

Modified Double DQN: addressing stability

Shervin Halat
Computer Engineering
Department
Amirkabir University of
Technology
Tehran, Iran
shervin.halat@aut.ac.ir

Mohammad Mehdi Ebadzadeh
Computer Engineering
Department
Amirkabir University of
Technology
Tehran, Iran
ebadzadeh@aut.ac.ir

Abstract—Inspired by double q learning algorithm, the double DQN algorithm was originally proposed in order to address the overestimation issue in the original DQN algorithm. The double DQN has successfully shown both theoretically and empirically the importance of decoupling in terms of action evaluation and selection in computation of targets values; although, all the benefits were acquired with only a simple adaption to DQN algorithm, minimal possible change as it was mentioned by the authors. Nevertheless, there seems a roll-back in the proposed algorithm of Double-DQN since the parameters of policy network are emerged again in the target value function which were initially withdrawn by DQN with the hope of tackling the serious issue of moving targets and the instability caused by it (i.e., by moving targets) in the process of learning. Therefore, in this paper three modifications to the Double-DQN algorithm are proposed with the hope of maintaining the performance in the terms of both stability and overestimation. These modifications are focused on the logic of decoupling the best action selection and evaluation in the target value function and the logic of tackling the moving targets issue. Each of these modifications have their own pros and cons compared to the others. The mentioned pros and cons mainly refer to the execution time required for the corresponding algorithm and the stability provided by the corresponding algorithm. Also, in terms of overestimation, none of the modifications seem to underperform compared to the original Double-DQN if not overperform it. With the intention of evaluating the efficacy of the proposed modifications, multiple empirical experiments along with theoretical experiments were conducted. The results obtained are represented and discussed in this article.

Keywords— *Stability, Overestimation, Deep Reinforcement Learning, DQN, Double Q-learning, Double-DQN*

I. INTRODUCTION

The goal of reinforcement learning (Sutton and Barto, 1998) is to learn good policies for sequential decision problems, by optimizing a cumulative future reward signal [1]. Q-learning is a popular reinforcement learning algorithm that was proposed by Watkins and can be used to optimally solve Markov Decision Processes [2] but it was shown that Q-learning’s performance can be poor in stochastic MDPs because of large overestimations of the action values due to including maximization step over estimated action values, which tends to prefer overestimated to underestimated values [1, 2]. In an early revision to Q-learning algorithm, overestimations had been attributed to insufficiently flexible function approximation (Thrun and Schwartz, 1993) and noise (van Hasselt, 2010, 2011) [1]. Therefore, an implementation of deep neural networks emerged as a

modification to traditional Q-learning algorithm, namely Deep Q-learning with the formula below:

$$Y_t^Q \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q \left(S_{t+1} \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_t); \theta_t \right) \quad (1)$$

Also, in another revision to Q-learning algorithm (Double Q-learning), it is argued that these overestimations result from a positive bias that is introduced because Q-learning uses the maximum action value as an approximation for the maximum expected action value [2]; then, the mentioned argument resulted in the introduction of famous Double Q-learning algorithm in which the two process of action selection and action evaluation of target value function became decoupled thanks to the employment of two sets of value functions or in other words two sets of weights. Double-DQN formula is then:

$$Y_t^{DoubleQ} \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q \left(S_{t+1} \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_t); \theta'_t \right) \quad (2)$$

Hence, merging the two ideas mentioned above (i.e., DQN and Double Q-learning), a more stable algorithm, Double-DQN, was introduced mainly with the aim of reducing the overestimation.

The main idea of Double-DQN, inspired by Double Q-learning, is to reduce overestimations by decomposing the max operation in the target into action selection and action evaluation; but in contrast to Double Q-learning, minimal possible changes to DQN towards Double Q-learning were considered both to keep DQN algorithm intact as much as possible in addition to not imposing additional computational overhead. Therefore, although, not fully decoupled, the target network in the DQN architecture provides a natural candidate for the second value function, without having to introduce additional networks. Therefore, it is proposed to evaluate the greedy policy according to the online network, but using the target network to estimate its value. In reference to both Double Q-learning and DQN, the resulting algorithm is referred as Double-DQN. The update process of Double-DQN is the same as for DQN, but replacing the target of DQN with the following:

$$Y_t^{DoubleQ} \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q \left(S_{t+1} \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_t); \theta'_t \right) \quad (3)$$

In comparison to Double Q-learning, the weights of the second network θ'_t are replaced with the weights of the target network θ^-_t for the evaluation of the current greedy policy. The update to the target network stays unchanged from DQN, and remains a periodic copy of the online network [1].

