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Abstract
Credit assignment is one of the central problems in reinforcement learning. The predominant approach is to assign credit based on the expected return. However, we show that the expected return may depend on the policy in an undesirable way which could slow down learning. Instead, we borrow ideas from the causality literature and show that the advantage function can be interpreted as causal effects, which share similar properties with causal representations. Based on this insight, we propose the Direct Advantage Estimation (DAE), a novel method that can model the advantage function and estimate it directly from data without requiring the (action-)value function. If desired, value functions can also be seamlessly integrated into DAE and be updated in a similar way to Temporal Difference Learning. The proposed method is easy to implement and can be readily adopted by modern actor-critic methods. We test DAE empirically on the Atari domain and show that it can achieve competitive results with the state-of-the-art method for advantage estimation.

1 Introduction
Reinforcement learning (RL) methods aim to maximize cumulative rewards in sequential decision making problems (Sutton and Barto 2018). Through interactions with the environment, agents learn to identify which actions lead to the highest return. One major difficulty of this problem is that, typically, a vast amount of decision makings are involved in determining the rewards, making it complex to identify which decisions are crucial to the outcomes. This is also known as the credit assignment problem (Minsky 1961). A straightforward approach is to assign credit according to the expected return, which is aligned with the RL objective. However, the expected return may depend on the policy in a convoluted way such that the effect of an action cannot be correctly reflected. A motivating example behind our work is illustrated in Figure 1. In this example, it is obvious that the effect of any action is only immediate. The expected return conditioned on any action, however, would depend on the policy of all subsequent states. This property could be undesirable because the expected return would vary whenever the policy changes during training, making it a difficult target to learn.

A natural question to ask is then, how should we define the effect of an action? In this work, we take inspiration from the causality literature, where the notion of causal effects is defined. We show that the advantage function can be interpreted as the causal effects of an action on the expected return. Additionally, we show that it shares similar properties with causal representations, which are expected to improve generalization and transfer learning (Schölkopf et al. 2021).

We show that the advantage function is a solution to a constrained least squares problem, and propose the Direct Advantage Estimation (DAE), a method that can estimate the advantage function directly from sampled trajectories without either the value function or the Q-function. Furthermore, we show that DAE can be combined with a value function approximator and be updated in a way similar to TD methods (Sutton 1988). We then use Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al. 2017) as an example and describe how DAE can be integrated into modern deep actor-critic methods. Finally, we perform experiments in the Atari domain and demonstrate empirically that DAE can achieve competitive results with Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE) (Schulman et al. 2015).

The main contributions of this paper are

- We study the properties of the advantage function and show how they are linked to causality.
- We develop DAE, a novel method for estimating the advantage function, and compare it empirically with GAE.
2 Background

We consider a discounted Markov Decision Process \((S, A, P, r, \gamma)\) with finite state space \(S\), finite action space \(A\), transition probability \(P(s'|s, a)\), reward function \(r: S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\), and discount factor \(\gamma \in [0, 1)\). A policy is a function \(\pi: S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) with \(\pi(a|s)\) denoting the probability of action \(a\) given state \(s\). A trajectory \(\tau = (s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots)\) is said to be sampled from a policy \(\pi\) if \(a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t)\) and \(s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_t, a_t)\). We denote the return of a trajectory by \(G(\tau) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \gamma^i r_t\), where \(r_t = r(s_t, a_t)\). The goal of an RL agent is to find a policy \(\pi^*\) that maximizes the expected return
\[
\pi^* = \arg \max_\pi \mathbb{E}_\tau [G(\tau)].
\] (1)

Given a policy \(\pi\), we define the value function and action-value function by
\[
V_\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} [G(\tau)|s_0 = s],
\] (2)
\[
Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} [G(\tau)|s_0 = s, a_0 = a],
\] (3)
and the advantage function by
\[
A^\pi(s, a) = Q^\pi(s, a) - V^\pi(s) \quad (4)
\]

We consider a discounted Markov Decision Process and the advantage function by sample average of the returns. By definition, an unbiased way to estimate the advantage function is to sample a transition \((s, a, r, s')\) and compute
\[
A(s, a) \approx r + \gamma V(s') - V(s).
\] (7)

The term \(r + \gamma V(s') - V(s)\) is known as TD Error which was introduced in the TD Learning algorithm to update the value estimates. Equation 4 works because
\[
Q(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[r(s, a) + \gamma V(s')],
\] (8)
that is, \(r + \gamma V(s')\) can be seen as an unbiased estimate of \(Q(s, a)\), which can then be used in Equation 4 to estimate \(A(s, a)\). This method can also be combined with TD(\(\lambda\)) to produce more accurate estimates of the advantage function \(\text{Schulman et al.}[2015b]\).

