\) to \(\lambda\) do
     6. \(c \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)\)
     7. \(\nabla_i \leftarrow c_0 \nabla f + \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \nabla m_j\)
     8. \(\theta'_i \leftarrow \theta + \nabla_i\)
     9. \(f'_i, m'_i \leftarrow evaluate(\theta'_i)\)
     10. \(\Delta_i \leftarrow \text{update_archive}(\theta'_i, f'_i, m'_i)\)
  11. end
  12. rank \(\nabla_i\) by \(\Delta_i\)
  13. \(\nabla_{\text{step}} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^\lambda w_i \nabla \text{rank}[i]\)
  14. \(\theta \leftarrow \theta + \eta \nabla_{\text{step}}\)
  15. Adapt CMA-ES parameters \(\mu, \Sigma, \rho\) based on improvement ranking \(\Delta_i\)
  16. if there is no change in the archive then
     17. Restart CMA-ES with \(\mu = 0\), \(\Sigma = \sigma_g I\).
  18. Set \(\theta\) to a randomly selected existing cell \(\theta_i\) from the archive
  19. end
  20. end

5 Domains

We select benchmark domains from previous work in the QD literature, but we focus on domains with differentiable objective and measures, where DQD is applicable.

Linear Projection. To show the importance of adaptation mechanisms in QD, the CMA-ME paper [13] introduced a simple domain, where reaching the extremes of the measures is challenging for non-adaptive QD algorithms. The domain forms each measure \(m_i\) by a linear projection from \(R^n\) to \(R\), while bounding the contribution of each component \(\theta_i\) to the range \([-5.12, 5.12]\).

We note that uniformly sampling from a hypercube in \(R^n\) results in a narrow distribution of the linear projection in \(R\). Increasing the number of parameters \(n\) makes the problem of covering the measure space more challenging, because to reach an extremum \(m_i(\theta) = \pm 5.12n\), all components must equal the extremum: \(\theta[i] = \pm 5.12\).

We select this domain as a benchmark to highlight the need for adaptive gradient coefficients for CMA-MEGA as opposed to constant coefficients for OMG-MEGA, because reaching the edges of the measure space requires dynamically shrinking the gradient steps.

As a QD domain, the domain must provide an objective. The CMA-ME study [18] introduces two variants of the linear projection domain with an objective based on the sphere and Rastrigin functions from the continuous black-box optimization set of benchmarks [27, 29]. We optimize an \(n = 1000\) unbounded parameter space \(R^n\). We provide more detail in the supplemental material.

Arm Repertoire. We select the robotic arm repertoire domain from previous work [13, 56]. The goal in this domain is to find an inverse kinematics (IK) solution for each reachable position of the end-effector of a planar robotic arm with revolute joints. The objective \(f\) of each solution is to minimize the variance of the joint angles, while the measure functions are the positions of the end effector in the \(x\) and \(y\)-axis, computed with the forward kinematics of the planar arm [41]. We selected a 1000-DOF robotic arm.
Table 1: Results: Mean QD-score and coverage values after 10,000 iterations for each algorithm per domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>LP (sphere) QD-score</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>LP (Rastrigin) QD-score</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Arm Repertoire QD-score</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>LSI QD-score</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAP-Elites</td>
<td>1.04 1.17%</td>
<td>1.18 1.72%</td>
<td>1.97 8.06%</td>
<td>13.88 23.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-Elites (line)</td>
<td>12.21 14.32%</td>
<td>8.12 11.79%</td>
<td>33.51 35.79%</td>
<td>16.54 25.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA-ME</td>
<td>1.08 1.21%</td>
<td>1.21 1.76%</td>
<td>55.98 56.95%</td>
<td>18.96 26.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG-MAP-Elites</td>
<td>1.52 1.67%</td>
<td>1.26 1.67%</td>
<td>57.17 58.08%</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMG-MEGA</td>
<td>71.58 92.09%</td>
<td>55.90 77.00%</td>
<td>44.12 44.13%</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA-MEGA</td>
<td>75.29 100.00%</td>
<td>62.54 100.00%</td>
<td>74.18 74.18%</td>
<td>5.36 8.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA-MEGA (Adam)</td>
<td>75.30 100.00%</td>
<td>62.58 100.00%</td>
<td>73.82 73.82%</td>
<td>21.82 30.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Experiments

We conduct experiments to assess the performance of the MEGA variants. In addition to our baseline OG-MAP-Elites, which we propose in section 4, we compare the MEGA variants with the state-of-the-art QD algorithms presented in section 3.