However, in the proposed formula of target values in Double-DQN, the parameters θ_t of online function (i.e., policy network in the case of Double-DQN) once again emerged which was previously withdrawn in the DQN algorithm with the logic of addressing the moving targets issue in the leaning process of neural networks which resulted in the introduction of target networks in conjunction with online networks. But, in this paper it is shown how a slight change in the function of action selection may change the obtained target value which on the other hand results in moving targets. Therefore, in this paper, considering what mentioned above, some possible modifications in span of the related papers of Double-DQN, DQN and Double Q-learning are proposed for the first time in the literature of deep reinforcement learning(DRL).

A. motivation

The blossom of powerful GPUs in recent years along with the moving targets issue mentioned above, also considering the argument of ‘minimal possible changes for handling computational overhead’ which was offered by Double-DQN paper, motivated us into employment of multiple trainable functions (i.e., networks in our case) similar to Double Q-learning and a copy of them every specific steps similar to DQN.

Moreover, stability is a central concern in control and stability in RL has largely remained an open question [4] also, stability is considered the key to achievement in reinforcement learning in general. Although, DQN and Double-DQN has improved stability by the employment of target network, replay memory and decoupling of action selection and evaluation (Exclusively in Double-DQN), but still any update into policy network could alter the target value due to the fact that still action selection is based on policy network; therefore, action value distribution still may be changed with every update. After all, any effort in improving in stability is of high value.

As an empirical example of mentioned instability, which occurs in mentioned algorithms of DQN and Double-DQN (although remarkably to a lesser extent in the latter one), is that in many games such as ‘Moon Lander’ or ‘Cart Pole’ it is a common phenomenon to repeatedly observe that the moving average score (over the last 100 episodes) with a nice continuous upward trend in is followed by a downward trend; considering this instability, it seems that the agent all of a sudden triggers to forget what it has been learnt up until that time no matter which hyperparameters chosen or how long the agent is learning. Using a more stable target function may be one way of combating this issue, an idea which was led to the contributions of this paper.

Therefore, in this paper some modifications to Double-DQN target value function are introduced. In the following, general descriptions of modifications mentioned above are provided and they will be evaluated more in depth in the next sections.

Two modifications, namely SD-DQN and FD-DQN are proposed each with two and three trainable networks

respectively. The first one (SD-DQN) can be viewed as a deep implementation of Double Q-learning algorithm only with two policy networks and their corresponding target networks for both calculation of target values besides decoupling action selection and evaluation. The second one (FD-DQN) can be viewed as a slightly more complex update to Double Q-learning which employs three policy networks and their corresponding target networks, again, for both calculation of target values and decoupling of action selection and evaluation just similar to SD-DQN with the aim of almost fully decouple the target and policy functions compared to SD-DQN which semi-decouples the mentioned functions.

Also, another modification, namely TDQN is proposed which not only has one trainable network but is expected to attenuate the moving target issues in Double-DQN by offering two target networks (one for action selection and the other for action evaluation) the weights of which are copied from policy network consecutively within a specified episode interval.