Policy Optimization

One important application of the advantage function is in policy optimization. \(\text{Williams}[1992]\), \(\text{Sutton et al.}[2000]\) showed that for parameterized policy \(\pi_\theta\), it is possible to estimate the gradient of the RL objective by
\[
\nabla \pi \mathbb{E}_\tau [G(\tau)] = \nabla \pi \mathbb{E}_\tau \sum_{s \in S} d^\pi(s) \sum_{a \in A} (Q(s, a) - b(s)) \nabla \pi_\theta(a|s),
\] (9)
where \(d^\pi(s) = \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t p(s_t = s)\) and \(b(s)\) is an arbitrary function of the state known as the baseline function. The baseline function can be seen as a control variate, which can be used to reduce the variance of the gradient estimator when chosen carefully (Greensmith, Bartlett, and Baxter[2004]). One popular and near-optimal choice of \(b(s)\) is the value function \(V\) which results in the advantage function
\[
A(s, a) = Q(s, a) - V(s),
\]
In a different approach, \(\text{Kakade and Langford}[2002]\) showed that the difference between the expected return of

Empirically, TD methods have been shown to converge faster than MC methods and have been widely used in recent deep RL methods (Mnih et al.[2015]).

One disadvantage of TD methods is that they only propagate the reward one step at a time, which can be slow when the rewards are sparse or the action space is fine-grained.

[Watkins[1989]] showed that we could instead look ahead \(n\) steps at each update by replacing the target \(r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1})\) with \(r_t + \gamma r_{t+1} + \ldots + \gamma^n V(s_{t+n})\). This allows the reward information to propagate faster to relevant state-action pairs and hence faster learning for carefully chosen \(n\). Additionally, this view unifies both methods in the sense that TD methods correspond to the case when \(n = 1\) while \(n \rightarrow \infty\) resembles MC methods. Choosing the parameter \(n\) can be seen as a bias and variance trade-off, where for lower \(n\), we rely more on our current estimations which could be heavily biased. On the other hand, for larger \(n\), we rely more on the sampled trajectory which is less biased but could lead to larger variance. In TD(\(\lambda\)), these \(n\)-step estimations are further combined to produce a more robust estimate by averaging them exponentially with \(\lambda^n\) (Sutton[1988]).

TD Errors and the Advantage Function

From Equation 4 we see that, given \(V\), an unbiased way to estimate \(A(s, a)\) is to sample a transition \((s, a, r, s')\) and compute
\[
A(s, a) \approx r + \gamma V(s') - V(s).
\] (7)

The term \(r + \gamma V(s') - V(s)\) is known as TD Error which was introduced in the TD Learning algorithm to update the value estimates. Equation 4 works because
\[
Q(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[r(s, a) + \gamma V(s')],
\] (8)
that is, \(r + \gamma V(s')\) can be seen as an unbiased estimate of \(Q(s, a)\), which can then be used in Equation 4 to estimate \(A(s, a)\). This method can also be combined with TD(\(\lambda\)) to produce more accurate estimates of the advantage function (Schulman et al. 2015b).

Monte Carlo (MC) Method

By definition, an unbiased way to estimate \(V(s)\) is by sampling trajectories starting from state \(s\) and calculating the sample average of the returns \(V(s) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} G(\tau_i)\). When approximating \(V\) with a parameterized function \(V_\theta\), the parameter \(\theta\) can be learned by minimizing the mean squared loss
\[
L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[ (V_\theta(s_0) - G(\tau))^2 ].
\] (5)

Despite their simplicity, MC methods are known to have high variance, which can cause slow learning.

Temporal Difference (TD) Learning

A different approach based on bootstrapping is proposed in (Sutton[1988]). In this method, we begin with an initial guess of the value function \(V_0\) and improve our estimates iteratively by sampling transitions \((s, a, r, s')\) and updating our current estimate \(V_{k+1}(s)\) to match the target \(r + \gamma V_k(s')\). Unlike MC methods, TD methods are biased due to their use of the bootstrapping target. Similar to MC methods, TD methods can be combined with function approximators by approximating \(V_k\) with \(V_{\theta_k}\) and changing the target from \(G(\tau)\) to \(r + V_{\theta_{k-1}}\), that is
\[
L(\theta_k) = \mathbb{E}[ (V_{\theta_k}(s) - (r + \gamma V_{\theta_{k-1}}(s')))^2 ].
\] (6)
two policies is directly related to the advantage function, which later led to some of the most popular policy optimization methods (Schulman et al. 2015; 2017).

