

REBEL: A Regularization-Based Solution for Reward Overoptimization in Robotic Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback

Souradip Chakraborty*, Anukriti Singh*, Amisha Bhaskar, Brian M. Sadler,
Dinesh Manocha, Pratap Tokekar, and Amrit Singh Bedi
<https://raaslab.org/projects/REBEL>

Abstract—The effectiveness of reinforcement learning (RL) agents in continuous control robotics tasks is heavily dependent on the design of the underlying reward function. However, a misalignment between the reward function and user intentions, values, or social norms can be catastrophic in the real world. Current methods to mitigate this misalignment work by learning reward functions from human preferences; however, they inadvertently introduce a risk of reward overoptimization. In this work, we address this challenge by advocating for the adoption of regularized reward functions that more accurately mirror the intended behaviors. We propose a novel concept of reward regularization within the robotic RLHF (RL from Human Feedback) framework, which we refer to as *agent preferences*. Our approach uniquely incorporates not just human feedback in the form of preferences but also considers the preferences of the RL agent itself during the reward function learning process. This dual consideration significantly mitigates the issue of reward function overoptimization in RL. We provide a theoretical justification for the proposed approach by formulating the robotic RLHF problem as a bilevel optimization problem. We demonstrate the efficiency of our algorithm **REBEL** in several continuous control benchmarks including DeepMind Control Suite [1] and MetaWorld [2] and high dimensional visual environments, with an improvement of more than 70% in sample efficiency in comparison to current SOTA baselines. This showcases our approach’s effectiveness in aligning reward functions with true behavioral intentions, setting a new benchmark in the field.

I. INTRODUCTION

The success of reinforcement learning (RL) relies on the design of an efficient, dense, and accurate reward function for the task at hand [3]–[6]. However, in many continuous control robot tasks such as grasping [3], motion planning [4], navigation [5], [6], the rewards are naturally sparse [7]–[12], thereby making solving them with RL challenging. An effective reward design is necessary. However, in practice, this is often done by trial-and-error or expert-engineering which is inefficient and not always feasible. This problem is compounded when we have multiple attributes in the reward function. For example, in an outdoor navigation scenario, several attributes may significantly affect the reward function, including time taken to reach the goal, distance traveled, risk of collisions, obeying social norms, fuel consumption,




Fig. 1: This figure describes the preference-based robotic reinforcement learning framework from human feedback (RRLHF) [16]. We introduce a novel regularized reward learning into the existing RRLHF framework, which helps improve the state-of-the-art performance as detailed in Sec. V.

etc. [13]. It is challenging to hand-design a reward function that can capture multiple attributes.

Without a principled way to design the reward, we may end up with *reward hacking*, where the agent hacks the reward function and maximizes it without performing the intended task [14]. For instance, let us consider the example of a robotic vacuum cleaner [15], where the objective is to clean all dirt and the robot receives a reward when there is no dirt left. Since the robot only perceives dirt through camera images, it might attempt to manipulate what it sees to eliminate the appearance of dirt in its input data (e.g., by going very close to a wall), which would result in a high reward without even accomplishing the intended task of cleaning the dirt.

To address the aforementioned concerns, existing approaches attempt to learn a reward function from expert demonstrations via inverse RL [17], [18] and imitation learning [19]. The performance of these techniques relies on the quality of the demonstrations collected. Collecting demonstrations can be expensive and sometimes infeasible for large-scale problems [20]. Alternatively, there have been efforts to leverage offline data in combination with demonstrations to reduce the dependence on expert feedback. However, such methods require a *coverability* assumption, restricting performance [21].

*Denotes equal contribution.

The authors are with the Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, USA. Brian M. Sadler is with UT Austin. Email:schakra3@umd.edu

This work was supported by Army Cooperative Agreement W911NF2120076.

Recently, preference-based RL has emerged as a compelling framework to solve the sequential decision-making problem by leveraging preferences (feedback) of state-actions pair trajectories [16], [22]–[24]. The basic idea is to get pairwise feedback from a user about which of the two trajectories they prefer (can be generalized to K -wise) and learn a reward function using Bradley-Terry preference models [25].

