
Offline Trajectory Generalization for Offline Reinforcement Learning

Ziqi Zhao¹ Zhaochun Ren² Liu Yang¹ Fajie Yuan³ Pengjie Ren¹ Zhumin Chen¹ Jun Ma¹ Xin Xin¹

Abstract

Offline reinforcement learning (RL) aims to learn policies from static datasets of previously collected trajectories. Existing methods for offline RL either constrain the learned policy to the support of offline data or utilize model-based virtual environments to generate simulated rollouts. However, these methods suffer from (i) poor generalization to unseen states; and (ii) trivial improvement from low-qualified rollout simulation. In this paper, we propose **offline trajectory generalization through world transformers for offline reinforcement learning (OTTO)**. Specifically, we use casual Transformers, a.k.a. World Transformers, to predict state dynamics and the immediate reward. Then we propose four strategies to use World Transformers to generate high-rewarded trajectory simulation by perturbing the offline data. Finally, we jointly use offline data with simulated data to train an offline RL algorithm. OTTO serves as a plug-in module and can be integrated with existing offline RL methods to enhance them with better generalization capability of transformers and high-rewarded data augmentation. Conducting extensive experiments on D4RL benchmark datasets, we verify that OTTO significantly outperforms state-of-the-art offline RL methods.

1. Introduction

Offline reinforcement learning (RL) refers to training RL agents from pre-collected datasets, without the need for real-time interactions or online explorations (Levine et al., 2020). This paradigm plays a crucial role in real-world scenarios where collecting online interactions can be expensive or risky, as observed in domains like healthcare (Liu et al., 2020), robotics (Singh et al., 2022), autonomous driving (Yu et al., 2020a), and recommendation systems (Swaminathan & Joachims, 2015). Standard RL methods often fail in

¹Shandong University ²Leiden University ³Westlake University.
Correspondence to: Xin Xin <xinxin@sdu.edu.cn>.

such offline setting due to erroneous estimation of value functions (Fujimoto et al., 2019).

Existing offline RL methods can be classified into two categories: model-free methods and model-based methods. Model-free methods incorporate conservatism into the value function estimation (Fujimoto et al., 2019; Kumar et al., 2019; Fujimoto et al., 2018; Siegel et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2020; Kostrikov et al., 2021a). For example, CQL (Kumar et al., 2020) adds a regularization term into the Q-function update. The conservatism downgrades the value function for unseen states and thus helps to avoid the over-estimation issue. As a result, the learned policy is constrained to near the offline data distribution. Besides, the overly conservatism could lead to underestimation of potentially good actions. Such issues lead to the poor generalization capability of model-free offline RL methods.

Unlike model-free RL methods, model-based RL algorithms learn a dynamics model based on the offline dataset. The dynamics model can be utilized as a simulated environment to generate additional interaction data, providing new potential to further enhance the learned policy (Yu et al., 2020b; Kidambi et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2021). However, we found that the simulated data generated by existing model-based RL methods is of low qualification, resulting in trivial improvement for policy learning. Specifically, existing model-based RL approaches can only perform short-horizon model rollouts, resulting in marginal generalization improvement only near the support data, as shown in Figure 1(a). Besides, when we perform the simulation of long-horizon trajectories using the environment model, the average reward of each interaction step often becomes lower for longer steps, as shown in Figure 1(b). As a result, the performance of the learned policy suffers a sharp decline, as shown in Figure 1(c). The above observation indicates that existing model-based offline RL methods suffer from trivial improvement from low-qualified rollout simulation.

To address the aforementioned issues, we propose **offline trajectory generalization through world transformers for offline reinforcement learning (OTTO)**. Specifically, we first learn the state dynamics transition and reward function by a pair of Transformers, a.k.a. World Transformers, based on the offline dataset. It is observed that the Transformer architecture achieves state-of-the-art performance in wide




Figure 1. (a): comparison between existing model-based RL methods and OTTO. The blue dot represents data from the offline dataset. The green region represents the generalization range of the original offline data. The red dots represent the short-horizon rollouts from existing model-based methods, resulting in a small generalization improvement near the original data, i.e., the dashed line. The green dots represent the long-horizon trajectories generated by OTTO, which leads to a broader generalization range, i.e., the dotted line. (b): the average immediate reward of each interaction step in a long simulation generated by a representative model-based method MOPO (Yu et al., 2020b). The reward becomes lower for longer steps. (c): policy performance of MOPO with short and long simulations. Long simulation with lower reward downgrades the performance.

domains, including natural language processing (NLP) (Devin et al., 2018; Raffel et al., 2020) and computer vision (He et al., 2022; Dosovitskiy et al., 2020). The Transformer particularly stands out for its outstanding generalization capability. As a result, the proposed World Transformers are utilized to improve the generalization capability for environment simulation. Then, four strategies are proposed to use World Transformers to generate long trajectory simulation by perturbing the offline data. The generalization capability of World Transformers, together with the prior knowledge in the offline dataset, ensures that the generated long-horizon trajectories are high-rewarded and thus helps the model to learn potential good actions. Finally, offline data together with the simulated trajectories are jointly used to train an offline RL algorithm. Note that OTTO serves as a plug-in module and can be integrated with a wide range of offline RL methods to enhance the learned policy further.

Our contributions in this paper are as follows:

1. We propose World Transformers, which utilize the sequential modeling of Transformers to learn state dynamics transition and reward functions with good generalization capability.
2. We propose four trajectory simulation strategies, which can autoregressively generate high-qualified long-horizon trajectory augmentation by using the World Transformers.
3. Our experiments on D4RL benchmarks show that OTTO can effectively improve the performance of representative model-free offline RL algorithms and outperforms strong model-based baselines.