6.1 Experiment Design

Independent Variables. We follow a between-groups design, where the independent variables are the algorithm and the domain (linear projection, arm repertoire, and LSI). We did not run OMG-MEGA and OG-MAP-Elites in the LSI domain; while CMA-MEGA computes the $f$ and $m_i$ gradients once per iteration (line 3 in Algorithm 1), OMG-MEGA and OG-MAP-Elites compute the $f$ and $m_i$ gradients for every sampled solution, making their execution cost-prohibitive for the LSI domain.

Dependent Variables. We measure both the diversity and the quality of the solutions returned by each algorithm. These are combined by the QD-score metric [45], which is defined as the sum of $f$ values of all cells in the archive (Eq. 1). To make the QD-score invariant with respect to the resolution of the archive, we normalize QD-score by the archive size. As an additional metric of diversity we compute the coverage as the number of occupied cells in the archive divided by the total number of cells. We run each algorithm for 20 trials in the linear projection and arm repertoire domains, and for 5 trials in the LSI domain, resulting in a total of 445 trials.

6.2 Analysis

Table 1 shows the metrics of all the algorithms, averaged over 20 trials for the benchmark domains and over 5 trials for the LSI domain. We conducted a two-way ANOVA to examine the effect of algorithm and domain (linear projection (sphere), linear projection (Rastrigin), arm repertoire) on the QD-Score. There was a statistically significant interaction between the search algorithm and the domain ($F(12, 399) = 6453.43, p < 0.001$). Simple main effects analysis with Bonferroni corrections showed that CMA-MEGA and OMG-MEGA performed significantly better than each of the baselines in the sphere and Rastrigin domains, with CMA-MEGA significantly outperforming OMG-MEGA. CMA-MEGA also outperformed all the other algorithms in the arm repertoire domain.

We additionally conducted a one-way ANOVA to examine the effect of algorithm on the LSI domain. There was a statistically significant difference between groups ($F(4, 20) = 260.64, p < 0.001$). Post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Bonferroni corrections showed that CMA-MEGA (Adam) significantly...
outperformed all other algorithms, while CMA-MEGA without the Adam implementation had the worst performance.

Both OMG-MEGA and CMA-MEGA variants perform well in the linear projection domain, where the objective and measure functions are additively separable, and the partial derivatives with respect to each parameter independently capture the steepest change of each function. We observe that OG-MAP-Elites performs poorly in this domain. Analysis shows that the algorithm finds a nearly perfect best solution for the sphere objective, but it interleaves following the gradient of the objective with exploring the archive as in standard MAP-Elites, resulting in smaller coverage of the archive.

In the arm domain, OMG-MEGA manages to reach the extremes of the measure space, but the algorithm fails to fill in nearby cells. OG-MAP-Elites performs significantly better than OMG-MEGA, because the top-performing solutions in this domain tend to be concentrated in an “elite hypervolume” [56]; moving towards the gradient of the objective finds top-performing cells, while applying isotropic perturbations to these cells fills in nearby regions in the archive. CMA-MEGA variants retain the best performance in this domain. Fig. 1 shows a high-precision view of the CMA-MEGA (Adam) archive for the arm repertoire domain.
Figure 3: Result of latent space illumination for objective “Elon Musk with short hair.” and for measures “A person with red hair,” and “A man with blue eyes.”. The axes values indicate the score returned by the CLIP model, where lower score indicates a better match.