The preferences can be at different levels, i.e., trajectory-based, state-based, or action-based. Trajectory-based feedback is the sparsest, and state/action-based feedback can be considered a more dense counterpart. This paradigm is sample-efficient as it does not need humans/experts to provide thousands of high-quality demonstrations but instead provide ranks of the trajectories, which is much easier and more efficient. The most important advantage of the preference-based framework lies in being able to detect and identify the inherent and hidden intentions and motivations from the human/expert preferences and encode them through the reward function. For example, there may be tasks where even the human may not know how the optimal solution looks like but they would still be able to determine which from a pair is better.

While preference based RL holds a lot of promise, recent research has raised the concern of reward over-optimization and overfitting while learning the reward function with the framework [26], related to Goodhart’s law [27]. Since the reward function is only a proxy of human preferences, optimizing its value too much might lead to the issue of reward overfitting and overoptimization [26]. One way of avoiding this issue is to choose suitable regularization when learning with preferences. This is most commonly used in fine-tuning language models [28], where a Kullback-Leibler (KL)-divergence is used as regularization to ensure that the current policy is within some neighborhood of the base policy. This regularization is effective since there is a stable language model base policy learnt through pre-training [28] over large datasets. However, no such stable policy is available in robotics control problems. Therefore, designing a suitable reward regularization for Robotic RLHF (RRLHF) is critical. Our main contribution is exactly such a regularization. More specifically, our **main contributions** are as follows.

- We propose a novel framework called **REBEL** (Reward rEgularization Based robotic rEinforcement Learning from human feedback). We introduce a new regularization, termed as *agent preference*, which is given by the value function evaluated at the optimal policy (cf. Sec. IV-B). This regularization term helps recover the true underlying reward from the human feedback and mitigate reward overoptimization.
- We show the efficacy of the proposed REBEL approach on several continuous control locomotion and manipulation tasks from DeepMind Control Suite [1] and MetaWorld [2]. We show that in terms of episodic reward return, REBEL archives up to 70% improvement in sample efficiency as compared to the state-of-the-

art baseline methods such as PEBBLE [16] and PEBBLE+SURF [23], where our algorithm achieves near oracle performance.

- We also provide a theoretical justification of our proposed regularization method by connecting to first-order Bilevel optimization and RLHF and thereby preventing reward overoptimization.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we discuss the research around reward design in RL specifically emphasizing robotics problems.

Reward Shaping. In addressing the issue of sparse rewards in RL, the reward shaping and design paradigm offers an intuitive solution. It involves augmenting the sparse extrinsic rewards with intrinsic curiosity terms and was initially proposed by [29] before being further developed in subsequent works [11], [30]–[33]. This augmentation reshapes the reward function and aids in handling the exploration-exploitation trade-off under sparsity, as demonstrated in prior studies [33]. However, this approach comes with trade-offs. The introduction of intrinsic rewards adds complexity to the underlying Markov Decision Process (MDP), potentially leading to suboptimal policies. To mitigate this, information-directed RL, proposed in [34], [35], offers a theoretically sound solution but faces scalability challenges, especially in large-scale robotics problems.

Inverse RL & Reward Design. Inverse RL (IRL) is concerned with inferring the underlying reward function from a set of demonstrations by human experts. In contrast, imitation and apprenticeship learning focus on learning a policy directly from these demonstrations [36], [37]. A significant advancement in IRL came from [17], [18], which introduced the Max Entropy IRL framework. This framework excelled in handling noisy trajectories with imperfect behavior. [17], [18] adopted a probabilistic perspective for reward learning while sharing the core principle with [37] of matching the expected feature counts between observed and expert trajectories. In their approach, reward weights are learned by maximizing the likelihood under the entropy distribution, as detailed in [17], [18]. However, a significant limitation of these previous approaches is their inability to account for unsuccessful demonstrations, as addressed in [38], where the problem was reformulated as a constraint optimization framework by maximizing the disparity between the empirical feature expectations derived from unsuccessful examples and the feature expectation learned from the data. [39] proposed another innovative paradigm of solving apprentice learning with IRL in [39] by posing it in the min-max formulation where the objective is to maximize the optimal policy and minimize the divergence to the occupancy indicated by the current policy and expert trajectories. It is also important to note that, despite their effectiveness, IRL methods remain heavily reliant on high-quality demonstrations. Obtaining such demonstrations can prove to be a costly and challenging endeavor, particularly for various off-the-shelf robotics tasks, a notable limitation