B. Terms’ Definition

To make this paper easy to read, In the following, the definition of commonly used abbreviations of this paper are provided here:

(More in-depth descriptions are brought in section 3)

- **Primary Target Network:** Here, Primary target network is the target network which was originally introduced by DQN but only with the role of ‘Q-value evaluation of best action selected’ just similar to the target network implemented in target value function of Double-DQN; the role of ‘best action selection’ is leaved to another target network, namely ‘secondary target network’.
- **Secondary Target Network:** Secondary target network, is the target network which is introduced for ‘best action selection’ in target value function. In contrast to the process of ‘best action selection’ of Double-DQN, in newly introduced models, the ‘best action selection’ is leaved to another target network, namely, secondary target network.
- **Mutual Target Network:** The joint existence of primary and secondary target network together is called mutual target network. Therefore, the role of mutual target network is to first select the best action by primary target network, then, evaluate the corresponding Q-value by the secondary target network.
- **DDQN:** DDQN stands for Double-DQN which is previously known.
- **TDQN (Triple Deep Q-network):** TDQN stands for Triple-DQN which is named after Double-DQN since




Fig. 1. Function Approximation Experiment

there are overall networks, one trainable policy network plus two untrainable target networks.

- **SD-DQN (Semi-Decoupled Deep Q-network):** SD-DQN stands for semi-decoupled DQN, since, although, not fully decoupled, two trainable separate policy networks are deployed as value functions exactly the same as Double Q-learning value functions but in deep neural network scope.
- **FD-DQN (Fully-Decoupled Deep Q-network):** FD-DQN stands for fully-decoupled DQN, since by deployment of three trainable separate policy networks a more decoupled model is introduced.

A more detailed and in-depth descriptions along with the corresponding training process of each newly introduced schemas are brought in sections 3 and 4.

C. Paper's Structure

- (Section 2): A theoretic evaluation of Mutual target network schema's effect on learning process will be demonstrated similar to theoretic evaluation of Double-DQN paper on overestimation.
- (Section 3): Formulations of different newly introduced schema are shown in section 3.
- (Section 4): In section 4, the obtained results of conducted experiments will be illustrated.
- (Section 5): lastly, in section 5, conclusions are discussed and possible future works are recommended.

II. THEORETICAL BASIS OF INTRODUCED SCHEMAS

In this section, theoretical evaluations are carried out to further validate what has been explained so far. These evaluations are visually illustrated for a better insight into conclusions obtained. The evaluation is exactly similar to the description of the DDQN experiment of 'illustration of overestimation during learning' with the following details.

A real-valued continuous state space with 10 discrete actions in each state is considered. For simplicity, the true optimal action values depend only on state so that in each state all actions have the same true value. These true values are shown in the left column of plots in Figure 1 (purple lines) and are defined as

TABLE I. SUM OF SQUARED ERRORS

Function	$\sin(s) / 6\text{-D}$	$2e^{-x^2} / 6\text{-D}$	$2e^{-x^2} / 9\text{-D}$
SSE	6.55	16.30	1.34

either $Q_*(s, a) = \sin(s)$ (top row) or $Q_*(s, a) = 2 \exp(-s^2)$ (middle and bottom rows). The left plots also show an approximation for a single action (green lines) as a function of state as well as the samples the estimate is based on (green dots). The estimate is a d -degree polynomial that is fit to the true values at sampled states, where $d = 6$ (top and middle rows) or $d = 9$ (bottom row). The samples match the true function exactly. There is no noise and we assume we have ground truth for the action value on these sampled states. The approximation is inexact even on the sampled states for the top two rows because the function approximation is insufficiently flexible. In the bottom row, the function is flexible enough to fit the green dots, but this reduces the accuracy in unsampled states. Notice that the sampled states are spaced further apart near the left side of the left plots, resulting in larger estimation errors. In many ways this is a typical learning setting, where at each point in time we only have limited data. The middle column of plots in Figure 1 shows estimated action value functions for all 10 actions (green lines), as functions of state, along with the maximum action value in each state (black dashed line). Although the true value function is the same for all actions, the approximations differ because we have supplied different sets of sampled states. The maximum is often higher than the ground truth shown in purple on the left. This is confirmed in the right plots, which shows the difference between the black and purple curves in orange. The orange line is almost always positive, indicating an upward bias. The right plots also show the estimates from Double Q-learning in blue, which are on average much closer to zero. This demonstrates that Double-Q learning indeed can successfully reduce the overoptimism of Q-learning. The different rows in Figure 1 show variations of the same experiment. The difference between the top and middle rows is the true value function, demonstrating that overestimations are not an artifact of a specific true value function. The difference between the middle and bottom rows is the flexibility of the function approximation. In the left- middle plot, the estimates are even incorrect for some of the sampled states because the function is insufficiently flexible. The function in the bottom left plot is more flexible but this causes higher estimation errors for unseen states, resulting in higher overestimations. This is important because flexible parametric function approximators are often employed in reinforcement learning.