We did not observe a large difference between the CMA-MEGA (Adam) and our gradient descent implementation in the first two benchmark domains, where the space is well-conditioned. On the other hand, in the LSI domain CMA-MEGA without the Adam implementation performed poorly. We conjecture that this is caused by the conditioning of the mapping from the latent space of the StyleGAN to the CLIP score.

Fig. 2 shows the QD-score values for increasing number of iterations for each of the tested algorithms, with 95% confidence intervals. The figure also presents heatmaps of the CMA-MEGA (Adam) and the generated archive of the strongest QD competitor for each of the three domains. We provide generated archives of all algorithms in the supplemental material.

We visualize the top performing solutions in the LSI domain by uniformly sampling solutions from the archive of CMA-MEGA (Adam) and showing the generated faces in Fig. 3. We observe that as we move from the top right to the bottom left, the features matching the captions “a man with blue eyes” and “a person with red hair” become more prevalent. We note that these solutions were generated from a single run of CMA-MEGA (Adam) for 10,000 iterations.

Overall, these results show that using the gradient information in quality diversity optimization results in significant benefits in search efficiency, but adapting the gradient coefficients with CMA-ES is critical in achieving top performance.

7 Related Work

Quality Diversity. The precursor to QD algorithms [46] originated with diversity-driven algorithms as a branch of evolutionary computation. Novelty search [36], which maintains an archive of diverse solutions, ensures diversity though a provided metric function and was the first diversity-driven algorithm. Later, objectives were introduced as a quality metric resulting in the first QD algorithms: Novelty Search with Local Competition (NSLC) [57] and MAP-Elites [13, 40]. Since their inception, many works have improved the archives [17, 57, 53], the variation operators [56, 18, 11, 14], and the selection mechanisms [18, 52] of both NSLC and MAP-Elites. While the original QD algorithms were based on genetic algorithms, algorithms based on other derivative-free approaches such as evolution strategies [18, 10, 14, 41] and Bayesian optimization [34] have recently emerged.
Being stochastic derivative-free optimizers [8], QD algorithms are frequently applied to reinforcement learning (RL) problems [44, 14] as derivative information must be estimated in RL. Naturally, approaches combining QD and RL have started to emerge [42, 9]. Unlike DQD, these approaches estimate the gradient of the reward function in action space and backpropagate this gradient through a neural network. Our proposed DQD problem differs by leveraging provided gradients for both the objective and measure functions.

Several works have proposed model-based QD algorithms. For example, the DDE-Elites algorithm [21] dynamically trains a variational auto-encoder (VAE) on the QD archive, then leverages the latent space of this VAE as a learned parameter space to optimize. The PoMS algorithm [48] builds on DDE-Elites by introducing a variation operator which samples based on the Jacobian of the learned VAE. These works differ by dynamically constructing a learned representation of the search space instead of leveraging the objective and measure gradients directly.

**Latent Space Exploration.** Several works have proposed a variety of methods for directly exploring the latent space of generative models. Methods on GANs include interpolation [55], gradient descent [4], importance sampling [59], and latent space walks [40]. Derivative-free optimization methods mostly consist of latent variable evolution (LVE) [5, 22], the method of optimizing latent space with an evolutionary algorithm. LVE was later applied to generating Mario levels [58] with targeted gameplay characteristics. Later work [19] proposed latent space illumination (LSI), the problem of exploring the latent space of a generative model with a QD algorithm. The method has only been applied to procedurally generating video game levels [19, 54, 51] and generating MNIST digits [60]. Follow-up work explored LSI on VAEs [50]. Our work improves LSI on domains where gradient information on the objective and measures is available with respect to model output.

### 8 Limitations and Future Work

Quality diversity (QD) is a rapidly emerging field [8] with applications including procedural content generation [25], damage recovery in robotics [13, 40], efficient aerodynamic shape design [20], and scenario generation in human-robot interaction [16]. We have introduced differentiable quality diversity (DQD), a special case of QD, where measure and objective functions are differentiable, and have shown how a gradient arborescence results in significant improvements in search efficiency.