2. Preliminaries

Offline RL: A Markov decision process is defined by the tuple $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, T, r, \mu_0, \gamma)$, where \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A} refer to state space and action space, respectively. A policy $\pi(a|s)$ defines a mapping from state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ to a probability distribution over action $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Given a (s, a) pair, $T(s'|s, a)$ and $r(s, a)$ represent the distribution of next state s' and the obtained immediate reward, respectively. μ_0 is the initial state distribution and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is the discount factor for future reward. The value function $V_M^\pi(s) := \mathbb{E}_{\pi, T}[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) | s_0 = s]$ represents the expected cumulative reward from executing π from state s . We define V_M^π as the value function under the initial state distribution, i.e. $V_M^\pi = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mu_0(s) V_M^\pi(s)$. The goal of RL is to find an optimal policy $\pi^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} V_M^\pi$ that maximizes the expected cumulative reward.

Conventional RL methods learn the value function through sampling (s, a) according to the target policy π , which is an online learning manner with error explorations. However, online learning is usually expensive under practical usage. To this end, offline RL has emerged. In offline RL, instead of obtaining interaction data via online environment explorations, the policy is learned purely from a static dataset \mathcal{D} consisting of trajectories pre-collected with an unknown behavior policy π_β . The goal of offline RL is to find the optimal policy using the static offline dataset.

Model-based Offline RL: Model-based offline RL aims to learn the environment model and utilize it to aid policy search. The model-based approaches typically train a state dynamics model \hat{T} and a reward function $\hat{r}(s, a)$ based on the given dataset \mathcal{D} . Subsequently, an estimated MDP

$\hat{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \hat{T}, \hat{r}, \mu_0, \gamma)$ which has the same state and action space as the true MDP but uses the simulated state transition and reward function is constructed. Following this, the policy is learned through simulated interactions to avoid expensive online explorations.

3. Methodology

This section presents OTTO, a novel model-based framework for offline RL. We first provide an overview in section 3.1. Then, the World Transformers are described in section 3.2. Finally, the process of long-horizon trajectory generalization is described in section 3.3.

3.1. Overview

Offline RL aims to learn a policy from a static dataset \mathcal{D} , which contains trajectories $\tau = \{s_t, a_t, r_t\}_{t=0}^{|\tau|}$ pre-collected with an unknown behavior policy. t denotes the interaction step in the trajectory τ . However, offline RL algorithms often fail to tackle unseen states and actions during online inference in a real environment. In this work, we aim to improve the generalization capability of offline RL methods through generating high-qualified simulated trajectories $\tau^* = \{s_t^*, a_t^*, r_t^*\}_{t=0}^{|\tau^*|}$, which enlarge the observed states and actions during offline model training.

To augment the trajectories, we first train World Transformers (\mathcal{M}) consisting of a State Transformer (\mathcal{M}_s) and a Reward Transformer (\mathcal{M}_r) based on \mathcal{D} , which predict the next state and reward for a given (s, a) pair, respectively, to serve as the simulated environment. Then, we introduce noises to perturb the original trajectories τ and use World Transformers to generate simulated trajectories τ^* , forming the generated dataset \mathcal{D}_{gen} . The new offline dataset \mathcal{D}_{new} is obtained by mixing \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}_{gen} , i.e., $\mathcal{D}_{new} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_{gen}$. Finally, a model-free offline RL algorithm is trained upon \mathcal{D}_{new} . $\delta = |\mathcal{D}_{gen}|/|\mathcal{D}|$ is used as the augmentation ratio.

3.2. World Transformers

To perform trajectory augmentation, we need to implement an environment simulator which models the state transition distribution and the reward function. However, existing model-based methods fail to generate long-horizon and high-rewarded trajectories, as shown in Figure 1(b), leading to trivial improvement. Inspired by recent work using the Transformer architecture by casting the RL problem as conditional sequence modeling tasks (Chen et al., 2021), we propose to model the environment dynamics through Transformers, aka World Transformers. It has been shown that Transformers can effectively learn from long input sequences and produce satisfying outputs.

Model Inputs. The key factors to construct the environment

model inputs are: (1) the model input should contain all the factors determining the environment state transitions; (2) the model should enable Transformers to learn from continuous sequential interactions; (3) the model input should be as simple as possible to avoid unnecessary noise. Considering that in online RL the environment provides feedback simply based on the agent’s action and the current state, the model input for World Transformers contains multiple continuous state and action tuples (s, a) . Formally, we define the model input as

$$inputs = \{\dots, s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}, a_{t+1}, \dots\} \quad (1)$$

Both the State Transformer and Reward Transformer take the above model inputs for environment simulation.

Environment Modeling. We use the State Transformer and the Reward Transformer to model the next state transition and the reward function, respectively. Particularly, we introduce a learnable embedding matrix to represent the interaction step t , which is similar to the positional embedding in language modeling. Noticing that GPT-series models have achieved remarkable success across various NLP tasks (Radford et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020; Radford et al., 2019), we deployed two GPT models to model the states transition and reward function. At timestep t , the State Transformer and Reward Transformer model the following distributions:

$$\hat{s}_{t+1} \sim \hat{T}_{\mathcal{M}_s}(\hat{s}_{t+1} | \{s, a\}_{t-L_s+1}^t) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{r}_t \sim \hat{r}_{\mathcal{M}_r}(\hat{r}_t | \{s, a\}_{t-L_r+1}^t) \quad (3)$$

where $\{s, a\}_{t-L+1}^t$ represents the model input sequence $\{s_{t-L+1}, a_{t-L+1}, s_{t-L+2}, a_{t-L+2}, \dots, s_t, a_t\}$ as shown in Eq.(1). L_s, L_r represent the hyperparameters that define the length of the model inputs for $\mathcal{M}_s, \mathcal{M}_r$ respectively. We also tried to model both distributions in one unified Transformer, but we did not observe a better performance.

Both \mathcal{M}_s and \mathcal{M}_r are trained in a supervised manner upon the offline dataset. The prediction output at the position of a_t is trained to predict \hat{s}_{t+1} or \hat{r}_t in \mathcal{M}_s or \mathcal{M}_r , respectively. We use mean-squared error for both the next state prediction and reward prediction. World Transformers are effective in conducting long sequence modeling and thus can be used to generate long-horizon simulation.