in their widespread utilization. However, the very recent work in [40] combines DeepRL with trajectory ranking of suboptimal demonstration and performs significantly better than prior IRL research.

Preference-based RL for Robotics. This provides a sample-efficient framework for learning the underlying true reward function which reflects human/expert preferences [16]. [41] proposed a Bayesian framework to learn a posterior distribution over the policies directly from preferences. However, instead of directly learning policies from preferences, [42] focused on learning a cost or utility function as a supervised learning objective to maximize the likelihood of the preferences and subsequently maximize the policy under the estimated utility. An alternative and interesting line of research involves dueling bandits, where one compares two actions and aims to minimize regret based on pairwise comparisons [43]–[46] and analyzes the sample complexity of dueling RL under the tabular case. Most of the research around this is theoretical and non-trivial to scale to large scale robotics. On the other hand, [22] scaled deep preference-based learning for large-scale continuous control tasks by learning a reward function aligned with expert preferences. However, they suffered from sample inefficiency due to being on-policy. This was later improved by introducing additional demonstrations [47] and non-binary rankings [48]. One of the most recent works, Pebble [16] improves the efficiency of preference-based learning for large-scale environments by virtue of off-policy learning and pre-training. However, none of these methods focuses on the critical aspect of the reward model over-optimization and overfitting.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Preliminaries: Policy Optimization in RL

Let us start by considering the Markov Decision Process (MDP) tuple $\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \gamma, \mathbb{P}, r\}$, which is a tuple consisting of a state space \mathcal{S} , action space \mathcal{A} , transition dynamics \mathbb{P} , discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and reward $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Starting from a given state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, an agent selects an action a and transitions to another $s' \sim \mathbb{P}(\cdot | s, a)$. We consider a stochastic policy that maps states to distributions over actions $\pi_\theta : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$, which is parameterized by a parameter vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, we can write the standard finite horizon policy optimization problem as

$$\max_{\theta} V_s(\theta) := \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h r(s_h, a_h) \mid, s_0 = s \right], \quad (1)$$

where the expectation is with respect to the stochasticity in the policy π_θ and the transition dynamics \mathbb{P} . In (1), we used notation $V_s(\theta)$ for value function in state s to emphasize the dependence on parameters θ . We note that for a given reward function r , we can solve the optimization problem in (1) to obtain the optimal policy parameters [49]. However, establishing a reward function that perfectly aligns with human preferences is a challenging task and might result in potentially misaligned RL policies. There are different ways to learn reward functions as discussed in the introduction

(Sec. I) but we consider the human feedback-based reward learning from preference as follows.

B. Robotic Reinforcement Learning From Human Feedback (RRLHF):

In this subsection, we introduce the problem of reinforcement learning from human feedback for robotic tasks. Following the description mentioned in [16], [22], the RRLHF framework can typically be described in three phases as follows.