As both MEGA variants are only first order differentiable optimizers, we expect them to have difficulty on highly ill-conditioned optimization problems. CMA-ES, as an approximate second order optimizer, retains a full-rank covariance matrix that approximates curvature information and is known to outperform quasi-Newton methods on highly ill-conditioned problems [23]. CMA-ME likely inherits these properties by leveraging the CMA-ES adaptation mechanisms and we expect it to have an advantage on ill-conditioned objective and measure functions.

While we found CMA-MEGA to be fairly robust to hyperparameter changes in the first two benchmark domains (linear projection, arm repertoire), small changes of the hyperparameters in the LSI domain led CMA-MEGA, as well as all the QD baselines, to stray too far from the mean of the latent space, which resulted in many artifacts and unrealistic images. One way to address this limitation is to constrain the search region to a hypersphere of radius $\sqrt{d}$, where $d$ is the dimensionality of the latent space, as done in previous work [39].

While CLIP achieves state-of-the-art performance in classifying images based on visual concepts, the model does not measure abstract concepts. Ideally, we would like to specify “age” as a measure function and obtain quantitative estimates of age given an image of a person. We believe that the proposed work on the LSI domain will encourage future research on this topic, which we would in turn be able to integrate with DQD implementations to generate diverse, high quality content.

Many problems, currently modelled as optimization problems, may be fruitfully redefined as QD problems, including the training of deep neural networks. Our belief stems from recent works [49, 38], which reformulated deep learning as a multi-objective optimization problem. However, QD algorithms struggle with high-variance stochastic objectives and measures [32, 15], which naturally conflicts with minibatch training in stochastic gradient descent [6]. These challenges need to be addressed before DQD training of deep neural networks becomes tractable.
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Appendix

A Hyperparameter Selection

For the arm and linear projection domains we mirror the hyperparameter selections from previous work \cite{56, 18} and tuned manually the hyperparameter of the newly proposed algorithms: OG-MAP-Elites, OMG-MEGA and CMA-MEGA. For the latent space illumination domain, since the domain is new, we manually tuned each algorithm so that the learning rate was as small as possible while still have perceptible differences in the first 10 iterations of each algorithm. We chose small learning rates because for large learning rates, the search moved far away from the training distribution, resulting in unrealistic images. We report the parameters of each algorithm below. In all algorithms we used a batch size $\lambda = 36$ following previous work \cite{18}. MAP-Elites and the algorithms derived from MAP-Elites (MAP-Elites (line), OG-MAP-Elites, OMG-MEGA) had an initial population size of 100, sampled from a distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$. These initial solutions used to seed the initial archive do not count as an iteration in our experiments.

**Linear Projection (Sphere, Rastrigin).**

- MAP-Elites: $\sigma = 0.5$
- MAP-Elites (line): $\sigma_1 = 0.5, \sigma_2 = 0.2$
- CMA-ME: $\sigma = 0.5$
- OG-MAP-Elites: $\sigma = 0.5, \eta = 0.5$
- OMG-MEGA: $\sigma_g = 10.0$
- CMA-MEGA: $\sigma_g = 10.0, \eta = 1.0$
- CMA-MEGA (Adam): $\sigma_g = 10.0, \eta = 0.002$

**Arm Repertoire.**

- MAP-Elites: $\sigma = 0.1$
- MAP-Elites (line): $\sigma_1 = 0.1, \sigma_2 = 0.2$
- CMA-ME: $\sigma = 0.2$
- OG-MAP-Elites: $\sigma = 0.1, \eta = 100$
- OMG-MEGA: $\sigma_g = 1.0$
- CMA-MEGA: $\sigma_g = 0.05, \eta = 1.0$
- CMA-MEGA (Adam): $\sigma_g = 0.05, \eta = 0.002$

**Latent Space Illumination of StyleGAN.**

- MAP-Elites: $\sigma = 0.2$
- MAP-Elites (line): $\sigma_1 = 0.1, \sigma_2 = 0.2$
- CMA-ME: $\sigma = 0.02$
- CMA-MEGA: $\sigma_g = 0.002, \eta = 1.0$
- CMA-MEGA (Adam): $\sigma_g = 0.002, \eta = 0.002$

**Adam Hyperparameters.** We use the same hyperparameters as the StyleGAN+CLIP implementation \cite{1}. We configure Adam with the same hyperparameters for each domain.