Now, to show how exact the functions and details are implemented, the generated plots with the mentioned settings are illustrated in Fig. 1. The sum of squared errors of the third columns for Double-Q estimates (blue lines) are depicted in Table I. As it can be figured out from the Fig. 1, the generated figures are exactly the same as the one in Double-DQN paper. Now, we focus on our own conducted experiment.




Fig. 2. Moving Targets of $\sin(x)$ with 6-D Polynomial




Fig. 3. Moving Targets of $2 \cdot \exp(-x^2)$ with 6-D Polynomial

A. Mutual target network schema’s Effect on Learning Process

Aside from benefits of decoupling logic, the most significant feature in common, and probably the most important contribution of this paper, among introduced schemas is the defined secondary target network to address the moving targets issue.

In this subsection we are to evaluate how each update of policy network may result in alteration of target value function in DDQN algorithm and, qualitatively, how much this moving target may affect the final performance of the algorithm. To do so, similar to the DDQN experiment of ‘illustration of overestimation during learning’, the following experiment with slight changes was performed.

In this experiment the double estimators are employed for action selection and the primary estimators for action value evaluation (Hence, the primary estimator is kept unchanged during experiments). Therefore, double estimators are a representative of policy network in real world problems.

Then, to show how change in double estimators (one step update in policy network in real world) due to an update may affect the final results. Specifically, this effect is compared with error obtained for Double-Q estimate of the main experiment of Double-DQN paper (Illustration of overestimations during learning) to show how much these updates may alter the error from optimal (original) functions.

Also, in order to evaluate how complexity of the environment and function estimators may affect the outcome of this experiment, all the three settings of the original experiment of Double-DQN paper were considered. The outcomes of conducted experiments are illustrated in the Fig. 2, 3, 4.

As it can be figured out from each of the figures below, as indexes of ‘i’ and ‘j’ become more distant, the corresponding squared error of $\{MaxQ(i) - MaxQ(j)\}$ almost becomes greater although all the approximated functions are rather similar to their corresponding original function (i.e., $\sin(x)$ in Fig. 2 and $2e^{-x^2}$ in Fig. 3 and 4). Note that the only difference between $MaxQ(i)$ s are in their action selection function of within the target value function. Now, what is critical here is that with even slight changes in the distribution of action selection function, in most cases, the obtained errors are approximately multiple times of their corresponding error of $\{MaxQ * -$

$MaxQ(i)\}$. For example, in Fig. 2, the $\{MaxQ(i) - MaxQ(j)\}$ for $i = 5$ and $j = 2$ is equal to 122.9, whereas, the function approximation error in this case (i.e., $\{MaxQ * -MaxQ(i)\}$ for $i = 5$) is about 6.5. As another example for Fig. 2 is that even in the lowest error of 2.65 (which is for $i = 5$ and $j = 4$) this error is about 30 percent of the function approximation error of 6.5. Although the latter example isn’t critical but still may affect the function approximation error to some extent.

Now considering figure 3, as we can see, except for the first plot (i.e., $i = 5$ and $j = 0$) the squared error of most of the plots doesn’t seem critical compared to the corresponding function approximation error of 16.2. This was expected since the distribution of different action value estimators for this setting doesn’t differ from each other as it is illustrated in Fig. 1 second row of middle column as against the distributions of two other settings (figure 1, first and third rows of middle column).

Lastly, considering the Fig. 4, here comes the most critical part of the experiment since this figure represents the most flexible function approximator which is more similar to neural networks in the sense of flexibility. As we can see, in Fig. 4, slight alterations in action selection estimators may result in extremely high squared errors (just note the errors obtained in first and second plots of Fig. 4). Hence, by comparison, we may conclude that the issue of moving targets is case sensitive and may vary depending on different environments).

