

# ENTROPY: Environment Transformer and Offline Policy Optimization

Pengqin Wang<sup>1</sup>, Meixin Zhu<sup>2,†</sup> and Shaojie Shen<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—Model-based reinforcement learning (RL), which aims to learn the environment dynamics from interaction experience and perform policy optimization based on the learned model, has provided an effective approach for offline RL. However, previous model-based offline RL methods suffer from lacking long-duration prediction ability, which results in significant inaccuracy when generating multiple step trajectories. We overcome this barrier by developing a sequence modeling architecture, Environment Transformer, which is able to generate reliable long-horizon trajectories based on the offline dataset. Based on above, We propose a new model-based offline RL algorithm, ENTROPY, which learns the dynamics model and reward function by Environment Transformer and performs Offline Policy optimization. We evaluate the proposed algorithm on MuJoCo continuous control RL environments. Results present that ENTROPY performs comparably or better than the state-of-the-art both model-based and model-free offline RL methods and demonstrates stronger long-term prediction capacity than previous model-based offline methods.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Offline reinforcement learning (RL) aims to solve the problem of learning a policy completely from a fixed batch of data without interactions with the environment [1] [2]. This provides an appealing paradigm for a wide range of applications such as autonomous driving and robotic tasks [3] [4] [5] [6], where the data collection in real world is expensive and risky. Recent studies have shown that model-based RL, which learns the dynamics model from the batch of data and performs policy optimization based on the learned model, demonstrates better generalization to deal with offline RL tasks [21] [22]. Previous model-based offline RL algorithms adopt actor-critic framework in which the value function is learned based on origin dataset and generated trajectories by the predictive model. Though they perform well when dealing with simulating short-term rollouts, significant inaccuracy appears when constructing multiple step trajectories. In brief, these approaches suffer from lacking the capacity for long-term prediction.

In order to overcome the above issues, we consider learning dynamics model and reward function as a sequence modeling task. In this work, we develop Environment Transformer, a sequence-to-sequence architecture that is able to predict the probability distribution of future state and reward based on a sequence of historical states and actions. Furthermore, we propose a new model-based offline RL algorithm ENTROPY, which learns the dynamics model and




Fig. 1: The framework of proposed ENTROPY algorithm, which learns the dynamics model and reward function from an offline dataset via Environment Transformer and performs offline policy optimization.

reward function by Environment Transformer and performs offline policy optimization, as shown in Fig. 1. The algorithm mainly consists of environment sequence modeling module and policy optimization module. At the beginning of environment sequence modeling, the initial batch states are sampled from the offline dataset according to state probability distribution, and the initial batch actions are selected by policy search. Later on, Environment Transformer is adopted to autoregressively generate reliable long-duration rollouts using a causal self-attention mask [24] [25]. Finally, Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) algorithm [29] is performed for policy optimization module.

We compare the proposed algorithm with the state-of-the-art both model-based and model-free offline RL methods on MuJoCo continuous control RL environments [30] [31]. Results present that our proposed method achieves comparable or better performance in most scenarios. Moreover, benchmark experiments show that our algorithm demonstrates strong long-term prediction capacity greater than previous model-based offline algorithms. We summarize the contributions of this paper as follows.

<sup>1</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China (email: pwangas@connect.ust.hk; eeshaojie@ust.hk).

<sup>2</sup>The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou), Guangzhou, China (email: meixin@ust.hk).

† Corresponding author

- A sequence modeling architecture Environment Transformer is proposed, which is able to generate reliable long-horizon trajectories based on the offline dataset.
- We propose a new model-based offline RL algorithm ENTROPY, which learns the dynamics model and reward function by Environment Transformer and performs offline policy optimization.
- Algorithm performance is evaluated on MuJoCo RL environments and compared with the state-of-the-art both model-based and model-free offline RL methods.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Offline RL