3.3. Trajectory Generalization

We now discuss how to generate trajectories with World Transformers. The key idea in trajectory generation is to expand the observed state-action tuples, thereby improving the performance of offline RL. Motivated by this, we introduce uniform noise to the action a_t in the original trajectory, forming a perturbed action a_t^* . In particular, we add a random number of range $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ to each dimension of




Figure 2. Trajectories generation with World Transformers. World Transformers consist of Reward Transformer \mathcal{M}_r and State Transformer \mathcal{M}_s . Given an original trajectory and the augmentation step $t = i + 1$ (as shown in black dashed box), random noise of range $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ is introduced to a_{i+1} (as shown as a_{i+1}^* in red circle) to form a new action. Then the corresponding r_{i+1}^* and s_{i+2}^* can be inferred from \mathcal{M}_r and \mathcal{M}_s , respectively. This process is repeated for h times to generate the new trajectory.

a_t . Then we predict the corresponding next state s_{t+1}^* and reward r_t^* with the World Transformer. The alteration of action results in changes to the next state, therefore a new tuple $\{a_t^*, r_t^*, s_{t+1}^*\}$ is generated in a new trajectory. We repeat this process of introducing noise to the original action and predicting the next state and reward from timestep $t = t_s$ to $t = t_s + h - 1$, where h is a hyperparameter that defines the length of simulation. The whole process is visualized in Figure 2. The generated trajectory effectively expands the observed state-action space. Besides, the generated trajectory is still continuous, which enables World Transformers to learn autoregressively from previous interaction steps, thereby avoiding overly erroneous estimations for long-horizon simulation. The perturbation of offline data also helps OTTO to utilize the prior knowledge of offline data, thus generating high-rewarded trajectories.

Generating for all the timesteps in the original offline dataset is not appropriate because (1) this may also introduce extra noise to the offline dataset and (2) not every tuple $\{s_t, a_t, r_t\}$ in a trajectory is worthy of augmenting. We prefer to generate trajectories with high total rewards, which are good demonstrations for policy improvement. In this paper, we propose four trajectory generation strategies:

Random : For each trajectory $\tau = \{s_t, a_t, r_t\}_{t=0}^{|\tau|}$ in offline dataset, we randomly select the start timestep $t_s \in [0, |\tau| - h + 1]$, and generate trajectory τ^* based on the trajectory segment $\{s_t, a_t, r_t\}_{t=t_s}^{t_s+h-1}$.

Top- K : We first split all original trajectories into segments of length h . Then we sort these segments by their cumulative rewards in descending order and generate trajectories based on the top- K segments, where $K = |\mathcal{D}_{gen}|/h$.

Softmax : We also split the trajectory segments as the Top- K strategy, but we choose the segments according to their probabilities calculated by a softmax function over the cu-

mulative rewards of the segments.

BeamSearch : Different with Top- K and Softmax strategies which perturb each segment one time, the BeamSearch strategy perturbs each segment multiple times and selects the trajectories with highest rewards as the augmented data. The details are summarized in Algorithm 1 in the appendix.

Finally, a model-free offline RL algorithm, e.g., DT (Chen et al., 2021), is trained upon both the original dataset and the augmented dataset to learn a policy.

4. Related Work

Offline RL is the task of learning policies from a static dataset of pre-collected trajectories. It has been applied to various domains including robotics (Kumar et al., 2021; Kalashnikov et al., 2018), healthcare (Wang et al., 2018; Tang & Wiens, 2021; Tang et al., 2022) and NLP (Snell et al., 2023; Verma et al., 2022; Wu & Hu, 2018). Existing offline RL methods can be categorized into model-free methods and model-based methods.

Model-free methods. As the learned policy might differ from the behavior policy, offline RL encounters the distributional shift issue. Most approaches for model-free offline RL are based on restricting the target policy, including constraining the learned policy to near the behavior policy (Fujimoto et al., 2019; Kostrikov et al., 2021b; Fujimoto & Gu, 2021; Wu et al., 2019; Siegel et al., 2020), incorporating value pessimism (Kumar et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2021; Kostrikov et al., 2021a), importance sampling (Liu et al., 2019; Nachum et al., 2019; Sutton et al., 2016), and uncertainty punishment for value functions (Sinha et al., 2022; An et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2019). However, these methods only use the offline dataset, which prevents them from broader generalization. On the contrary, we use both

the offline data as well as the high-qualified augmentation data, which can further enhance the performance of these existing methods.

Recently, Chen et al. (2021); Janner et al. (2021) proposed to cast offline RL into a sequence modeling problem and use Transformers to solve it in a supervised manner. Their methods directly output the action but are limited to the support of offline data. However, the proposed OTTO aims to model the environment through World Transformers, leading to better generalization.

Model-based methods. Model-based offline RL methods (Yu et al., 2020b; Kidambi et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2021; Rigter et al., 2022; Zhan et al., 2022; Swazinna et al., 2021; Rafailov et al., 2020; Matsushima et al., 2020) provide an alternative approach that learns a model of environment and generate synthetic rollouts from the model to optimize the policy. Model-based methods provide the potential for broader generalization. However, we found the trajectories generated by these methods are extremely short-horizon (with simulation length $h = 5$ or even $h = 1$), resulting in limited generalization improvement. On the contrary, OTTO can generate long-horizon trajectories with high rewards by World Transformers, which provides more potential for better generalization. Micheli et al. (2022) also proposed to use Transformers to model the environment. However, their methods are not tailored for offline RL. Besides, OTTO can serve as a plug-in module that can be integrated with existing model-free methods to provide further improvement.

5. Experiments

In this section, we conduct experiments to answer the following research questions: (1) Can OTTO effectively improve the performance of existing model-free offline RL methods? (2) How does OTTO perform compared to state-of-the-art model-based offline RL methods? (3) How does the design of OTTO affect the performance?