In summary, we have shown that how even slight changes or any update in action selection estimators may, on the other hand, result in dramatically high target value changes which lastly may result in moving targets issue in real world settings especially in neural networks in our case. Therefore, addressing this issue seems of high value.

III. FORMULATION OF DIFFERENT SCHEMAS

In the following, newly introduced schemas’ formulations along with their corresponding descriptions and learning process is discussed.

A. TDQN

TDQN in an update to Double-DQN with only one simple modification. This modification is deployment of secondary target network along with the primal target network. The secondary target network is a copy of policy network after each




Fig. 4. Moving Targets of $2.exp(-x^2)$ with 9-D Polynomial

'N/2' episodes (or steps in general) if 'N' is number of episodes after which weights of policy network are copied to primal target network. This way we expect to further address the moving targets issue and therefore, reach to a more stable model. The process of learning of TDQN is exactly the same as DDQN except that the best action to select is obtained from the secondary target network (i.e., $Q_{\theta'}$).

$$Y_t^{TDQN} \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_t''), \theta_t' \right) \quad (4)$$

B. SD-DQN

Pushing DDQN further towards Double-Q learning model then combining it with TDQN model, in this formulation, two networks (i.e., two sets of weights) are trained as Q-value approximators. Also, each of these networks has their corresponding primary target network. Hence, overall, there are two primary target networks along with two policy networks. The logic behind this formulation is to combine the benefits of all mentioned settings so far; that is, SD-DQN not only benefits from double value functions to overcome overestimations, but it also benefits from target network introduced by DQN besides decoupling logic of Double-DQN and moreover it also takes advantage of TDQN by deployment of primary target network. Therefore, by this setting we expect further stabilization of the model.

The process of learning is exactly similar to Double-Q learning since in SD-DQN both functions are updated symmetrically by randomly assigning each experience from replay buffer to each of the functions.

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^1 \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q_2 \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q_1(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_{t_1}', \theta_{t_2}') \right) \\ Y_t^2 \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q_1 \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q_2(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_{t_2}', \theta_{t_1}') \right) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

C. FD-DQN

FD-DQN is actually a revision to SD-DQN where it is further decoupled. Although it is named 'Fully Decoupled-DQN' it has actually not been fully decoupled which may be inferred by




Fig. 6. Cartpole with Convolutional Layers with 1500 #Episodes




Fig. 7. Cartpole with Convolutional Layers with 2000 #Episodes

substituting each value function estimator in other value function estimator.

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^1 \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q_2 \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q_3(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_{t_3}', \theta_{t_2}') \right) \\ Y_t^2 \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q_3 \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q_1(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_{t_1}', \theta_{t_3}') \right) \\ Y_t^3 \equiv R_{t+1} + \gamma Q_1 \left(S_{t+1}, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q_2(S_{t+1}, a; \theta_{t_2}', \theta_{t_1}') \right) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The process of learning in FD-DQN is exactly the same as SD-DQN except for three value function estimators.

IV. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

In this section we are to evaluate performance of each introduced schema in practice. To do so, two different environments of OpenAI Gym were selected, 'CartPole_v0' game from the classic control environment and 'Pong_v4' game from Atari environment.

The goal of these experiments was not to solve games or fine-tune hyperparameters of any of the introduced schemas for the mentioned games but to evaluate the performance of each proposed schema and specifically seeking any improvements in stability especially for a sensible number of episodes. These performances were compared to Double-DQN performance. It should be noted that utilized hyperparameters were fine-tuned for Double-DQN; in this case introduced schemas were not necessarily expected to outperform Double-DQN but we were to seek if stability was improved in the process of learning. The




Fig. 8. Pong with Convolutional Layers with 500 #Episodes

utilized hyperparameter were selected from [5] for 'Cartpole' and [6] for 'Pong'.

For the 'Cartpole' two set of settings were considered. The first setting was with employment of neural network with three linear layers followed by 'ReLU' activation functions. The second setting was employment of deep neural network with three convolutional layers with 'ReLU' activation functions followed by two linear layers. The second setting is actually the setting previously offered by Double-DQN paper. Lastly, for the 'Pong' game only one setting which is exactly similar to the second setting of 'Cartpole' was considered. Before diving into the obtained outcomes, it should be noted that these experiments were conducted under extremely limited hardware resources.