- $\beta_1 = 0.9$
- $\beta_2 = 0.999$
B Domain Details.

Linear Projection. We use the linear projection domains sphere and Rastrigin from previous work \[18\], and selected \( n = 1000 \) for both domains. Each domain has a different objective function (Eq. 4 Eq. 5) but identical measure functions. As in previous work \[17\], we offset the objective to move the optimal location away from the center of the search space, to \( x_i = 5.12 \cdot 0.4 = 2.048 \).

\[
sphere(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 \tag{4}
\]

\[
\text{Rastrigin}(x) = 10n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} [x_i^2 - 10\cos(2\pi x_i)] \tag{5}
\]

We define the 2D measure space with the projection of the first and second half of the components \( x_i \) (see Eq. 7). We bound the contribution of each component through a \( \text{clip} \) function (Eq. 6) which restricts the measure contribution of each \( x_i \) to the range \([-5.12, 5.12]\).

\[
\text{clip}(x_i) = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } -5.12 \leq x_i \leq 5.12 \\ 5.12 / x_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6}
\]

\[
m(x) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \text{clip}(x_i), \sum_{i=\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}^{n} \text{clip}(x_i) \right) \tag{7}
\]

We observe that the partial derivatives for \( m \), are 1 for the range \([-5.12, 5.12] \). A constant derivative means that the gradient step will not shrink as OMG-MEGA approaches an extreme point in measure space, thus OMG-MEGA often overshoots the bounds; on the other hand, CMA-MEGA dynamically adapts the gradient steps, allowing for efficient coverage the measure space.

Fig. 4 visualizes the challenge of the linear projection domain. Observe that if we sample uniformly on the hypercube \([-5.12, 5.12]^n\), then each of our measure functions becomes a sum of random variables. If we normalize each measure by dividing by \( n \), then our measure functions become an average of random variables. The average of \( n \) random variables forms the Bates distribution \[31\], a distribution that narrows as \( n \) increases (Fig. 2a). At \( n = 1000 \) the solutions sampled from the hypercube are very close to 0 in measure space with high probability. A QD algorithm could simply increase its step-size to move to extremes of measure space, but the \( \text{clip} \) function prevents this by implicitly bounding the extremes of the measure space; each component of \( \theta \) can contribute at most \( \pm 5.12 \) to change the position in measure space. We note the heavy penalty in the \( \text{clip} \) function for a component leaving the range \([-5.12, 5.12]\). The combination of the narrowness of the Bates distribution and the implicit bounding of the \( \text{clip} \) function means that a QD algorithm must dynamically \textit{adapt} its sampling distribution by shrinking step-sizes as the distribution gets close to the extremes of the measure space.

Arm Repertoire. We visualize example solutions for a \( n = 7 \) (7-DOF) planar arm in Fig. 5. The optimal solutions in this domain have zero joint angle variance from the mean (all angles are equal). We note that we selected as objective the variance, instead of the standard deviation used in previous work \[56\], so that the objective is differentiable at 0. The measures for the arm repertoire have range \([-n, n]\), since they are the positions of the end-effector, and the arm has \( n \) links of length \( l_i = 1 \). Thus, the reachable space forms a filled circle with radius \( n \), and the maximum archive coverage becomes \( \frac{\pi n^2}{4n^2} \approx 78.5\% \). We selected \( n = 1000 \) (1000-DOF) for the experiments.

Latent Space Illumination. The latent space of StyleGAN \[33\] has size 512 where a latent code is repeated 18 times for each level of detail.