- 1) **Pre-training:** RRLHF starts with a pre-trained policy for the underlying robotic task in an unsupervised manner. We can achieve that via training a policy to maximize the entropy to be able to collect different experiences in the environment [16]. Let's assume the corresponding pre-trained policy as π_0 .
- 2) **Reward Learning from Feedback:** In the second phase, we collect the trajectories by interacting with the training environment and collecting human feedback. Let us call the new reward after feedback as \hat{r} .
- 3) **Policy update:** Once we have a reward learned from the human feedback, then we follow the standard policy optimization to solve the problem 1 to learn an updated policy for the new reward function coming from phase 2 as follows

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h \hat{r}(s_h, a_h) \mid, s_0 = s \right]. \quad (2)$$

Limitations of Phase 2: Before discussing the limitations, let us first discuss in detail the existing reward learning procedure. A preference-based feedback is utilized where we collect preferences from humans for each generated trajectory pair (τ_i, τ_j) generated by a policy π and the feedback is represented by $y = [y_i, y_j]$ where $y_i = 1, y_j = 0$ if $\tau_i > \tau_j$ and vice versa. With these preferences, the reward model is learned using the Bradley-Terry (BT) choice model [25] and is mathematically expressed as

$$P_\nu(\tau_i > \tau_j) = \frac{\exp G_\nu(\tau_i)}{\exp G_\nu(\tau_i) + \exp G_\nu(\tau_j)} \quad (3)$$

where, $G_\nu(\tau_i) := \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h r_\nu(s_h^i, a_h^i)$, ν is the reward model parameter, (s_h^i, a_h^i) denotes state action pairs from the trajectory τ_i , $P_\nu(\tau_i > \tau_j)$ represents the probability of the trajectory $\tau_i > \tau_j$ which models the human preference. Thus the objective of reward learning can be formulated as maximizing the likelihood of human preferences to learn the optimal parameter ν as

$$\max_{\nu} \mathbb{E}_{\tau_i, \tau_j \sim \mathcal{D}} [y_i \log P_\nu(\tau_i > \tau_j) + y_j \log P_\nu(\tau_i < \tau_j)], \quad (4)$$

where the expectation is over the trajectories we have in the feedback dataset \mathcal{D} . The above-mentioned framework from human feedback is popular but still has not been able to achieve the optimal performance in terms of learning optimal reward, which is clear from the experimental results presented in [16]. There is a gap between the performance of




Fig. 2: This figure highlights the performance gap of the PEBBLE approach [16]. We note that PEBBLE achieves a return of around 500 while the maximum possible is 1000.

rewards learned from human preferences and the underlying oracle reward (see Figure 2). In this work, we are interested in investigating this issue and propose improvements. An important point to note here is that the data set \mathcal{D} is not independent of the policy which we update in phase 2. Since in RRLHF framework, we repeat the steps in Phase 2 and Phase 3, we need to account for the dependency that the eventual data collection is going to happen at the current optimal policy. This is currently missing from the existing literature, and we propose to fix it by considering a regularization term in the reward learning phase. We detail the proposed approach in the next section.

IV. PROPOSED ALGORITHM AND APPROACH

In this section, we start by providing a key insight regarding the need to improve the reward learning phase of the RRLHF framework and then present the main algorithm.

A. Key Insight Regarding Reward Learning

The reward learning phase in the RRLHF framework is where we utilize the preference-based human feedback to design a good reward model to be used in phase 3 of policy learning. It is important to note that in practical implementations such as in [16], [22], [23], phase 2 and phase 3 are repeated in a sequential manner such as from iteration $k = 1$ to K and reward and policy are updated for each k . Therefore, the dictionary \mathcal{D} in (4) actually gets updated for each iteration (say k). Therefore, at each iteration k , we collect data by interacting with the environment with policy $\pi_{\theta_k^*}$ at each k , then we learn a reward model ν_{k+1}^* by solving (4), followed by the policy update by solving (2) to obtain $\pi_{\theta_{k+1}^*}$.