The research of Offline RL addresses the challenge to learn a policy from a fixed dataset instead of interaction with the environment. The major issue of Offline RL is extrapolation error [1], which is generalization error in estimation value function caused by out-of-distribution actions. One potential approach to solve this problem is to integrate a pessimistic bias for unseen actions into the Q-function. Kumar et al. [7] propose to learn a conservative Q-function such that the expected value of a policy under the Q-function lower-bounds its true value. Kostrikov et al. [13] treat the state value function as a random variable whose randomness is determined by the action, and use the upper expectile to estimate the value of the best actions. The alternative approach is to restrict the policy optimization to remain close to origin data samples. Wang et al. [8] utilize a form of critic-regularized regression to learn policies from data. Nair et al. [9] combine sample efficient dynamic programming with maximum likelihood policy updates. Wu et al. [11] propose a framework to generalize previous approaches to solve the offline RL problem by regularizing to the behavior policy. Zhou et al. [12] propose to learn the policy in the latent action space, which constrains the policy to select actions within the support of the dataset. Xu et al. [14] construct a novel offline-applicable policy learning goal that corresponds to the advantage function value of the behavior policy, multiplying by a statemarginal density ratio. Fujimoto et al. [15] include a behavior cloning component in the policy update of an online RL algorithm and normalize the data to push the policy towards favoring actions in dataset.

### B. Dynamics Modeling

There exist wealth of prior work to learn the environment dynamics. Sutton [16] proposes an architecture which maintains a dynamics model of the the agent’s actions effects. Deisenroth et al. [17] model the environment dynamics as Gaussian processes and incorporate model uncertainty into long-term planning. Levine et al. [18] leverage local linear models to represent the environment dynamics. Chua et al. [19] integrate deep network dynamics models that account for uncertainty with sampling-based uncertainty propagation. Janner et al. [20] [21] use bootstrap ensembles of predictive models, which is able to capture aleatoric uncertainty and epistemic uncertainty.

Recent breakthroughs in sequence modeling using deep neural network have resulted in fast improvements in long-horizon prediction accuracy and model efficiency [23] [24] [25]. Chen et al. [26] [27] consider RL to be a sequence modeling problem, which aims to generate a series of actions to receive high rewards. In our approach, the environment modeling problem is viewed as a sequence modeling task, which is required to predict the probability distribution of future state and reward based on a sequence of historical states and actions.

## III. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Policy Optimization

The goal of standard reinforcement learning is to obtain the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  such that the cumulative reward is maximized and the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  can be written as:

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} r(s_t, a_t) \right]. \quad (1)$$

In maximum entropy reinforcement learning, the expected entropy term is augmented [28], which helps the agents explore more widely and give up on clearly unpromising avenues. In this case the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  with parameter  $\alpha$  that determines the relative importance of the expected entropy term can be written as:

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [r(s_t, a_t) + \alpha \mathcal{H}(\pi(\cdot | s_t))] \right]. \quad (2)$$

We adopt soft-actor critic (SAC) [29] as our policy optimization algorithm, which demonstrates impressive performance for continuous tasks. In policy improvement step, the policy parameters can be directly updated by minimizing the following:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\pi}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{s_t \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ D_{KL} \left( \pi_{\phi}(\cdot | s_t) \left\| \frac{\exp(Q_{\theta}(s_t, \cdot))}{Z_{\theta}(s_t)} \right\| \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\phi$  represents parameters of policy network  $\pi_{\phi}(a_t | s_t)$  and  $\theta$  are parameters of soft Q-function  $Q_{\theta}(s_t, a_t)$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  is the distribution of states and actions sampled from interaction experience, and  $Z_{\theta}(s_t)$  is the partition function that normalizes the distribution.

For our offline scenario,  $\mathcal{D}$  is the distribution of the origin offline dataset combined with a replay buffer which contains simulated trajectories generated by the learned model.

Finally, actions  $a_t$  are generated by reparameterizing the policy using noise vector  $\epsilon_t$ :

$$a_t = f_{\phi}(\epsilon_t; s_t). \quad (4)$$




Fig. 2: The framework of proposed sequence modeling architecture, Environment Transformer, which is able to generate reliable long-horizon states and rewards prediction based on historical states and actions.

### B. Transformer

Transformers are proposed by [24] as a framework for effectively modeling sequential data, which consist of stacked encoders and decoders. Both of them are based on attention mechanisms, where the  $i$ -th input token  $x_i$  is embedded and mapped to key  $k_i$ , query  $q_i$  and value  $v_i$ , and the  $i$ -th output token can be represented as:

$$z_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \text{softmax} \left( \left\{ \langle q_i, k_{j'} \rangle \right\}_{j'=1}^n \right)_j \cdot v_j. \quad (5)$$

Generative pre-training transformer (GPT) is proposed by [25], where the encoder-decoder architecture is changed to a causal self-attention mask without any encoders. In our paper, we adopt GPT framework and develop Environment Transformer to obtain accurate long-horizon environment dynamics and rewards prediction.