In the following, for each part, obtained outcomes are illustrated (it should be noted that these outcomes are the most intuitive outcomes obtained among multiple runs). All figures below include outcomes of all schemes' outputs except figure 8 which the outcomes for FD-DQN models are missing which is discussed in its own part.

A. 'CartPole' with Linear Layers

In this type of experiment DDQN seemed that has outperformed other models in terms of both stability and final results in all runs which is a disappointing result so far. A sample of runs are shown in Fig. 5. affiliation.

B. 'CartPole' with Convolutional Layers

The most optimistic conducted experiments belong to this part in both 1500 and 2000 episodes. In almost all runs of the setting of 'Cartpole with convolutional layers'. Results are shown in Fig. 6 and 7.

C. 'Pong' with Convolutional Layers

Here, in the game of 'Pong', surprisingly, both 'SD-DQN' and 'FD-DQN' appeared frustrating and completely random without signs of learning, although, high chances are that this phenomenon may be due to a hidden bug in the process of implementations which requires more time and effort to tackle. Looking on the bright side though, TDQN has outperformed DDQN in both stability besides final results in two consecutive runs. As it can be figured out in the Fig. 8, TDQN has a much more stable upward trend as against DDQN.

In summary, it may be inferred that in almost each of the conducted experiments, at least one of the introduced schemas

have illustrated more stability in the process of learning compared to DDQN. For example, TDQN had much more stability in the 'Pong' game (especially, with much lower execution time as show on the title of figure 8) and SD_DQN or FD-DQN had more stability in the 'Cartpole' game with convolutional setting. More importantly, all these outcomes were based on hyperparameters which were fine-tuned for Double-DQN. After all, these findings are consistent with the theoretical experiments of section 2.

CONCLUSION

This paper has three main contributions. First, we both discussed and illustrated theoretically that how action selection based on an online network (i.e., policy network) may result in moving targets issues and how sensitive and critical it may be depending on different environments and settings. Second, we have introduced three schemas with a few modifications to the existing algorithms to further tackle the instability challenge which exists in both Double-DQN and DQN algorithms. Third, we have shown that even with hyperparameters which were fine-tuned for Double-DQN algorithm, in most of the conducted experiments, at least one the newly introduced models outperformed Double-DQN especially in stability which was the main goal of this paper. Finally, in order to further research in the scope of this paper, one may evaluate the efficacy of averaging, minimizing or maximizing over all learned policy networks (particularly, in schemas with more than one policy network) in order to overcome possible overestimations or underestimations occurred in introduced schemas. This provides more flexibility when encountering different environments. Another future direction may be the evaluation of taking the best action proposed from a randomly selected policy network instead of epsilon-greedy algorithm, this way chances there are that epsilon-greedy will not be needed any more since for example the two policy networks initially (at initial episodes or steps) are neither the same nor optimal and may provide exploration in a more efficient and sensible way in contrast to the latest episodes which provide exploitation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hasselt, H. V., A. Guez and D. Silver. "Deep Reinforcement Learning with Double Q-Learning." AAAI, 2016.
- [2] Hasselt, H. V.. "Double Q-learning." NIPS, 2010.
- [3] Mnih, V., K. Kavukcuoglu, D. Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, J. Veness, Marc G. Bellemare, A. Graves, Martin A. Riedmiller, A. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen, Charlie Beattie, A. Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, D. Kumaran, Daan Wierstra, S. Legg and D. Hassabis. "Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning." Nature 518 (2015): 529-533.
- [4] L. Buşoniu, T. de Bruin, D. Tolić, J. Kober and I. Palunco, "Reinforcement learning for control: Performance, stability, and deep approximators", 2018.

[5] "DDQN Hyperparameter Tuning Using Open AI Gym Cartpole". 2021. ADG Efficiency. <https://adgefficiency.com/dqn-tuning/>.

[6] "Github - Jmichaux/Dqn-Pytorch: DQN To Play Atari Pong". 2021. Github. <https://github.com/jmichaux/dqn-pytorch>.