To answer question (1), we integrate OTTO with several representative model-free offline RL approaches and compare the agent performance with or without OTTO. These model-free offline RL approaches include DT (Chen et al., 2021), CQL (Kumar et al., 2020) and BCQ (Fujimoto et al., 2019). DT employs Transformers to cast RL as a sequence modeling task. The CQL and BCQ are both time-difference (TD) learning algorithms and CQL is regarded as one of the state-of-the-art model-free approaches. To answer question (2), we choose COMBO (Yu et al., 2021), MOPO (Yu et al., 2020b) and MOREL (Kidambi et al., 2020) as our baselines. These model-based methods also aim to use a model to simulate the environment and generate short-horizon rollouts to improve the policy learning, among which COMBO achieved the best performance.




Figure 3. The average immediate reward of each interaction step in simulated trajectories with $h = 50$. Random, Top- K , Softmax, and BeamSearch correspond to four strategies of OTTO. MOPO refers to the trajectories generated by MOPO (Yu et al., 2020b).

We evaluate all the methods on continuous control tasks in OpenAI Gym MuJoCo environments (Brockman et al., 2016) from the D4RL benchmark (Fu et al., 2020), which contains three environments (halfcheetah, hopper, and walker2d) and four datasets for each environment (expert, medium, medium-replay, and medium-expert).

5.1. Improvement of Model-free Methods.

We implement three representative model-free methods and train them on both the original dataset \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}_{new} augmented by OTTO. Table 1 shows the summary of our experimental results. Firstly, we can see that with the augmented trajectories from OTTO, all algorithms achieve better scores than their original scores in 30 out of total 36 settings, and achieve comparable results in remaining settings, suggesting that OTTO is robust to different datasets and can generalize to multiple model-free algorithms. Secondly, DT is the most suitable algorithm for OTTO among the three algorithms as it outperforms Ori in all settings, especially in *hopper_medium-replay* (+17.2 scores). We guess the reason could be that DT can hone in on high-rewarded actions (Chen et al., 2021), resulting in better utilization of the generated trajectories. Thirdly, for the other two TD-learning algorithms, OTTO also achieves remarkable performance improvement (2.2 average improvement for CQL and 2.8 average improvement for BCQ), suggesting that OTTO is robust to different model-free offline RL algorithms. Finally, we find that OTTO achieves significant improvement in *hopper* environment, while its performance is not as remarkable in *halfcheetah* environment. We attribute this performance gap to the differences between environments, more details are shown in the error analysis of section 5.3.

To conclude, the proposed OTTO can help to further improve the performance of existing model-free methods.

Table 1. Results for model-free methods. All the average and standard deviation scores are reported over 5 seeds. Ori columns report the result of using the original offline dataset and OTTO columns report the result of using our framework. The numbers in Ori column are run by our own using the recommended hyperparameters. We also copy the reported results from Chen et al. (2021) for DT in Ref*. Each number is the normalized score as in Fu et al. (2020) and we bold the highest scores.

Dataset	Environment	Ref*	DT		CQL		BCQ	
			Ori	OTTO	Ori	OTTO	Ori	OTTO
medium	halfcheetah	42.6 ± 0.1	41.4 ± 0.1	41.9 ± 0.1	49.1 ± 0.8	50.4 ± 0.2	46.3 ± 0.2	46.4 ± 0.2
	hopper	67.6 ± 1.0	64.9 ± 4.6	71.9 ± 1.2	95.9 ± 6.8	102.6 ± 0.8	69.4 ± 3.8	77.3 ± 6.7
	walker2d	74.0 ± 1.4	73.9 ± 2.7	79.6 ± 1.0	88.3 ± 2.4	93.1 ± 0.3	84.2 ± 1.5	86.4 ± 0.2
med-replay	halfcheetah	36.6 ± 0.8	35.5 ± 0.4	37.9 ± 0.2	48.4 ± 0.7	47.8 ± 0.2	42.7 ± 0.6	41.7 ± 0.2
	hopper	82.7 ± 7.0	71.2 ± 3.6	88.9 ± 3.4	103.5 ± 2.2	103.8 ± 0.6	83.9 ± 10.6	97.7 ± 1.6
	walker2d	66.6 ± 3.0	70.2 ± 1.2	76.0 ± 1.5	92.2 ± 2.8	93.6 ± 2.2	76.7 ± 6.9	81.4 ± 2.4
med-expert	halfcheetah	86.8 ± 1.3	87.7 ± 1.4	92.1 ± 1.5	87.0 ± 6.7	86.8 ± 0.3	93.5 ± 0.5	92.1 ± 0.0
	hopper	107.6 ± 1.8	105.3 ± 6.0	111.6 ± 0.4	113.8 ± 1.4	115.9 ± 1.4	112.4 ± 0.8	112.9 ± 0.1
	walker2d	108.1 ± 0.2	108.1 ± 0.7	109.7 ± 0.2	116.1 ± 3.0	120.7 ± 1.9	112.7 ± 0.7	113.2 ± 0.2
expert	halfcheetah	-	88.3 ± 0.5	92.0 ± 0.4	98.4 ± 1.9	99.8 ± 1.3	97.1 ± 0.3	95.6 ± 0.3
	hopper	-	109.5 ± 1.1	111.5 ± 0.2	114.3 ± 1.9	117.5 ± 0.5	112.5 ± 1.1	113.3 ± 0.4
	walker2d	-	109.2 ± 0.1	110.4 ± 0.4	115.0 ± 2.7	116.2 ± 0.8	111.7 ± 0.4	112.4 ± 0.0
Average (Without Expert)		74.7	73.1	78.8	88.3	90.5	80.4	83.2
Average (All Settings)		74.7	80.4	85.3	93.5	95.7	87.1	89.2

Table 2. Comparison between model-based methods. All the average and standard deviation scores are reported over 5 seeds. CQL+OTTO represents our method with CQL as the offline algorithm. The numbers in COMBO, MOPO and MOREL are copied from their papers (Yu et al., 2021; 2020b; Kidambi et al., 2020).