## IV. ENVIRONMENT TRANSFORMER

In this section, we introduce Environment Transformer, which is able to learn the dynamics model and reward function from the offline dataset and generate reliable long-horizon prediction. We present the environment modeling, training process and usage.

### A. Environment Modeling

We consider the environment dynamics as a Gaussian process with diagonal covariance where the future states and rewards depend on historical states and actions:

$$Pr(s_{t+1}, r_t | s_{\leq t}, a_{\leq t}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu(s_{\leq t}, a_{\leq t}), \Sigma(s_{\leq t}, a_{\leq t})), \quad (6)$$

where  $s_{\leq t}$  and  $a_{\leq t}$  denote historical states and actions at timestep  $t$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  represent the mean and covariance of the Gaussian distribution for future state and reward at timestep  $t$ , respectively.

### B. Training

In training module, the inputs are state action pairs of trajectories from the offline dataset containing  $N$  trajectories. The  $i$ -th trajectory training input  $\tau_i$  can be represented as:

$$\tau_i = \left\{ (s_t^i, a_t^i) \right\}_{t=0}^{T-1}, \quad (7)$$

where  $t$  denotes the timestep of state action pairs,  $i$  is training trajectory index and  $T$  is prediction rollout length.

As shown in Fig. 2, the state action tokens are fed into linear embeddings added with a time encoding which contains the token positional information. Then these tokens are fed into Environment Transformer to predict the probability distribution of future states and rewards using a causal self-attention mask. After linear projection, the output of Environment Transformer  $f_i$  can be written as:

$$f_i = \left\{ \left( \hat{\mu}(s_{\leq t}^i, a_{\leq t}^i), \hat{\Sigma}(s_{\leq t}^i, a_{\leq t}^i) \right) \right\}_{t=0}^{T-1}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\hat{\mu}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  represent the mean and covariance of the Gaussian distribution for predicted future state and reward at timestep  $t$ , respectively.

Finally, we obtain predicted states and rewards of  $i$ -th trajectory  $\phi_i$  by probabilistic sampling from the Gaussian distribution built in (6), which can be represented as:

$$\phi_i = \left\{ (\hat{s}_{t+1}^i, \hat{r}_t^i) \right\}_{t=0}^{T-1}. \quad (9)$$

### C. Usage

When the training process is finished, the Environment Transformer can be used to generate reliable long-duration trajectories which will be applied in policy optimization module. We take the generation of single trajectory as an example to illustrate how Environment Transformer simulates long-horizon trajectories.

At the beginning, an empty model replay buffer is created to save simulated experience data. The initial state  $s_0$  is selected from the offline dataset while action  $a_0$  is generated by actor policy search. After that the initial state action pair  $(s_0, a_0)$  is fed into Environment Transformer to predict  $(\hat{s}_1, \hat{r}_0)$ . The simulated interaction experience data  $(s_0, a_0, \hat{s}_1, \hat{r}_0)$  will be retained in the model replay buffer. Same as above, the action  $a_1$  is generated by actor policy search and the state action pair  $(\hat{s}_1, a_1)$  is fed into Environment Transformer to predict  $(\hat{s}_2, \hat{r}_1)$ . Then  $(\hat{s}_1, a_1, \hat{s}_2, \hat{r}_1)$  will be retained in the model replay buffer. We finally obtain a  $T$ -length simulated trajectory after repeating above steps  $T$  times. When performing policy optimization, we sample 5% trajectories from the origin offline dataset while 95% from the model replay buffer.




Fig. 3: The MuJoCo continuous control environments, including two-dimensional robot HalfCheetah, one-legged figure Hopper and two-legged figure Walker2d.

## V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we design our experiments on MuJoCo continuous control RL environments, which aims to: (1) evaluate the algorithm long-term prediction ability compared with the state-of-the-art model-based offline RL method and (2) evaluate the algorithm performance compared with the state-of-the-art model-free and model-based offline RL methods.

### A. Environments and datasets

Fig. 3 presents MuJoCo continuous control environments, including HalfCheetah, Hopper and Walker2d. The HalfCheetah is a two-dimensional robot with nine links and eight joints. The objective is to apply torque to the joints so that the cheetah can run forward as quickly as possible [32]. The hopper is a one-legged, two-dimensional figure with four major body sections. The goal is to make forward-moving jumps by applying torques to the three hinges connecting the four body sections [33]. The Walker is a two-dimensional figure with two legs and four major body sections. Similarly, the objective is to control the forward movement by applying torques to the corresponding hinges [33].