Transformations of the Objective Function. The QD-score metric, which we use to estimate the performance of QD algorithms, associates solution quality with higher objective value \( f \), and assumes a strictly positive objective value \( f \) for every solution. Therefore, in each domain we transform the objective through a linear transformation of the form \( f' = af + b \) to map the objective values to the range \([0, 100]\).
In the linear projection domain, we follow the objective transformation proposed in previous work [18]. The original objective is to minimize the sphere and Rastrigin functions. We compute an estimate on the largest sphere and Rastrigin values in the hypercube $[-5.12, 5.12]^n$ which contain only components in the linear portion of the clip function. We compute $f(-5.12, -5.12, ..., -5.12)$ as an estimated maximum of the function $f_{\text{max}}$. The minimum of each function is $f_{\text{min}} = 0$. We then remap the function values for both the sphere and Rastrigin objective functions through the linear transformation given by:

$$f'(\theta) = 100 \cdot \frac{f(\theta) - f_{\text{max}}}{f_{\text{max}} - f_{\text{min}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

For the arm domain we estimate $f_{\text{max}}$ to be 1 from an initial population of angles sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$. For the LSI domain we picked $f_{\text{max}} = 10$ by observing the CLIP loss function values for the objective text prompt “Elon Musk with short hair.”.

### C Implementation

**Archives.** In the both the linear projection and arm repertoire domains, the measure space is 2D, with resolution $100 \times 100$. We normalize the objective value $f$ so that it is in the range $[0,100]$ and initialize empty cells of the archive with an objective value $f$ of 0. For latent space illumination we form a 2D archive with the resolution $200 \times 200$. We double the resolution in each dimension as the examined QD algorithms fill roughly a quarter of possible cells in the archive.

**Computational Resources.** We ran 10,000 iterations in all algorithms. We ran all trials in parallel on an AMD Ryzen Threadripper 32-core (64 threads) processor and an GeForce RTX 3090 Nvidia GPU. A run of 20 trials in parallel required about 30’ for the linear projection domains and 2 hours.
for the arm repertoire domain. One trial run for the latent space illumination domain took about 2 hours. We note runtime increases at a higher logging frequency and algorithms which perform better may run slower due to iterating over more archive solutions when QD statistics are calculated.

**Software Implementation.** We use the publicly available Pyribs library for all algorithms, where we implemented the OG-MAP-Elites, OMG-MEGA and CMA-MEGA algorithms. We use the Adam implementation of ESTool.\(^1\)

## D Improvement Ranking as a Natural Gradient Approximation

We show for the first time that CMA-ME’s improvement ranking optimizes a modified QD objective (eq. 10) via a natural gradient approximation. We then extend our derivation to show that the coefficient distribution of CMA-MEGA approximates natural gradient steps of same objective with respect to the gradient coefficients.

We let the original QD objective for an archive \(A\) be:

\[
\max J_1(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} f(\theta_i)
\]

where \(f(\theta_i) = 0\) if a cell \(i\) is unfilled.

Ranking solutions based on \(J_1\) may prioritize solutions that improve existing cells on the archive over solutions that discover new cells. To show this possibility, let \(\theta_i\) and \(\theta_j\) be two arbitrary candidate solutions, where \(\theta_i\) replaces a cell with an existing occupant \(\theta_p\) and \(\theta_j\) discovers a new cell. If \(f(\theta_i) - f(\theta_p) > f(\theta_j)\), then \(\theta_i\) will be ranked higher than \(\theta_j\).

To strictly prioritize exploration, CMA-ME performs a two-stage improvement ranking on the objective \(J_1\), where it ranks first all solutions \(\theta_j\) that discover new cells based on their objective value \(f(\theta_j)\), and subsequently all solutions \(\theta_i\) that improve existing cells based on the difference \(f(\theta_i) - f(\theta_p)\) between the \(f\) value of the new and previous solution \(\theta_p\).