3 Revisiting the Advantage Function

We begin by examining the motivating example in Figure 1. In this example, it is obvious that the optimal decision only depends on the immediate reward at each state. However, if we calculate the Q-function, we get

\[ Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = \begin{cases} 1 + \sum_{t' > t} \gamma^{t'-t} \pi(u|s_{t'}) , & a_t = u \\ 0 + \sum_{t' > t} \gamma^{t'-t} \pi(u|s_{t'}) , & a_t = 1 \end{cases} \]  

(10)

which shows that the Q-values at each state are dependent on the policy evaluated at all subsequent states despite the actions having only immediate effects on the expected return. This property can be undesirable as the policy is typically being optimized and varied, which could lead to variations in the Q-values and make previous estimates unreliable. This is also known as the problem of distribution shift, where the data generating distribution differs from the distribution we are making predictions on. Similar problems have also been studied in offline RL, where distribution shift could cause Q-function estimates to be unreliable (Levine et al. 2020; Kumar et al. 2020; Fujimoto, Meger, and Precup 2019). One source of this problem is that the expected return by nature treats all subsequent rewards as related to the current action, whether they are causal or not. Alternatively, we would like to focus ourselves on the effect of an action. But how should we define it?

Questions like this are central to the field of causality and have been studied extensively (Holland 1986; Pearl 2009). We draw our inspiration from (Rubin 1974) in which the author developed a framework, known as the Neyman-Rubin model, to estimate causal effects of treatments. It defines the causal effect of a treatment to be the difference between (1) the outcome of a trial resulting from one treatment, and (2) what would have happened if we had chosen another treatment. The work focused mainly on the problem of counterfactuals, which we shall not delve into. Instead, we focus simply on its definition of causal effects. In RL, we concern ourselves with the effect of each action on the expected return. However, the action space usually consists of more than two actions, so it is ambiguous as to which action we should compare to. One way to resolve this is to compare each action with what would have happened normally (Halpern and Hitchcock 2015). This way, we can calculate the causal effect of an action on some quantity \( X \) at state \( s \) by

\[ \mathbb{E}[X|s,a] - \mathbb{E}[X|s] . \]  

(11)

If we choose \( X \) to be the return starting from \( s \), then

\[ \mathbb{E}[X|s,a] - \mathbb{E}[X|s] = \mathbb{E}[G(\tau)|s_0=s, a_0=a] - \mathbb{E}[G(\tau)|s_0=s] \]  

(12)

which is exactly the advantage function. If we calculate the advantage function for the example environment in Figure we get

\[ A^\pi(s, a) = \begin{cases} 1 - \pi(u|s) , & a_t = u \\ 0 - \pi(u|s) , & a_t = 1 \end{cases} \]  

(13)

which now only depends on the policy evaluated at the state \( s \). This occurs because, in this example, the future state distribution is independent of the current action, so the conditional expectation cancels out for the future terms leaving only the current term. One can readily see that a similar property holds even for states that are further apart as long as the future state is independent of the current action. More generally, we only need the expected return for the future state to be independent of the current action.

Proposition 1. Given \( t' > t \) such that

\[ \mathbb{E}[V(s_{t'})|s_t, a_t] = \mathbb{E}[V(s_{t'})|s_t] \]  

then

\[ A^\pi(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{k=t}^{t'-1} \gamma^{k-t} r_k \right] s_t, a_t] - \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{k=t}^{t'-1} \gamma^{k-t} r_k \right] s_t \]  

(15)

Proof. See Appendix. □

This proposition shows that the advantage function is local, in the sense that the advantage of an action is only dependent on the policy of subsequent states to the point where the action stops being relevant to future rewards. This property is strikingly similar to the Sparse Mechanism Shift hypothesis (Scholkopf et al. 2021) which states that small distribution changes should only lead to sparse or local changes if the representation is causal/disentangled. We hypothesize that this property would make the advantage function an easier target to learn compared to \( Q \) or \( V \) when the policy is changing, which may partially explain performance improvements reported empirically by (Baird III 1993; Wang et al. 2016b).

The question we are now interested in is how to learn the advantage function. In previous work, estimating the advantage function typically relied on using TD Errors as described in the previous section. This method, despite being unbiased when \( V \) is accurate, also faces the same problem of non-causal policy dependencies due to the use of \( V \). Instead, we seek methods which could directly model the advantage function and estimate it from data. Since both \( Q \) and \( V \) could be learned with bootstrapping via TD Learning, one might wonder if there is an equivalent for the advantage function. In previous work, estimating the advantage function typically relied on using TD Errors as described in the previous section. This method, despite being unbiased when \( V \) is accurate, also faces the same problem of non-causal policy dependencies due to the use of \( V \). Instead, we seek methods which could directly model the advantage function and estimate it from data. Since both \( Q \) and \( V \) could be learned with bootstrapping via TD Learning, one might wonder if there is an equivalent for the advantage function. In previous work, estimating the advantage function typically relied on using TD Errors as described in the previous section. This method, despite being unbiased when \( V \) is accurate, also faces the same problem of non-causal policy dependencies due to the use of \( V \). Instead, we seek methods which could directly model the advantage function and estimate it from data. Since both \( Q \) and \( V \) could be learned with bootstrapping via TD Learning, one might wonder if there is an equivalent for the advantage function. In previous work, estimating the advantage function typically relied on using TD Errors as described in the previous section. This method, despite being unbiased when \( V \) is accurate, also faces the same problem of non-causal policy dependencies due to the use of \( V \). Instead, we seek methods which could directly model the advantage function and estimate it from data. Since both \( Q \) and \( V \) could be learned with bootstrapping via TD Learning, one might wonder if there is an equivalent for the advantage function. In previous work, estimating the advantage function typically relied on using TD Errors as described in the previous section. This method, despite being unbiased when \( V \) is accurate, also faces the same problem of non-causal policy dependencies due to the use of \( V \). Instead, we seek methods which could directly model the advantage function and estimate it from data. Since both \( Q \) and \( V \) could be learned with bootstrapping via TD Learning, one might wonder if there is an equivalent for the advantage function.
TD Learning. An intuitive explanation for this failure is that, unlike the value function, which contains information about all future rewards, the advantage function only models the causal effect of each action; therefore, if the next action is not causal to a distant reward, then the information about that reward is lost.