We select four kinds of datasets as the offline dataset for each environment, involving random datasets, medium datasets, medium-replay datasets and full-replay datasets. The random datasets are generated by a random policy. The medium datasets are generated by a “medium” policy trained by SAC, which reaches approximately one-third performance of an expert policy. The medium-replay datasets contain all timestep samples from the training start until the policy achieves “medium” level of performance. And the full-replay datasets contain all timestep samples from the training start until the policy becomes an expert policy.

### B. Long-term Prediction

In previous model-based offline RL work, the environment model is set to predict the future trajectories as short as possible. For the purpose of reducing the accumulation of model prediction error, single-step prediction is the most

commonly used method where the state and action from last timestep are mapped to the state of next timestep. However, the capacity to deal with long sequence prediction is usually ignored. In brief, previous model-based offline RL methods suffer from lacking the long-duration prediction ability, which can result in large error when dealing with the issues associated with distributional shift.

In this case, we intend to evaluate the long-term prediction capacity of our algorithm compared with the state-of-the-art model-based offline RL method MOPO [21]. In this task, the environment dynamics models are required to autoregressively generate rollouts with 20 steps length according to the offline dataset. Policy optimization algorithms are performed based on the simulated rollouts. The accuracy of the learned dynamics model as a long-sequence predictor is evaluated by computing the final scores of learned policies, instead of directly visualizing the difference between the simulated rollouts with the groundtruth rollouts provided by the offline dataset. MOPO also adopts SAC as policy optimization algorithm, but with a penalty reward based on an estimate of the model error. The purpose for MOPO to apply penalty reward is incorporating uncertainty of single-step predictive model, which has been implicitly considered by sequence modeling method in our work.

We sample initial batch states from the offline dataset according to the state probability distribution. Corresponding initial actions are selected by policy search. After that, Environment Transformer is adopted to autoregressively generate 20 steps length rollouts whose transitions are saved in the model replay buffer. After enough transitions are retained, the total replay buffer will be made by 95% from the model replay buffer and 5% from the offline dataset, which will be used to update the policies.

We select full-replay and medium-replay datasets of the three environments as the long-term prediction experimental scenarios and visualize the episode reward curves during training. The results are presented in Fig. 4. We normalize the scores as proposed in the D4RL [30] paper such that 100 score means an expert policy. For each scenario, the mean and variance are obtained by experiments with three




Fig. 4: The training episode reward curves of ENTROPY and MOPO in full-replay and medium-replay datasets. The mean and variance are obtained by experiments with three random seeds.

random seeds. During training, our algorithm shows final performance improvement in all cases and lower variance in most of the cases. This demonstrates that the quality of simulated long-horizon trajectories generated by Environment Transformer is better than those generated by single-step predictive model.

### C. Performance Comparisons

In order to evaluate the performance of our algorithm, we compare with the state-of-the-art model-free offline RL algorithms CQL [7], BEAR [10] and BRAC-v [11] as well as the state-of-the-art model-based offline RL algorithm MOPO [21]. We select three environments (HalfCheetah, Hopper and Walker2d) and four kinds of datasets (random, medium, medium-replay and full-replay). We normalize the scores as proposed in the D4RL [30] paper such that 100 score means an expert policy. The scores of BEAR and BRAC-v are based on the D4RL paper. The scores of CQL are taken from the origin paper. The scores of MOPO in random, medium and medium-replay datasets are taken from the origin paper, while the scores of MOPO in full-replay dataset are tested based on official implementations since they are not reported on the origin paper. In this case, the implementation of MOPO uses one-step rollout generation and policy optimization with penalty reward. Similar as above, the implementation of ENTROPY still adopts long-term trajectory generation with 20 steps length and policy optimization with predicted reward. The scores of ENTROPY are averaged over three random seeds.

The results of performance comparisons are shown in

Table I. Our algorithm outperforms the baseline in most of the scenarios while presents comparable scores in other scenarios. In medium-replay datasets, ENTROPY obtains the highest score among all environments. In full-replay datasets, our algorithm performs the best among Hopper environment and Walker environment while similar as the best in HalfCheetah environment. We analyze the reason is that medium-replay datasets and full-replay datasets contain all timestep samples from the training start until the policy reaches a certain level of performance. In this case the state and action space are covered as sufficient as possible. Once enough state and action space are covered in the training set of Environment Transformer, our algorithm is able to generate reliable long-horizon trajectories owing to the strong sequence modeling ability.