In the above procedure, we note that when we solve for the policy, we consider the updated value of reward for the value function maximization problem of (4). But on the other hand, when we optimize for reward in (2), we do not

Algorithm 1 REBEL: Reward Regularization Based Robotic Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback

```

1: Initialize parameters of critic  $Q_\theta$ , policy  $\pi_\theta$ 
2: Initialize a dataset of preferences  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: // POLICY LEARNING
4: for each iteration do
5:   // REWARD LEARNING
6:   if iteration %  $K == 0$  then
7:     for  $m$  in  $1 \dots M$  do
8:       Collect trajectories  $(\tau_0, \tau_1)$  and collect preference
9:       label from human-feedback as  $y$ 
10:      Store preference  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \{(\tau_0, \tau_1, y)\}$ 
11:    end for
12:    for each iteration of the reward learning do
13:      Sample  $D$  number of trajectory-pairs
14:       $\{(\tau_0, \tau_1, y)_j\}_{j=1}^D \sim \mathcal{D}$  and corresponding
15:      labels for reward learning
16:      Perform gradient update step for reward parameter  $\nu$ 
17:      to optimize (2)
18:    end for
19:  end if
20:  for each timestep  $t$  do
21:    Interact with the environment using the current policy
22:    by taking  $a_t \sim \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$  and collect  $s_{t+1}$  and
23:     $r_\nu(s_t, a_t)$  which is the predicted reward function
24:    Store transitions  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \mathcal{B} \cup \{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}, r_\nu(s_t, a_t))\}$ 
25:  end for
26:  for each gradient step do
27:    Sample random minibatch  $\{(\tau_j)\}_{j=1}^B \sim \mathcal{B}$  These
28:    transitions are saved for updating the actor and critic
29:    parameters (inner loop)
30:  end for
31: end for

```

pay attention to the current policy $\pi_{\theta_k^*}$. We realize that this plays an important role in the sub-optimal behavior of the performance of approaches such as PEBBLE in [16]. We address this concern in the next subsection.

B. Proposed REBEL Algorithm

The main objective of RRLHF is to design a reward function that aligns with human preferences, but we point out that eventually, our designed reward should also be suitable for learning a policy for the downstream task. Therefore, to make the reward learning in (4) dependent on the policy as well, we propose a novel regularization term called *agent preference* which is nothing but the value function at the policy $\pi_{\theta_k^*}$, hence (4) would become

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\nu} \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\tau_i, \tau_j \sim \mathcal{D}} [y_i \log P_\nu(\tau_i > \tau_j) + y_j \log P_\nu(\tau_i < \tau_j)]}_{\text{Human preference}} \\
& + \lambda \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h r_\nu(s_h, a_h) \mid s_0 = s, a_h \sim \pi_{\theta_k^*} \right]}_{\text{Agent preference (proposed)}}, \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$




Fig. 3: (Above) MetaWorld [2] and (below) DM Control Suite [1].

where $\lambda > 0$ is the tuning parameter to control the importance of agent preference versus human preference. Intuitively, the additional regularization term would make sure to learn reward which results in a higher value of reward return at the current policy, which implies that it is not very different from the previous reward at which the optimal policy was learned. By regularizing the reward function appropriately, we develop a way to incorporate the policy preference in the learning paradigm, missing from earlier research [16], [23]. We provide a detailed mathematical justification of the same in the next section. But first, to illustrate the intuition, let us consider a simple example of a robot learning to navigate to a goal location. Suppose that the user’s preferred goal is very far away from the start position of the agent. In such cases, the trajectories at the start of the learning would not reach the goal. As such, the user may not meaningfully differentiate between a pair of sub-optimal trajectories. Optimizing such preferences might not cause the agent to learn anything meaningful due to the extreme sparsity of the environment. Hence, while designing the reward function if there is no priority given to the agent’s performance, it will eventually be tough to converge. On the other hand, if the goal position is shifted somewhere in the middle, it can be solved in a much more efficient way. We summarize the proposed approach in Algorithm 1 and provide a mathematical justification in the next section connecting it to bilevel optimization.