To show that the ranking rules of CMA-ME are equivalent to a natural gradient of a QD objective, we specify a function \(J_2\) (see Eq. 10), and we will show that sorting solutions purely by \(J_2\) results in the same order as the improvement ranking by CMA-ME on the objective \(J_1\).

\[
\max J_2(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} [f(\theta_i) + b_i C]
\]

where \(C\) is larger than two times the largest gap between any pair of \(f(\theta_i)\) and \(f(\theta_j)\) (see Eq. 11), \(b_i\) is 1 if a cell is occupied and 0 otherwise, and \(f(\theta_i) = 0\) if a cell \(i\) is unfilled.\(^2\)

Let \(\theta_i\) and \(\theta_j\) be two arbitrary candidate solutions whose addition to the archive changes the archive. We define \(\Delta J_1^i = J_2(A + \theta_i) - J_2(A)\) and \(\Delta J_2^j = J_2(A + \theta_j) - J_2(A)\), and we consider the following three cases:

1: Without loss of generality \(\theta_i\) improves an occupied cell and \(\theta_j\) discovers a new cell.

Based on the improvement ranking of CMA-ME, \(\theta_j\) will always be ranked higher than \(\theta_i\). We will show that the same ordering holds if we sort based on the objective \(J_2\).

We let \(\theta_p\) be the occupant replaced by \(\theta_i\).

We show that \(\Delta J_2^j > \Delta J_1^i\):

\(^1\)https://github.com/hardmaru/estool/blob/master/es.py (line 70)

\(^2\)We note that this is an initialization value, since an empty cell does not yet contain a \(\theta_i\).
\[
\Delta_{j} = f(\theta_{j}) + C = f(\theta_{j}) + \frac{C}{2} + \frac{C}{2} > f(\theta_{j}) + f(\theta_{i}) - f(\theta_{p}) > f(\theta_{i}) - f(\theta_{p}) = \Delta_{i}^{2},
\]

(12)

Where inequalities hold from the definition of \( C \) (Eq. 11).

2: Both \( \theta_{i} \) and \( \theta_{j} \) discover new cells.

From the improvement ranking rule, \( \theta_{i} \) will be ranked higher than \( \theta_{j} \) iff \( \Delta_{i}^{1} > \Delta_{j}^{1} \).

We show that this is equivalent to \( \Delta_{i}^{2} > \Delta_{j}^{2} \).

\[
\Delta_{i}^{1} > \Delta_{j}^{1} \Leftrightarrow f(\theta_{i}) > f(\theta_{j}) \Leftrightarrow f(\theta_{i}) + C > f(\theta_{j}) + C \Leftrightarrow \Delta_{i}^{2} > \Delta_{j}^{2} \tag{13}
\]

3: Both \( \theta_{i} \) and \( \theta_{j} \) improve existing cells.

We let \( \theta_{p} \) the occupant replaced by \( \theta_{i} \) and \( \theta_{r} \) the occupant replaced by \( \theta_{j} \).

\[
\Delta_{i}^{1} > \Delta_{j}^{1} \Leftrightarrow f(\theta_{i}) - f(\theta_{p}) > f(\theta_{j}) - f(\theta_{r}) \Leftrightarrow \Delta_{i}^{2} > \Delta_{j}^{2} \tag{14}
\]

Therefore, the CMA-ME improvement ranking is identical to ranking purely based on \( J_{2} \).

Previous work [2] has shown that CMA-ES approximates the natural gradient of its provided optimization objective function to a scale. At the same time, CMA-ES is invariant to order-preserving transformations of its objective function, since it is a comparison-based optimization method [28]. We provide an explicit objective function \( J_{2} \), and we have shown that maximizing this function results in the same ordering as the one specified implicitly by the improvement ranking rules. Therefore, CMA-ME, which uses improvement ranking to update the CMA-ES parameters, approximates a natural gradient of \( J_{2} \) to a scale.

CMA-MEGA sorts solutions via the same improvement ranking rules as CMA-ME to update an internal sampling distribution maintained by CMA-ES. Unlike CMA-ME, CMA-MEGA updates a sampling distribution of gradient step coefficients, and not solution parameters directly. Therefore, it performs a form of adaptive search, where it dynamically changes the search hyperparameters (gradient step coefficients) to maximize \( J_{2} \).