Dataset	Environment	CQL+OTTO	COMBO	MOPO	MOREL
medium	halfcheetah	50.4 ± 0.2	54.2 ± 1.5	42.3	42.1
	hopper	102.6 ± 0.8	97.2 ± 2.2	28.0	95.4
	walker2d	93.1 ± 0.3	81.9 ± 2.8	17.8	77.8
medium-replay	halfcheetah	47.8 ± 0.2	55.1 ± 1.0	53.1	40.2
	hopper	103.8 ± 0.6	89.5 ± 1.8	67.5	93.6
	walker2d	93.6 ± 2.2	56.0 ± 8.6	39.0	49.8
medium-expert	halfcheetah	86.8 ± 0.3	90.0 ± 5.6	63.3	53.3
	hopper	115.9 ± 1.4	111.1 ± 2.9	23.7	108.7
	walker2d	120.7 ± 1.9	103.3 ± 5.6	44.6	95.6
Average Score		90.5	82.0	42.1	72.9

5.2. Comparison Between Model-based Methods

In this section, we compare OTTO and existing model-based methods. We integrate OTTO with CQL as our methods. For baselines, COMBO (Yu et al., 2021) improved the Q-function used in CQL and achieved current state-of-the-art results in a wide range of tasks. We also include MOPO and MOREL as baselines. Table 2 shows the comparison results. We can see that CQL+OTTO significantly outperforms COMBO in all datasets of *hopper* and *walker2d* environments and achieves a higher average score (90.5 vs 82.0). While COMBO outperforms CQL+OTTO in *halfcheetah* environments, we discuss the possible reasons in the error analysis of section 5.3.

Besides, we compare the quality between the trajectories

generated by our method and MOPO as shown in Figure 3. Particularly, we calculate the real reward for each state-action tuple (s_t, a_t) at timestep t in the trajectories generated by MOPO and OTTO in an online environment. We also calculate the average reward in the offline dataset as a reference. We can see that the immediate reward of MOPO initially hovers around the mean score during the initial five timesteps but suffers a rapid decline as the timesteps progress. The trajectories generated by MOPO are quite low-rewarded compared to the mean of offline data, which leads to trivial improvement for policy learning. On the contrary, all the four strategies in OTTO generate high-rewarded long-horizon trajectories. The rewards for all four strategies remain relatively stable in all timesteps. Three of them consistently remain above the offline mean score, while the




Figure 4. The average immediate reward of each interaction step in the trajectories generated by OTTO. The dashed line represents predicted immediate reward by using the World Transformers. The solid line represents real immediate reward by calculating in online environments.

remaining one hovers around the mean score.

To conclude, OTTO can generate high-qualified trajectories and outperforms existing model-based methods.

5.3. OTTO Investigation

5.3.1. PERFORMANCE OF GENERATION STRATEGIES.

In this section, we evaluate the four trajectory generation strategies using DT as the following model-free RL method. Table 3 summarizes the experimental results. To ensure a fair comparison, we set δ to be the same for all strategies ($\delta = 1/8$ for the medium-replay dataset and $\delta = 1/10$ for other datasets). Firstly, we can see that all the strategies can outperform their original performance, which suggests that all four strategies can enhance the performance of existing offline RL algorithms. Secondly, we found the overall performance of Top- K is similar to Softmax. Top- K performs slightly better in datasets with high-rewarded trajectories (medium-expert and expert), while Softmax performs better in other datasets (medium-replay and medium). Besides, we find the Random strategy performs best in expert and medium datasets. As noted in Yu et al. (2020b); Rafailov et al. (2020), medium-replay and medium-expert are collected with a wide range of policies while expert and medium datasets are collected with fewer policies and have narrow state-action distributions. In such a case, the Random strategy can more effectively enlarge the observed state-action space through perturbation on randomly selected actions, thus leading to better performance.

5.3.2. QUALITY OF GENERATED TRAJECTORIES

To investigate the quality of generated trajectories, we aim to address the following two questions: (i) can OTTO generate high-rewarded trajectories by using manually designed trajectory generation strategies; (ii) how is the estimated error of reward prediction? To answer these questions, we cal-

culate the immediate reward of each interaction step in the trajectories generated by OTTO as shown in Figure 4. We can see that for both predicted rewards and accurate rewards, BeamSearch strategy generates the highest-rewarded trajectories in all settings, Softmax and Top- K strategies perform comparably in the middle, while the Random strategy generates the lowest-rewarded trajectory in most settings. This suggests that three manually designed trajectory generation strategies can effectively generate high-rewarded trajectories by selecting the specific segments. However, we can see that these manually designed trajectory generation strategies also lead to a bigger gap between the real reward and the predicted reward, which affects policy performance as well. In datasets with narrow state-action distribution such as the expert dataset, the estimated error of immediate reward is relatively higher. As a result, the Random strategy performs better in expert dataset. While in datasets with a wide range of policies like medium-replay, we can see BeamSearch can generate high-rewarded trajectories with little estimated error, resulting in better performance as shown in Table 3. These observations suggest that we should navigate a trade-off between low-error, low-reward strategy (Random) and high-error, high-reward strategies (Top- K , Softmax, BeamSearch) based on the specific dataset.

5.3.3. IMPACT OF AUGMENTATION RATIO δ .

Table 4 shows the impact of the augmentation ratio. Firstly, we can see that for all augmentation ratios varying from $\delta = 1/8$ to $\delta = 2$, OTTO outperforms its original performance. This suggests that DT+OTTO is robust to the δ . Secondly, for all environments, we observed that as the augmentation ratio increases, the performance of OTTO improves because the mixed dataset with more augmented data is able to provide more high-rewarded trajectories to enlarge the observed states and actions. But the performance will drop when δ is too large. The reason is that too large δ introduces more noise.