4 Direct Advantage Estimation

In this section, we present the main contribution of this paper. We show that it is possible to estimate $A$ directly from sampled trajectories without either $Q$ or $V$.

Before we begin, we first observe that the advantage function satisfies the equation

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) \hat{A}(s, a) = 0. \quad (16)$$

Functions with this property, as it turns out, could be very useful to the development of our method, so we give a formal definition of it as follows

**Definition 1.** Given a policy $\pi$, we say a function $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $\pi$-normalized if for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) f(s, a) = 0. \quad (17)$$

We shall refer to these functions as effects since they capture the idea of causal effects described in the previous section, where they quantify how much we gain or lose from a certain action compared to what would have happened normally. One interesting property of these functions is that, for a fixed policy, if we transform the reward by $\delta_t = r_t - \hat{A}(s_t, a_t)$ with any $\pi$-normalized function $A$, then the expected return remains unchanged, that is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t r_t \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t \delta_t \right]. \quad (18)$$

This can be seen as a form of reward shaping [Ng, Harada, and Russell 1999], where the expected return is now invariant to the choice of $\hat{A}$ for a fixed policy. If we now consider the variance of the expected return after the transformation $G'(\tau) = \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t \delta_t$, we get

$$\text{Var}[G'(\tau)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ G'(\tau)^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ G'(\tau) \right]^2. \quad (19)$$

In other words, minimizing the variance is equivalent to minimizing the following quantity

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t (r_t - \hat{A}(s_t, a_t)) \right)^2 \right], \quad (20)$$

which leads us to our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.** Given a policy $\pi$ and time step $t \geq 0$, we say $(s, a) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ or $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is reachable within $t$ if there exists $0 \leq t' \leq t$ such that $p(s_{t'} = s, a_{t'} = a) > 0$ or $p(s_{t'} = s) > 0$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the set of all $\pi$-normalized functions, $\hat{A}_t = \hat{A}(s_t, a_t)$, and

$$\hat{A}^* = \arg \min_{A \in \mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t' = 0}^t \gamma^{t'} \hat{A}_{t'} \right)^2 \right],$$

then for all $(s, a)$ that are reachable within $t$, we have

$$\hat{A}^*(s, a) = \hat{A}(s, a).$$

**Proof.** See Appendix.

Note that the first term inside the expectation is equal to the return, while the sum in the second term is only up to step $t$. If we apply this theorem to the case where $t \rightarrow \infty$, then we find that the advantage function minimizes the variance in Equation (19). The implication of this theorem is twofold. (1) Additivity: If we view $\sum_{t' = 0}^t \gamma^{t'} \hat{A}_{t'}$ as the total effect of an action sequence, then it is simply the discounted sum of individual effects. (2) Disentanglement: If $(s, a)$ is reachable within $t$, we see that $A^*(s, a) = A^*(t, a)$ remains the same if we apply the theorem for any $t' > t$, which implies that including additional effects in the sequence does not interfere with existing ones.

This theorem also allows a natural way to estimate the advantage function from sampled trajectories $\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_N$ by solving the following minimization problem

$$\min_{\theta} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\tau = \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_N} \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t \hat{A}_{\theta,t} \right)^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{a} \pi(a|s) \hat{A}_{\theta}(s, a) = 0 \quad \forall s \in \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$$

(21)

where we let $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the theorem, and relax the constraint from all states to states in the sampled trajectories. In practice, this constraint could be forced upon a general function approximator $f_0$, such as a neural network, by letting

$$\hat{A}_{\theta}(s, a) = f_\theta(s, a) - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) f_0(s, a).$$

(22)

Note that in our method, neither the $Q$-function nor the value function is required a priori. Instead, the advantage function is directly modeled and estimated from data, hence we name our method **Direct Advantage Estimation** (DAE).

This method is similar to the MC method where we have to sample trajectories until they terminate to update our estimates. In practice, however, we might want to start updating...
our estimates before the environment terminates. Here we show that the value function can be seamlessly integrated into our method, which allows us to perform updates in a similar fashion to the n-step bootstrapping method.