C. Theoretical Justification of Proposed Approach

In this section, we discuss the theoretical motivation behind agent preference regularization and explain the connection to reward over-optimization. We first mathematically express the RLHF problem as a bilevel optimization objec-

tive (also shown in [24]) which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\nu} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{y, \tau_0, \tau_1 \sim \rho_h(\tau; \theta^*(\nu))} [L_{\nu}(y, \tau_0, \tau_1)] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \theta^*(\nu) := \arg \max_{\theta} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H_{\ell}-1} \gamma^h r_{\nu}(s_h, a_h) \mid, s_0 = s \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $L_{\nu}(y, \tau_0, \tau_1)$ represents the likelihood maximization objective given as $L_{\nu}(y, \tau_0, \tau_1) = y \log P_{\nu}(\tau_0 > \tau_1) + (1 - y) \log P_{\nu}(\tau_0 < \tau_1)$, as defined in Equation (4). Note that the objective requires trajectory samples by solving the inner policy optimization objective and thus, the two objectives cannot be disentangled as done in several past works, including [16], [23]. The objective intuitively explains that while optimizing the outer objective for learning the reward parameterization, it is important to consider the agent’s performance, which is an important factor ignored in earlier literature leading to reward over-optimization. However, it’s important to note that solving the above bilevel optimization is computationally expensive and requires second-order information, as shown in [24]. However, with a novel value function-based reformulation, the bilevel objective from Equation (6) can be reformulated as a constrained optimization problem without any approximation as

$$\max_{\nu, \theta} \mathbb{E}_{y, \tau_0, \tau_1 \sim \rho_h(\tau; \theta)} [L_{\nu}(y, \tau_0, \tau_1)] + \lambda (V(\pi_{\theta^*(\nu)}) - V(\pi_{\theta})) \quad (7)$$

which represents the first-order reformulation of the original objective. It has been shown in recent research that such an approach requires only first-order information and is computationally tractable [50]. Here $V(\pi_{\theta^*(\nu)}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h r_{\nu}(s_h, a_h) \mid, s_0 = s, a_h \sim \pi_{\theta^*(\nu)} \right]$ and $V(\pi_{\theta}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \gamma^h r_{\nu}(s_h, a_h) \mid, s_0 = s, a_h \sim \pi_{\theta} \right]$, where the second term corresponds to the agent preference, which resembles our proposed (5). Thus our approach provides a guided direction to update the reward function which also cares for the inner agent’s performance and thus regularizes the reward learning objective and avoids reward over-optimization.

V. EXPERIMENTS

Environment: We consider two robot locomotion and two manipulation environments from the DeepMind (DM) Control suite [1] and Meta-world [2] along with high dimensional visual DM control environments [1] to perform detailed experimental evaluations as shown in Figure 4. Specifically, we use the *walker* and the *Cheetah* environments from the DM control suite. The objective in each task differs and the true reward function is typically a function of several attributes. For example, in the *standing* task, the true (hidden) reward incorporates terms that promote an upright posture and maintain a minimum torso height. For the *walking* and *running* tasks, an additional element in the reward function encourages forward movement. Similarly for Cheetah, the objective of the agent is to run fast up to a certain speed threshold, with rewards based on forward velocity. In addition to locomotion, we also use manipulation tasks from




Fig. 4: Learning curves on two locomotion and two robotics manipulation tasks as measured on the ground truth reward. The solid line and shaded regions respectively represent the mean and standard deviation, across three runs

Meta-World. The objective of the manipulation tasks (*Door Open*, *Button press*) [2] is to open doors or press buttons in varied positions, focusing on adaptability and precision. We also consider high-dimensional and challenging visual environments from the DM Control Suite to see the generality of our proposed approach in high-dimensional tasks.

Baselines: We consider two state-of-the-art baselines for preference-based RL, which are PEBBLE [16] and PEBBLE+SURF [23]. PEBBLE+SURF utilizes data augmentation to improve the performance of PEBBLE,

Evaluation Metric: To evaluate the performance of the different methods, we select episodic reward return as a valid metric. The eventual goal of any RL agent is to maximize the expected value of the episodic reward return and this is widely used in the literature. All the hyperparameter details are provided in the supplementary material [51].