Table 3. DT+OTTO results for Open AI Gym MuJoCo with four trajectory generation strategies. All the average and standard deviation scores are reported over 5 seeds. Ori column reports the result of using the original offline dataset.

Dataset	Environment	Random	Top-K	Softmax	BeamSearch	Ori
medium	halfcheetah	41.5 ± 0.6	41.6 ± 0.9	41.9 ± 0.1	41.8 ± 0.2	41.4 ± 0.1
	hopper	71.9 ± 1.2	71.0 ± 0.4	69.8 ± 1.4	70.0 ± 3.7	64.9 ± 4.6
	walker2d	79.6 ± 1.0	77.2 ± 0.7	77.1 ± 0.6	77.1 ± 1.0	73.9 ± 2.7
medium-replay	halfcheetah	37.0 ± 0.4	37.0 ± 0.3	37.9 ± 0.2	37.2 ± 0.3	35.5 ± 0.4
	hopper	82.2 ± 1.5	88.8 ± 11.0	88.9 ± 3.4	82.2 ± 3.4	71.2 ± 3.6
	walker2d	74.4 ± 1.5	76.0 ± 1.5	74.9 ± 1.4	69.4 ± 0.4	70.2 ± 1.2
medium-expert	halfcheetah	92.0 ± 1.5	91.7 ± 1.1	91.8 ± 1.5	92.1 ± 1.5	87.7 ± 1.4
	hopper	111.3 ± 0.4	111.6 ± 0.4	111.0 ± 0.2	110.6 ± 0.4	105.3 ± 6.0
	walker2d	109.0 ± 0.1	109.2 ± 0.3	109.3 ± 0.4	109.7 ± 0.2	108.1 ± 0.7
expert	halfcheetah	92.0 ± 0.4	91.9 ± 0.2	91.6 ± 0.3	91.1 ± 0.3	88.3 ± 0.5
	hopper	111.5 ± 0.2	111.3 ± 0.2	111.1 ± 0.1	111.1 ± 0.2	109.5 ± 1.1
	walker2d	110.4 ± 0.4	109.7 ± 0.4	109.5 ± 0.1	109.8 ± 0.3	109.2 ± 0.1
Average Score		84.4	84.8	84.6	83.5	80.4

Table 4. DT+OTTO results for Open AI Gym MuJoCo with augmentation ratio δ sweep. All the average and standard deviation scores are reported over 5 seeds. We use Softmax strategy for all augmentation ratio δ .

Dataset	Environment	$\delta = 1/8$	$\delta = 1/4$	$\delta = 1/2$	$\delta = 1$	$\delta = 3/2$	$\delta = 2$	Ori
medium-replay	halfcheetah	37.2 ± 0.3	37.5 ± 0.6	37.9 ± 0.2	37.5 ± 0.7	37.7 ± 0.6	36.2 ± 0.7	35.5 ± 0.4
	hopper	86.4 ± 2.3	88.9 ± 3.4	83.1 ± 4.4	79.0 ± 2.7	85.0 ± 5.6	80.0 ± 3.7	71.2 ± 3.6
	walker2d	70.7 ± 2.1	73.4 ± 3.7	71.5 ± 1.6	72.6 ± 2.2	74.9 ± 1.4	71.5 ± 1.3	70.2 ± 1.2




Figure 5. Comparison of the average loss of state estimation and reward estimation between three environments.

5.3.4. ERROR ANALYSIS.

In experiments, we found that OTTO can significantly improve the performance in *hopper* and *walker2d* environments, but only perform comparably in *halfcheetah*. To further analyze this performance gap, we compare the estimated error of environment modeling between these three environments as shown in Figure 5. Particularly, we define the loss as mean absolute deviation. We can see that the loss of next state estimation and reward estimation in *halfcheetah* are both higher than that in the other two environments. Especially the standard deviation of reward loss is extremely high. To conclude, the environment simulation

in *halfcheetah* is not as accurate as the other two environments, resulting in a smaller improvement of OTTO. Such observation indicates that the accuracy of the environment model is essential for model-based methods.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we have presented offline trajectory generalization through world transformers for offline reinforcement learning (OTTO). In particular, we have trained the World Transformers to simulate the environment and proposed four trajectory generation strategies to generate high-qualified trajectories based on World Transformers. The RL agent is trained upon both the original data and augmented trajectories from World Transformers. Extensive experiments on D4RL benchmarks show that OTTO improves the performance of representative model-free offline RL algorithms and outperforms strong model-based baselines. Despite the advantages of OTTO, there are a few challenges left such as the relatively high estimation error of World Transformers in complex environments. We leave them for future studies. Additionally, noticing that large language models (LLMs) have achieved promising results in a variety of tasks, we also want to investigate the prospective utilization of LLMs as environmental models in future research.