In random and medium datasets, our algorithm achieves comparable scores with other methods. There is no expert trajectories in random datasets since the agent takes action randomly at each moment, which leads to inaccuracy of the learned dynamics model and reward function. This is especially an concerned issue where the predictor can not correctly identify those high-reward actions when they are not included by the training set. The medium datasets consist of the transitions generated by “medium” policy, which leads to the lack of action diversity. This limits environment modeling and makes it hard to learn an effective policy. In this case, our algorithm can still perform best in random dataset on Hopper environment and medium dataset on HalfCheetah environment. ENTROPY achieves the highest scores when calculating the average of all settings. In general, ENTROPY

Dataset	Environment	ENTROPY(Ours)	MOPO	CQL	BEAR	BRAC-v
Random	HalfCheetah	27.6	<b>35.4</b>	<b>35.4</b>	25.1	31.2
Random	Hopper	<b>22.7</b>	11.7	10.8	11.4	12.2
Random	Walker	9.0	<b>13.6</b>	7.0	7.3	1.9
Medium	HalfCheetah	<b>47.6</b>	42.3	44.4	41.7	46.3
Medium	Hopper	52.6	28.0	<b>86.6</b>	52.1	31.1
Medium	Walker	18.8	17.8	74.5	59.1	<b>81.1</b>
Medium-Replay	HalfCheetah	<b>54.5</b>	53.1	46.2	38.6	47.7
Medium-Replay	Hopper	<b>75.4</b>	67.5	48.6	33.7	0.6
Medium-Replay	Walker	<b>67.2</b>	39.0	32.6	19.2	0.9
Full-Replay	HalfCheetah	74.5	<b>77.3</b>	-	-	-
Full-Replay	Hopper	<b>85.8</b>	72.6	-	-	-
Full-Replay	Walker	<b>95.6</b>	86.0	-	-	-
Average (Without Full-Replay)		41.7	34.3	<b>42.9</b>	32.0	28.1
Average (All Settings)		<b>52.6</b>	45.4	-	-	-

TABLE I: Performance Comparisons for D4RL datasets. The scores of ENTROPY are averaged over three random seeds.

performs comparably or better than the state-of-the-art both model-based and model-free offline RL methods.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we propose a new model-based offline RL algorithm, ENTROPY, which performs comparably or better than the state-of-the-art both model-based and model-free offline RL methods on MuJoCo environments. The algorithm is able to generate long-horizon rollouts with higher quality than previous model-based offline RL algorithms. In order to model the environment dynamics accurately, we develop a sequence modeling architecture, Environment Transformer, which is able to predict the probability distribution of future state and reward based on a sequence of historical states and actions. Initial batch states are probabilistically sampled from the offline dataset and Environment Transformer is adopted to autoregressively simulate long-term rollouts using a causal self-attention mask. Furthermore, Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) algorithm is performed for policy optimization.