Human Feedback: Although it would be ideal to evaluate the real-world effectiveness of our algorithm based on actual human feedback, but for simulation and comparisons on benchmark it is hard to collect a large amount of human feedback. Hence, to emulate human feedback, we leverage simulated human teachers as used in prior research [16], [23], whose preferences are based on ground-truth reward functions which help us to evaluate the agent efficiently. In order to design more human-like teachers, various humanly behaviors like stochasticity, myopic behavior, mistakes etc. are integrated while generating preferences as in [16], [23].

A. Results and Discussions

We start by plotting the episodic (true and hidden) reward returns for various algorithms in Figure 4. We note that the oracle reward is denoted by a dotted line in all the plots, which is the maximum value of the reward return. All the algorithms would achieve a reward return less than the maximum value. We note that in the majority of the experiments, PEBBLE achieves a sub-optimal performance whereas PEBBLE+SURF (green curve) is able to achieve better performance but it requires data augmentation. On the other hand, the proposed REBEL achieves the best performance compared to all the baselines in a sample efficient manner, in all the environments including the very high-dimensional visual environment, which is closer to the optimal reward. This gain in performance is coming because of the additional agent preference term we add as regularization in the proposed approach (cf. (4)).

We also study the effect of human feedback on the performance of the proposed REBEL algorithm in Figure 5. We plot the reward return in Figure 5 for two different amounts of human feedback namely *low* and *high* (where *low* feedback indicates receiving human feedback after every 20 episodes and *high* feedback indicates receiving after 10 episodes). It is clear to observe that higher feedback (more frequent) results in better performance which is intuitive. Further, in Figure 6, we analyze the effect of regularization parameter λ on the performance of the proposed REBEL algorithm. We note that reducing the value of λ helps in improving the performance of REBEL but we cannot decrease it beyond a limit because we know that for $\lambda = 0$, our loss function in (4) would boil




Fig. 5: This figure shows the performance of the proposed REBEL algorithm for varied levels of human feedback(100 and 50). We note that when we increase the number of human feedback interactions, we clearly see an improvement in the performance of REBEL.




Fig. 6: This figure plots the average value of the episodic reward return of REBEL for different values of the regularization parameter λ . It clearly shows that we need to carefully tune the hyperparameter λ to obtain the optimal reward function.

down to PEBBLE and hence performance would degrade as shown in Figure 4.

VI. CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE WORK

Sparse reward functions in robotics are ubiquitous and challenging to handle, which usually leads to labor-intensive design and reward hacking risks. An interesting existing approach is preference-based learning which utilizes human feedback to infer reward functions, but it faces over-optimization concerns. In this work, we addressed these concerns by proposing a novel regularization term called *agent preference* for preference-based learning in robotics control. We have shown the advantages of the proposed regularization term in experiments. However, limitations include subjective