Impact Statements

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- An, G., Moon, S., Kim, J.-H., and Song, H. O. Uncertainty-based offline reinforcement learning with diversified q-ensemble. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:7436–7447, 2021.
- Brockman, G., Cheung, V., Pettersson, L., Schneider, J., Schulman, J., Tang, J., and Zaremba, W. Openai gym. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540*, 2016.
- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Chen, L., Lu, K., Rajeswaran, A., Lee, K., Grover, A., Laskin, M., Abbeel, P., Srinivas, A., and Mordatch, I. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:15084–15097, 2021.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- Fu, J., Kumar, A., Nachum, O., Tucker, G., and Levine, S. D4rl: Datasets for deep data-driven reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07219*, 2020.
- Fujimoto, S. and Gu, S. S. A minimalist approach to offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:20132–20145, 2021.
- Fujimoto, S., Hoof, H., and Meger, D. Addressing function approximation error in actor-critic methods. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1587–1596. PMLR, 2018.
- Fujimoto, S., Meger, D., and Precup, D. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2052–2062. PMLR, 2019.
- He, K., Chen, X., Xie, S., Li, Y., Dollár, P., and Girshick, R. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 16000–16009, 2022.
- Janner, M., Li, Q., and Levine, S. Offline reinforcement learning as one big sequence modeling problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:1273–1286, 2021.
- Kalashnikov, D., Irpan, A., Pastor, P., Ibarz, J., Herzog, A., Jang, E., Quillen, D., Holly, E., Kalakrishnan, M., Vanhoucke, V., and Levine, S. Qt-opt: Scalable deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic manipulation, 2018.
- Kidambi, R., Rajeswaran, A., Netrapalli, P., and Joachims, T. Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21810–21823, 2020.
- Kostrikov, I., Fergus, R., Tompson, J., and Nachum, O. Offline reinforcement learning with fisher divergence critic regularization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5774–5783. PMLR, 2021a.
- Kostrikov, I., Nair, A., and Levine, S. Offline reinforcement learning with implicit q-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06169*, 2021b.
- Kumar, A., Fu, J., Soh, M., Tucker, G., and Levine, S. Stabilizing off-policy q-learning via bootstrapping error reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Kumar, A., Zhou, A., Tucker, G., and Levine, S. Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1179–1191, 2020.
- Kumar, A., Singh, A., Tian, S., Finn, C., and Levine, S. A workflow for offline model-free robotic reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10813*, 2021.
- Levine, S., Kumar, A., Tucker, G., and Fu, J. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.
- Liu, S., See, K. C., Ngiam, K. Y., Celi, L. A., Sun, X., and Feng, M. Reinforcement learning for clinical decision support in critical care: comprehensive review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 22(7):e18477, 2020.
- Liu, Y., Swaminathan, A., Agarwal, A., and Brunskill, E. Off-policy policy gradient with state distribution correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08473*, 2019.

- Matsushima, T., Furuta, H., Matsuo, Y., Nachum, O., and Gu, S. Deployment-efficient reinforcement learning via model-based offline optimization, 2020.
- Micheli, V., Alonso, E., and Fleuret, F. Transformers are sample efficient world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00588*, 2022.
- Nachum, O., Dai, B., Kostrikov, I., Chow, Y., Li, L., and Schuurmans, D. Algaedice: Policy gradient from arbitrary experience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02074*, 2019.
- Radford, A., Narasimhan, K., Salimans, T., Sutskever, I., et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- Rafailov, R., Yu, T., Rajeswaran, A., and Finn, C. Offline reinforcement learning from images with latent space models, 2020.
- Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., and Liu, P. J. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020.
- Rigter, M., Lacerda, B., and Hawes, N. Rambo-rl: Robust adversarial model-based offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:16082–16097, 2022.
- Siegel, N. Y., Springenberg, J. T., Berkenkamp, F., Abdolmaleki, A., Neunert, M., Lampe, T., Hafner, R., Heess, N., and Riedmiller, M. Keep doing what worked: Behavioral modelling priors for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08396*, 2020.
- Singh, B., Kumar, R., and Singh, V. P. Reinforcement learning in robotic applications: a comprehensive survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pp. 1–46, 2022.
- Sinha, S., Mandlekar, A., and Garg, A. S4rl: Surprisingly simple self-supervision for offline reinforcement learning in robotics. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 907–917. PMLR, 2022.
- Snell, C. V., Kostrikov, I., Su, Y., Yang, S., and Levine, S. Offline RL for natural language generation with implicit language q learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=aBH_DydEvoH.
- Sutton, R. S., Mahmood, A. R., and White, M. An emphatic approach to the problem of off-policy temporal-difference learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2603–2631, 2016.
- Swaminathan, A. and Joachims, T. Batch learning from logged bandit feedback through counterfactual risk minimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):1731–1755, 2015.
- Swazinna, P., Udluft, S., and Runkler, T. Overcoming model bias for robust offline deep reinforcement learning, 2021.
- Tang, S. and Wiens, J. Model selection for offline reinforcement learning: Practical considerations for healthcare settings, 2021.
- Tang, S., Makar, M., Sjoding, M., Doshi-Velez, F., and Wiens, J. Leveraging factored action spaces for efficient offline reinforcement learning in healthcare. In *Decision Awareness in Reinforcement Learning Workshop at ICML 2022*, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=wl_o_hilncS.
- Verma, S., Fu, J., Yang, S., and Levine, S. CHAI: A CHatbot AI for task-oriented dialogue with offline reinforcement learning. In Carpuat, M., de Marneffe, M.-C., and Meza Ruiz, I. V. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 4471–4491, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.332. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.332>.
- Wang, L., Zhang, W., He, X., and Zha, H. Supervised reinforcement learning with recurrent neural network for dynamic treatment recommendation, 2018.
- Wu, Y. and Hu, B. Learning to extract coherent summary via deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI’18/IAAI’18/EAAI’18*. AAAI Press, 2018. ISBN 978-1-57735-800-8.
- Wu, Y., Tucker, G., and Nachum, O. Behavior regularized offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.11361*, 2019.
- Xie, T., Cheng, C.-A., Jiang, N., Mineiro, P., and Agarwal, A. Bellman-consistent pessimism for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:6683–6694, 2021.

Yu, F., Chen, H., Wang, X., Xian, W., Chen, Y., Liu, F., Madhavan, V., and Darrell, T. Bdd100k: A diverse driving dataset for heterogeneous multitask learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 2636–2645, 2020a.

Yu, T., Thomas, G., Yu, L., Ermon, S., Zou, J. Y., Levine, S., Finn, C., and Ma, T. Mopo: Model-based offline policy optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:14129–14142, 2020b.

Yu, T., Kumar, A., Rafailov, R., Rajeswaran, A., Levine, S., and Finn, C. Combo: Conservative offline model-based policy optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:28954–28967, 2021.

Zhan, X., Zhu, X., and Xu, H. Model-based offline planning with trajectory pruning, 2022.