By connecting CMA-ME to previous work that connects natural gradient descent and CMA-ES [2], we gain a new perspective on both CMA-ME and CMA-MEGA. In each iteration, CMA-ME optimizes for a single solution whose addition to the archive results in the largest increase in \( J_{2} \). However, after sampling, we update the archive which results in a small change to the optimization landscape. In other words, CMA-ME assumes that CMA-ES is a robust enough optimizer to handle small changes to its target objective.

To apply this new perspective to CMA-MEGA, we observe that CMA-MEGA solves the optimization problem of finding the chosen gradient coefficients that yield the largest increase in \( J_{2} \) for a fixed \( \theta \) and archive \( A \). In other words, CMA-MEGA optimizes the objective \( J_{2} \), as CMA-ME, but it does so directly in objective-measure space. However, after taking one optimization step, we change the single solution optimization problem by updating the archive and moving \( \theta \). Just like CMA-ME, we assume that CMA-ES is a robust enough optimizer to handle changes in the optimization landscape brought about by changing the archive and \( \theta \).

E Additional Results

Generated Archives. Fig. 6 presents example archives for each algorithm and domain combination.
Quantitative Results. Table 2 presents the values of the QD-score, coverage, and best solution for each algorithm and domain. We additionally ran MAP-Elites and MAP-Elites (line) for $10^6$ iterations, 20 trials, in the linear projection and arm repertoire domains, and present the results as MAP-Elites* and MAP-Elites (line)*. We observe that running CMA-MEGA for only 10,000 iterations outperforms the two algorithms in both domains. We don’t run CMA-ME for additional iterations due to the running time of CMA-ME being $O(n^2)$ per solution generated.

---

3We note that the QD-score and coverage values of OG-MAP-Elites are slightly different between Table 1 and Table 2. Table 2 contains the correct values and we will update Table 1 in the revised version. The change does not affect the tests for statistical significance or any of our quantitative and qualitative findings of the experiments in section 6.
We note that the QD-score metric combines both the number of cells filled in the archive (diversity) and the objective value of each occupant (quality). To disambiguate the two, we show in Fig. 7 the percentage of cells (y-axis) that have objective value greater than the threshold specified in the x-axis.

**Qualitative Results in LSI Domain.** We compare the quality of the generated images with latent space illumination, with the images generated when using a single-objective Adam optimizer, where we optimize StyleGAN+CLIP [11] with Adam as a baseline (instead of running a QD algorithm). We run 5 different trials for 10,000 iterations, and for each trial we present the image that the algorithm converged to. StyleGAN+CLIP with Adam gradually drifted towards unrealistic images, so we excluded from our selection images that were unrealistic or with large artifacts. We used the same prompt as the objective of section 6: “Elon Musk with short hair.”. We compare these images with the best image, according to the objective, of each of the 5 generated archives of CMA-MEGA (Adam). We used in both conditions the Adam implementation of ESTool (see accompanying source code) with the same hyperparameters. We observe that the quality of the images is comparable (Fig. 8).
F Societal Impacts

By proposing gradient-based analogs to derivative-free QD methods, we hope to expand the potential applications of QD research and bring the ideas of the growing QD community to a wider machine learning audience. We are excited about future mixing of ideas between QD, generative modeling, and other machine learning subfields.

In the same way that gradient descent is used to synthesize super-resolution images [39], our method can be used in the same context, which would raise ethical considerations due to potential biases present in the trained model [7]. On the other hand, we hypothesize that thoughtful selection of the measure functions may help counterbalance this issue, since we can explicitly specify the measures that ensure diversity over the collection of generated outputs. For example, a model may be capable of generating a certain type of face, but the latent space may be organized in a way which biases a gradient descent on the latent space away from a specific distribution of faces. If the kind of diversity required is differentiably measurable, then DQD could potentially help resolve which aspect of the generative model, i.e., the structure of the latent space or the representational capabilities of the model, is contributing to the bias.

Finally, we recognize the possibility of using this technology for malicious purposes, including generation of fake images (“DeepFakes”), and we highlight the utility of studies that help identify DeepFake models [26].