**Theorem 2.** Following the notations in Theorem 1. Let \( \delta_t = r_t - \hat{A}_t, U(s) \) and \( \hat{V}(s) \) be any functions of state, and

\[
L(\hat{A}, \hat{V}) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t' = 0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} \delta_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s_0) \right]^2.
\]

If \( \hat{V}^* = \arg\min_{\hat{V}} L(\hat{A}, \hat{V}) \), then we treat \( \hat{V}^* \) as repeated applications of Theorem 2, which leads us to the loss function

\[
L_A(\theta, \phi) = \mathbb{E}\left[ \sum_{t' = 0}^{t-1} \left( \sum_{k = t'}^{t-1} \gamma^{k-t'} \delta_{t,k} + \gamma^{t-t'} U(s_t) - \hat{V}_{t'}(s_{t'}) \right)^2 \right],
\]

where \( \delta_{t,k} = r_{t,k} - \hat{A}_t(s_{t,k}, a_{t,k}) \), \( \hat{A}_t \) is the approximated advantage function, \( U \) is the bootstrap target and \( \hat{V}_{t'} \) is the approximated value function. Algorithm 1 shows a practical implementation of this method when used with neural networks and stochastic gradient descent.

**5 Experiments**

We perform our experiments on the Atari Learning Environment (ALE) (Bellemare et al. 2013), a set of high dimensional discrete control tasks commonly used for deep RL benchmarks. We test our method on 6 popular environments from the ALE, namely, Beamrider, Breakout, Pong, Q*bert, Seaquest and Space Invaders. We follow the preprocessing procedures from (Mnih et al. 2015) and use the same metrics as in (Schulman et al. 2017) to compare different methods. The metrics include

1. Average score for all training episodes
2. Average score for the last 100 training episodes
where the first metric reflects how fast an agent learns while the second one reflects the final performance of the policy.

We use PPO (Schulman et al. 2017), a popular policy optimization method, as the base algorithm and compare the performance between GAE and DAE. For GAE, we take the implementation from (Kafun et al. 2019), which includes a faithful implementation of the original PPO algorithm combined with GAE. We use the same set of tuned hyperparameters reported in (Kafun et al. 2020) for GAE, which we list in the Appendix. For DAE, we use the bootstrapped variant of the algorithm and make a few changes to PPO which we briefly discuss here.

First, we use two separate deep neural networks to model the policy and the value function, and train them separately. This is due to DAE training the value function by sampling
mini-batches of trajectories instead of states, which are used to train the policy. Both networks follow the same architecture as in (Mnih et al. 2015) except for the output layer. For the policy network, we use a softmax output layer to model the probability of each action. For the value network, we use a similar dueling architecture from (Wang et al. 2016b) to model the advantage function and the value function jointly using a single network. One minor difference between our network and the original dueling network is that, in the original dueling network, the advantage stream is normalized by

$$\hat{A}(s, a) = f(s, a) - \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a \in A} f(s, a),$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

while we simply normalize the advantage stream by the sampling policy using Equation 22.

Second, unlike GAE which was designed to estimate the advantages along sampled trajectories, DAE directly models the advantage function. This allows us to compute the surrogate loss in expectation over the actions instead of relying on importance sampling which could lead to high variance. That is, we compute the surrogate loss by

$$\mathbb{E}_{a \sim \mu} \left[ \frac{\pi_\psi(a|s)}{\mu(a|s)} A^\mu(s, a) \right] = \sum_{a \in A} \pi_\psi(a|s) A^\mu(s, a)$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

where $$\pi_\psi$$ is the policy parameterized by $$\psi$$ that we are optimizing and $$\mu$$ is the sampling policy. In this form, however, it is no longer clear how the probability ratio clipping in PPO should be applied. Instead, we simply use the penalized variant of PPO (PPO-penalty) where an additional KL penalty term is added to approximate the trust-region updates, which results in

$$L_{\text{sur}} = - \sum_{a \in A} \pi_\psi(a|s) A^\mu(s, a) + \beta_{\text{KL}} \text{KL} \left( \mu(\cdot|s) || \pi_\psi(\cdot|s) \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)

where $$\beta_{\text{KL}}$$ is a hyperparameter controlling the strength of the trust-region constraint. Note that the clipping variant of PPO (PPO-clipping) was considered to be superior to PPO-penalty (Schulman et al. 2017), but as we shall see, when combined appropriately with DAE, PPO-penalty can achieve results comparable to GAE combined with PPO-clipping. In practice, an additional entropy loss is also added to Equation 30 to encourage exploration, which leads us to

$$L_\pi(\psi) = \mathbb{E}_s \left[ L_{\text{sur}} + \beta_{\text{ent}} H(\pi_\psi(\cdot|s)) \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

We present the full algorithm in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: PPO with DAE