A. BeamSearch

We summarized the details of BeamSearch strategy as shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Beam Search

Input: trajectory segment $\tau_{seg} = \{s_t, a_t, r_t\}_{t=t_s}^{t_s+h-1}$, beam width B , State Transformer \mathcal{M}_s , Reward Transformer \mathcal{M}_r , the range of uniform noise ϵ , start timestep t_s
 Initialize generative trajectory list $\Gamma \leftarrow [\{s_{t_s}\}]$
for $t = t_s$ **to** $t_s + h - 1$ **do**
 $tem \leftarrow []$
 for Each trajectory segment $\tau_{seg}^i \in \Gamma$ **do**
 for $b = 1$ **to** B **do**
 $a_t^* \leftarrow a_t + UniformRandom(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$
 $inputs_s \leftarrow \{s^*, a^*\}_{t-L_s+1}^t$ (Equation. 2)
 $inputs_r \leftarrow \{s^*, a^*\}_{t-L_r+1}^t$ (Equation. 3)
 $r_t^* \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_r(inputs_r)$, $s_{t+1}^* \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_s(inputs_s)$
 if $t = t_s + h - 1$ **then**
 $\tau_{seg}^{i,b} \leftarrow \tau_{seg}^i \cup \{a_t^*, r_t^*\}$
 else
 $\tau_{seg}^{i,b} \leftarrow \tau_{seg}^i \cup \{a_t^*, r_t^*, s_{t+1}^*\}$
 end if
 $tem.append(\tau_{seg}^{i,b})$
 end for
 end for
 $\Gamma \leftarrow B\text{-argmax}(\sum_{\tau_{seg}^i \in tem} r_i^*)$
end for
Return Γ

B. The influence of the range of noise ϵ

Table 5. DT+OTTO results for Open AI Gym MuJoCo with a range of noise ϵ sweep. All the average and standard deviation scores are reported over 5 seeds.

Dataset	Environment	$\epsilon = 0.02$	$\epsilon = 0.1$	$\epsilon = 0.5$	Ori
medium-replay	halfcheetah	37.0 \pm 0.1	36.8 \pm 0.4	37.9 \pm 0.2	35.5 \pm 0.4
	hopper	87.5 \pm 4.3	88.9 \pm 3.4	88.8 \pm 2.4	71.2 \pm 3.6
	walker2d	72.0 \pm 2.3	74.4 \pm 1.6	76.0 \pm 1.5	70.2 \pm 1.2
expert	halfcheetah	91.6 \pm 0.3	92.0 \pm 0.4	88.6 \pm 0.2	88.3 \pm 0.5
	hopper	111.5 \pm 0.2	111.1 \pm 0.6	109.0 \pm 0.4	109.5 \pm 1.1
	walker2d	109.5 \pm 0.3	110.4 \pm 0.4	109.4 \pm 0.2	109.2 \pm 0.1

We consider the range of noise ϵ we introduce to the action as an important parameter in OTTO, as it determines the scope of searching for optimal actions. In this section, we evaluate the hyperparameter searches for the range of noise ϵ on DT as shown in Table 5.

We can see that when we introduce a wide range of noise to the actions ($\epsilon = 0.5$), OTTO performs better in medium-replay dataset. When the perturbation is small, we found a better performance in expert dataset. Ideally, a larger perturbation range leads to a broader generalization. However, this will also lead to more inaccurate estimations. We calculate the average L1 loss of next state estimation and reward estimation for each interaction step as shown in Figure 6. We can see that in expert dataset, either reward L1 loss or next state L1 loss is relatively high when $\epsilon = 0.5$ compared to $\epsilon = 0.02$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$. While in medium-replay dataset, there is no significant difference in both reward L1 loss and next state L1 loss between three values of ϵ . This suggests that we should choose the appropriate value of ϵ based on the specific dataset.




Figure 6. The average L1 loss of next state estimation and reward estimation. We do experiments on walker2d-expert and walker2d-medium-replay dataset and use the BeamSearch strategy.

C. Hyperparameters

In this section, we discuss the hyperparameters that we use for OTTO. Similar to Chen et al. (2021), the World Transformers is based on the implementation of GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019). Table 6 lists the hyperparameters we use to train the World Transformers. We use the same hyperparameters for both the State Transformer and Reward Transformer.

We now list the additional hyperparameters of trajectory generation as follows.

- **Trajectory length h .** Unlike existing model-based offline RL only perform short-horizon rollouts with $h \leq 5$, OTTO performs long-horizon trajectories with $h = 50$. However, we found when l is too large, it will also lead to inaccurate estimation.
- **Augmentation ratio δ .** For DT, we simply choose $\delta = 0.1$ in medium, medium-expert and expert dataset, as we didn't find significant improvement when δ increases. We find the total timesteps in medium-replay dataset are relatively low, so we choose $\delta = 0.25$ to augment more trajectories. We find δ is sensitive to other offline RL methods which are based on restricting the learning policy such as CQL and BCQ. When the δ is too large, these methods have either poor performance or large variance. Therefore, we choose $\delta \in \{0.05, 0.1\}$ to avoid too much noise.
- **Range of noise ϵ .** We select ϵ from the set $\{0.02, 0.1, 0.5\}$, which correspond to low perturbation range, medium perturbation range and high perturbation range. In the D4RL experiments, we found that $\epsilon = 0.02$ works well for the

Table 6. Hyperparameters of World Transformers.

Hyperparameter	Value
Number of layers	3
Number of attention heads	1
Embedding dimension	128
Activation function	ReLU
Batch size	64
L_s, L_r (interaction steps of input)	20
Dropout	0.1
Learning rate	10^{-4}
Grad norm clip	0.25
Weight decay	10^{-4}
Learning rate decay	Linear warmup for first 10^5 training steps
gradient steps	5×10^5

medium and expert dataset, which have narrow state-action distributions. And we choose $\epsilon = 0.1$ for medium-expert dataset and $\epsilon = 0.5$ for medium-replay dataset, which is collected by a wide range of policies.

- **BeamSearch width B .** We simply choose $B = 10$ for all settings. This takes into account both the efficiency of generating trajectories and the high qualification of generated trajectories.