The limitation of our algorithm is that it requires the training set to cover the state and action space as full as possible. Environment Transformer works well to learn the dynamics model and reward function when the training set sufficiently covers the space. In contrast, it works poorly with little coverage of the space even though the training set is an expert dataset. In the future, we intend to further enhance the algorithm and focus more on online scenario.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Prof. Barto for insightful discussions. We would like to thank Michael Janner and Costa Huang for practical suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Fujimoto, D. Meger, and D. Precup, "Off-Policy Deep Reinforcement Learning without Exploration," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 2052-2062.
- [2] S. Lange, T. Gabel, and M. Riedmiller, "Batch Reinforcement Learning," in *Reinforcement Learning*, 2012, pp. 45-73.
- [3] A. X. Lee et al., "How to Spend Your Robot Time: Bridging Kick-starting and Offline Reinforcement Learning for Vision-based Robotic Manipulation," in *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2022.
- [4] J. Li, C. Tang, M. Tomizuka, and W. Zhan, "Hierarchical planning through goal-conditioned offline reinforcement learning," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 10216-10223, 2022.
- [5] J. Jin, D. Graves, C. Haigh, J. Luo and M. Jagersand, "Offline learning of counterfactual predictions for real-world robotic reinforcement learning," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2022, pp. 3616-3623.
- [6] T. Z. Zhao et al., "Offline meta-reinforcement learning for industrial insertion," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2022, pp. 6386-6393.
- [7] A. Kumar, A. Zhou, G. Tucker, and S. Levine, "Conservative Q-Learning for Offline Reinforcement Learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04779*, 2020.
- [8] Z. Wang et al., "Critic Regularized Regression," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020, vol. 33, pp. 7768-7778.
- [9] A. Nair, A. Gupta, M. Dalal, and S. Levine, "AWAC: Accelerating Online Reinforcement Learning with Offline Datasets," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09359*, 2020.
- [10] A. Kumar, J. Fu, G. Tucker, and S. Levine, "Stabilizing Off-Policy Q-Learning via Bootstrapping Error Reduction," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [11] Y. Wu, G. Tucker, and O. Nachum, "Behavior regularized offline reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.11361*, 2019.
- [12] W. Zhou, S. Bajracharya, and D. Held, "PLAS: Latent Action Space for Offline Reinforcement Learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07213*, 2020.
- [13] I. Kostrikov, A. Nair, and S. Levine, "Offline Reinforcement Learning with Implicit Q-Learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.06169*, 2021.
- [14] H. Xu, X. Zhan, J. Li, and H. Yin, "Offline Reinforcement Learning with Soft Behavior Regularization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07395*, 2021.

- [15] S. Fujimoto and S. (shane) Gu, "A Minimalist Approach to Offline Reinforcement Learning," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021, vol. 34, pp. 20132-20145.
- [16] R. S. Sutton, Dyna, "an Integrated Architecture for Learning, Planning, and Reacting," *SIGART Bull.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 160-163, Jul. 1991.
- [17] M. P. Deisenroth and C. E. Rasmussen, "PILCO: A Model-Based and Data-Efficient Approach to Policy Search," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2011, pp. 465-472.
- [18] S. Levine and V. Koltun, "Guided Policy Search," in *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2013, vol. 28, pp. 1-9.
- [19] K. Chua, R. Calandra, R. McAllister, and S. Levine, "Deep Reinforcement Learning in a Handful of Trials using Probabilistic Dynamics Models," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, vol. 31.
- [20] M. Janner, J. Fu, M. Zhang, and S. Levine, "When to Trust Your Model: Model-Based Policy Optimization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [21] T. Yu et al., "MOPO: Model-based Offline Policy Optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13239*, 2020.
- [22] T. Yu, A. Kumar, R. Rafailov, A. Rajeswaran, S. Levine, and C. Finn, "COMBO: Conservative Offline Model-Based Policy Optimization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021, vol. 34, pp. 28954-28967.
- [23] I. Sutskever, O. Vinyals, and Q. V. Le, "Sequence to Sequence Learning with Neural Networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014, vol. 27.
- [24] A. Vaswani et al., "Attention is All you Need," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, vol. 30.
- [25] A. Radford, K. Narasimhan, T. Salimans and I. Sutskever, "Improving language understanding by generative pre-training," 2018.
- [26] L. Chen et al., "Decision Transformer: Reinforcement Learning via Sequence Modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01345*, 2021.
- [27] M. Janner, Q. Li, and S. Levine, "Offline Reinforcement Learning as One Big Sequence Modeling Problem," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021, vol. 34, pp. 1273-1286.
- [28] Ziebart, B. D., "Modeling Purposeful Adaptive Behavior with the Principle of Maximum Causal Entropy," 2010.
- [29] T. Haarnoja, A. Zhou, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, "Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor," in *International conference on machine learning*, 2018, pp. 1861-1870.
- [30] J. Fu, A. Kumar, O. Nachum, G. Tucker, and S. Levine, "D4rl: Datasets for deep data-driven reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07219*, 2020.
- [31] E. Todorov, T. Erez, and Y. Tassa, "Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control," in *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, 2012, pp. 5026-5033.
- [32] P. Wawrzyński, "A cat-like robot real-time learning to run," in *Adaptive and Natural Computing Algorithms: 9th International Conference*, 2009, pp. 380-390.
- [33] T. Erez, Y. Tassa, and E. Todorov, "Infinite-horizon model predictive control for periodic tasks with contacts," *Robotics: Science and systems VII*, pp. 73-80, 2012.