1: Initialize the dueling network $$\hat{A}$$ by $$\theta$$.
2: Initialize the policy $$\pi$$ with $$\psi$$
3: while not converged do
4: $$D_r = \{\}$$
5: for $$n = 1, \ldots, N_{\text{actor}}$$ do
6: Sample trajectory $$\tau_n = (s_0, a_0, r_0, \ldots, s_T)$$ with $$\pi$$
7: $$D_r \leftarrow D_r \cup \{\tau_n\}$$
8: end for
9: Update $$\theta$$ using Algorithm 1 with $$\pi_\psi, D_r$$.
10: Compute advantages $$\hat{A}_\theta(s, a)$$ for all $$s$$ in $$D_r$$.
11: $$A(s, a) \leftarrow \text{stop_gradient}(\hat{A}_\theta(s, a))$$
12: for $$n = 1, \ldots, N_\pi$$ do
13: Sample a mini-batch $$S = \{s'_0, \ldots, s'_K\}$$ from $$D_r$$,
14: $$\psi \leftarrow \psi - \alpha_\psi \nabla L_\pi(\psi)$$
15: end for
16: end while

For each method, we train 20 agents for each environment from scratch using the same set of hyperparameters for the corresponding method. Each training session starts with a different random seed and runs for 40 million in-game frames. We summarize our results in Figure 3 and Table 1. From the learning curves in Figure 3 we see that the differences between both methods are mostly within one standard deviation, suggesting that the learning dynamics are similar. In Table 1 the Last 100 metric suggests that there is no significant difference between the final policies obtained by both methods performance-wise. In terms of sample efficiency, as reflected in the Overall metric, DAE outperforms GAE in two of the environments (Breakout, Q*bert) significantly while falling behind in one of them (Space Invaders). These results suggest that the performance of DAE is comparable with GAE in policy optimization.

6 Related Work

The advantage function was first introduced in (Baird III 1993) to tackle problems with fine-grained time steps, where Q-Learning could be slow. More recently, (Wang et al. 2016b) developed a neural network architecture, which can jointly estimate the value function and the advantage function, and combined it with DQN (Mnih et al. 2015) to achieve better performance. Our work complements theirs by justifying the use of policy normalized functions to estimate the advantage function, and showing how it can be combined with multi-step learning.

A direct comparison to our work would be (Schulman et al. 2015b) in which GAE is proposed. While both GAE and DAE aim to estimate the advantage function, they work in very different ways. In GAE, value functions and TD Errors are used to estimate the advantage functions for state-action pairs in the sampled trajectories. On the other hand, DAE models the advantage function directly and learns it by minimizing a least square problem, which has the upside that it allows us to extrapolate for state and action pairs that
are not present in the sampled trajectories.

The link between causal effects and the advantage function was also explored in (Corcoll and Vicente 2020), where they developed a hierarchical method using a similarly defined advantage function to model the dynamics of environments which, as the authors argued, are composed of effects in a hierarchical manner. Our work further strengthens this link and shows that the advantage function shares properties with causal representations and that the effect of a sequence of actions can be seen as being composed of individual effects in an additive way.

7 Conclusions and Future Directions

In this work, we pointed out a potential problem with the expected return where it would depend on the policies of states that are not causally related. Inspired by previous studies in causality, we found that the advantage function can be interpreted as the causal effect of an action on the expected return, and also that it shares similar properties to causal representations. We then proposed the Direct Advantage Estimation, a novel method that can model the advantage function and estimate it from data, and tested it on the Atari domain. Our results show that the proposed method is competitive with GAE on 6 Atari games.

Here we note some possible extensions to this method. First, due to the normalization step in Equation 22 currently, we restrict ourselves only to environments with discrete action spaces. One potential solution to this problem was outlined in (Wang et al. 2016a) where they used a sampling method to approximate the normalization step for continuous action spaces. Second, in this work, we developed our method assuming the data is on-policy. An interesting extension would be using importance sampling techniques such as Retrace (Munos et al. 2016) or V-Trace (Espeholt et al. 2018) to estimate the advantage function from off-policy data.
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A Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. By definition

\[ Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_k \bigg| s_t, a_t \right] \]  

(32)

Similarly, we have

\[ V^\pi(s_t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_k \bigg| s_t \right] + \gamma^{t-t} \mathbb{E} [V(s_{t'}) | s_t] \]  

(37)

If \( \mathbb{E} [V(s_{t'}) | s_t, a_t] = \mathbb{E} [V(s_{t'}) | s_t] \), we have

\[ A^\pi(s_t, a_t) = Q^\pi(s_t, a_t) - V^\pi(s_t) \]  

(38)

\[ = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_k \bigg| s_t, a_t \right] - \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} \gamma^k r_k \bigg| s_t \right] \]  

(39)

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. For simplicity, we denote \( \hat{A} \) by \( f \). Notice that the condition \( f \in F_\pi \) is equivalent to the equality constraint

\[ \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s) f(s, a) = 0 \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \]  

(40)

Using the method of Lagrange multipliers, we have the Lagrangian

\[ \mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \lambda_s \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s) f(s, a) \]  

(41)

If we differentiate it with respect to \( f(s', a') \), then

\[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial f(s', a')} = 2 \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \right) \right] + \lambda_{s'} \pi(a'|s') \]  

(42)

\[ = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right] \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} + \lambda_{s'} \pi(a'|s') \]  

(43)

Note that

\[ \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (s_k, a_k) = (s', a') \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]  

(44)
We now calculate the expectation,

\[
\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \right]
\]  

(45)

\[
= \sum_{\tau} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s_{k}, a_{k}, s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} 
\]  

(46)

\[
= \sum_{\tau \setminus \{s_k, a_k\}} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s_k, a_k, s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) 
\sum_{t'=0}^{k-1} \gamma^{t'} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} 
\]  

(47)

where \( \delta_{t'} = r_{t'} - f_{t'} \) and we denote the sum over \( \tau \setminus \{s_k, a_k\} \) as the sum over all states and actions at each step except for the \( k \)-th step. From the Markov property, we can decompose the probability by

\[
p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s', a', s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) = p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \]  

(48)

Let’s first consider the sum

\[
\sum_{\tau \setminus \{s_k, a_k\}} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s', a', s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) \sum_{t'=0}^{k-1} \gamma^{t'} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} 
\]  

(49)

\[
= p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \sum_{s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s_k = s') \sum_{t'=0}^{k-1} \gamma^{t'} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} 
\]  

(50)

\[
= p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t'=0}^{k-1} \gamma^{t'} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \bigg| s_k = s' \right] = p(s_k = s', a_k = a') M_k(s') 
\]  

(51)

where we denote \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t'=0}^{k-1} \gamma^{t'} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \bigg| s_k = s' \right] \) by \( M_k(s') \). Next, we consider

\[
\sum_{\tau \setminus \{s_k, a_k\}} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s', a', s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) (\gamma^k r(s', a') + \sum_{t'>k} \gamma^{t'} r_{t'}) 
\]  

(52)

\[
= \gamma^k p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \left( r(s', a') + \sum_{s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots} p(s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots | s_k = s', a_k = a') \sum_{t'>k} \gamma^{t'-k} r_{t'} \right) 
\]  

(53)

\[
= \gamma^k p(s_k = s', a_k = a') Q(s', a') 
\]  

(54)

Finally,

\[
\sum_{\tau \setminus \{s_k, a_k\}} p(s_0, a_0, \ldots, s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}, s', a', s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots) (\gamma^k f(s', a') + \sum_{t'>k} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'}) 
\]  

(55)

\[
= \gamma^k p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \left( f(s', a') + \sum_{s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots} p(s_{k+1}, a_{k+1}, \ldots | s_k = s', a_k = a') \sum_{t'>k} \gamma^{t'-k} f_{t'} \right) 
\]  

(56)

\[
= \gamma^k p(s_k = s', a_k = a') f(s', a'). 
\]  

(57)

Combining Equation 51, 54, 57, we have

\[
\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( G(\tau) - \sum_{t'=0}^{t} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} \right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \right] = p(s_k = s', a_k = a') \left( M_k(s') + \gamma^k (Q(s', a') - f(s', a')) \right). 
\]  

(58)

To find the minimum, we require that

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial f(s', a')} = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k p(s_k = s', a_k = a') (M_k(s') + \gamma^k (Q(s', a') - f(s', a'))) + \lambda_s \pi(a'|s') = 0 
\]  

(59)
If we sum the above equation for all $a' \in \mathcal{A}$, since $p(s_k=s', a_k=a') = p(s_k=s') \pi(a'|s')$, we have
\[
\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\partial L}{\partial f(s', a')} = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k p(s_k = s') (M_k(s') + \gamma^k V(s')) + \lambda_{s'} = 0 \tag{60}
\]
which implies that
\[
\lambda_{s'} = -2 \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k p(s_k = s') (M_k(s') + \gamma^k V(s')) \tag{61}
\]
Substituting this back in Equation\[59\] we get
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^{2k} p(s_k = s', a_k = a') (Q(s', a') - V(s') - f(s', a')) = 0. \tag{62}
\]
If $(s', a')$ is reachable within $t$, then
\[
f(s', a') = Q(s', a') - V(s') \tag{63}
\]
\[\square\]

**Proof of Theorem**\[2\]

*Proof.* Again, we substitute $\hat{A}$ by $f$ and use the method of Lagrange multipliers. Consider the Lagrangian
\[
L = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} r_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s_0) \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(a|s) f(s, a) \tag{64}
\]
Let’s first consider the minimum for $\hat{V}$,
\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{V}(s')} = 2p(s_0 = s') \sum_{a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t} p(a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t|s_0 = s') \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} \delta_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s') \right) \tag{65}
\]
Since
\[
\sum_{a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t} p(a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t|s_0 = s') \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} f_{t'} = 0 \tag{66}
\]
we have
\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \hat{V}(s')} = 2p(s_0 = s') \sum_{a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t} p(a_0, s_1, a_1, \ldots, s_t|s_0 = s') \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} r_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s') \right) \tag{67}
\]
\[
= 2p(s_0 = s') \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} r_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) \bigg| s_0 = s' \right] - \hat{V}(s') \right) = 0 \tag{68}
\]
If $p(s_0 = s') > 0$, then
\[
\hat{V}(s') = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} r_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) \bigg| s_0 = s' \right] \tag{69}
\]
Next, we prove the second part of the theorem regarding $f$. Similar to the proof of Theorem\[1\] we consider
\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial f(s', a')} = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{t} \gamma^k \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} \delta_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s_0) \right) \left( \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \right) \right] + \lambda_{s'} \pi(a'|s') \tag{70}
\]
Following the proof of Theorem\[1\] we know that
\[
\mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} \left[ \left( \sum_{t'=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{t'} \delta_{t'} + \gamma^t U(s_t) - \hat{V}(s_0) \right) \left( \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial f(s', a')} \right) \right] = p(s_k=s', a_k=a') \left( M_k(s') + \gamma^k \mathbb{E} \left[ H_k \bigg| s_k=s', a_k=a' \right] - f(s', a') \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{V}(s_0)|s_k=s' \right] \tag{71}
\]
\[
= p(s_k=s', a_k=a') \left( M_k(s') + \gamma^k \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ H_k \bigg| s_k=s', a_k=a' \right] - f(s', a') \right) \right) - \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{V}(s_0)|s_k=s' \right] \tag{72}
\]
where we denote \( r_k + \gamma r_{k+1} + \cdots + \gamma^{t-k} U(s_t) \) by \( H_k \). We substitute this back into Equation (70) and sum over the action space, which results in

\[
\sum_{a' \in A} \frac{\partial L}{\partial f(s', a')} = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \gamma^k p(s_k=s') \left( M_k(s') + \gamma^k \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s'] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{V}(s_0) | s_k=s' \right] \right) + \lambda_{s'}
\]

(73)

By requiring \( \frac{\partial L}{\partial f(s', a')} = 0 \), we have

\[
\lambda_{s'} = -2 \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \gamma^k p(s_k=s') \left( M_k(s') + \gamma^k \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s'] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{V}(s_0) | s_k=s' \right] \right)
\]

(74)

Substituting this back again into Equation (70) we have

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{2k} p(s_k=s', a_k=a') \left( \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s', a_k=a'] - \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s'] - f(s', a') \right) = 0,
\]

(75)

which implies

\[
\pi(a' | s') \left( \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} w_k(s') \right) f(s', a') = \pi(a' | s') \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} w_k(s') \left( \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s', a_k=a'] - \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s'] \right),
\]

(76)

where \( w_k(s') = \gamma^{2k} p(s_k=s') \). If \( (s', a') \) is reachable within \( t - 1 \), then

\[
f(s', a') = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} w_k(s')} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} w_k(s') \left( \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s', a_k=a'] - \mathbb{E} [H_k | s_k=s'] \right).
\]

(77)
The network architecture used by DAE is summarized in Figure 4.

![Network Architecture Diagram]

Figure 4: The network architectures for the policy network (left) and the dueling network (right). Each hidden layer is followed by a rectified linear unit (ReLU). The output layer of the policy network is followed by a softmax function to model the probability of each action.

We summarize the search space for the hyperparameters in Table 2 and the final set of hyperparameters in Table 3. For DAE, the learning rate is linearly increased from 0 to the listed value for the first one million in-game frames and then linearly decreased to 0 throughout training. The same learning rate is used for both policy training and value training. For GAE, the learning rate and the PPO clipping (\(\epsilon\)) are linearly decreased from the listed values to 0 throughout training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning rate</td>
<td>[0.0001, 0.001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N_{actor})</td>
<td>{32, 64, 128, 256}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N_{steps})</td>
<td>{4, 8, 16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE epochs</td>
<td>{2, 3, 4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE mini-batch size</td>
<td>{4, 8, 16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta_{KL})</td>
<td>{10, 30, 50, 100}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta_{ent})</td>
<td>{0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.1}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ranges of hyperparameters considered for DAE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>GAE</th>
<th>DAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount $\gamma$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{\text{actor}}$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{\text{steps}}$</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning rate</td>
<td>0.00025</td>
<td>0.00045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizer</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam $\beta$</td>
<td>(0.9, 0.999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam $\epsilon$</td>
<td>$10^{-5}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO epochs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO mini-batch size</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO Clipping $\epsilon$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPO VF coeff.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{\text{KL}}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{\text{ent}}$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE epochs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE mini-batch size</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAE $\lambda$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Final set of hyperparameters for GAE and DAE.