preferences and potential hyperparameter sensitivity. Future research may explore automated preference generation and advanced regularization methods. Extending preference-based learning beyond robotics to various domains is an exciting avenue to explore further.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Tassa, Y. Doron, A. Muldal, T. Erez, Y. Li, D. d. L. Casas, D. Budden, A. Abdolmaleki, J. Merel, A. Lefrancq, *et al.*, “Deepmind control suite,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00690*, 2018.
- [2] T. Yu, D. Quillen, Z. He, R. Julian, A. Narayan, H. Shively, A. Bellathur, K. Hausman, C. Finn, and S. Levine, “Meta-world: A benchmark and evaluation for multi-task and meta reinforcement learning,” 2021.
- [3] O. Kilinc and G. Montana, “Reinforcement learning for robotic manipulation using simulated locomotion demonstrations,” *Machine Learning*, pp. 1–22, 2021.
- [4] M. Everett, Y. F. Chen, and J. P. How, “Motion planning among dynamic, decision-making agents with deep reinforcement learning,” in *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3052–3059.
- [5] L. Liu, D. Dugas, G. Cesari, R. Siegwart, and R. Dubé, “Robot navigation in crowded environments using deep reinforcement learning,” in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 5671–5677.
- [6] K. Weerakoon, A. J. Sathyamoorthy, U. Patel, and D. Manocha, “Terp: Reliable planning in uneven outdoor environments using deep reinforcement learning,” in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 9447–9453.
- [7] K. Weerakoon, S. Chakraborty, N. Karapetyan, A. J. Sathyamoorthy, A. Bedi, and D. Manocha, “Htron: Efficient outdoor navigation with sparse rewards via heavy tailed adaptive reinforce algorithm,” in *6th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*.
- [8] A. S. Bedi, S. Chakraborty, A. Parayil, B. M. Sadler, P. Tokekar, and A. Koppel, “On the hidden biases of policy mirror ascent in continuous action spaces,” in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri, S. Jegelka, L. Song, C. Szepesvari, G. Niu, and S. Sabato, Eds., vol. 162. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022, pp. 1716–1731. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/bedi22a.html>
- [9] “Technical report for “dealing with sparse rewards in continuous control robotics via heavy-tailed policy optimization”,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://tinyurl.com/43v3783j>
- [10] P. Rauber, A. Ummadisingu, F. Mutz, and J. Schmidhuber, “Reinforcement learning in sparse-reward environments with hindsight policy gradients,” *Neural Computation*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 1498–1553, 2021.
- [11] S. Chakraborty, A. S. Bedi, A. Koppel, B. M. Sadler, F. Huang, P. Tokekar, and D. Manocha, “Posterior coresets construction with kernelized stein discrepancy for model-based reinforcement learning,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01162>
- [12] S. Chakraborty, A. S. Bedi, A. Koppel, M. Wang, F. Huang, and D. Manocha, “Steering: Stein information directed exploration for model-based reinforcement learning,” 2023.
- [13] W. B. Knox, A. Allievi, H. Banzhaf, F. Schmitt, and P. Stone, “Reward (mis)design for autonomous driving,” 2022.
- [14] J. Skalse, N. H. R. Howe, D. Krashennnikov, and D. Krueger, “Defining and characterizing reward hacking,” 2022.
- [15] C. Wirth, R. Akrou, G. Neumann, and J. Fürnkranz, “A survey of preference-based reinforcement learning methods,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 136, pp. 1–46, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-634.html>
- [16] K. Lee, L. Smith, and P. Abbeel, “Pebble: Feedback-efficient interactive reinforcement learning via relabeling experience and unsupervised pre-training,” 2021.
- [17] B. D. Ziebart, A. Maas, J. A. Bagnell, and A. K. Dey, “Maximum entropy inverse reinforcement learning,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 3*, ser. AAAI’08. AAAI Press, 2008, p. 1433–1438.
- [18] B. D. Ziebart, J. A. Bagnell, and A. K. Dey, “Modeling interaction via the principle of maximum causal entropy,” in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. ICML’10. Madison, WI, USA: Omnipress, 2010, p. 1255–1262.

- [19] A. Hussein, M. M. Gaber, E. Elyan, and C. Jayne, "Imitation learning: A survey of learning methods," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 1–35, 2017.
- [20] D. Kalashnikov, A. Irpan, P. Pastor, J. Ibarz, A. Herzog, E. Jang, D. Quillen, E. Holly, M. Kalakrishnan, V. Vanhoucke, and S. Levine, "Qt-opt: Scalable deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic manipulation," 2018.
- [21] T. Xie, D. J. Foster, Y. Bai, N. Jiang, and S. M. Kakade, "The role of coverage in online reinforcement learning," 2022.
- [22] P. Christiano, J. Leike, T. B. Brown, M. Martic, S. Legg, and D. Amodei, "Deep reinforcement learning from human preferences," 2017.
- [23] J. Park, Y. Seo, J. Shin, H. Lee, P. Abbeel, and K. Lee, "Surf: Semi-supervised reward learning with data augmentation for feedback-efficient preference-based reinforcement learning," 2022.
- [24] S. Chakraborty, A. S. Bedi, A. Koppel, D. Manocha, H. Wang, M. Wang, and F. Huang, "Parl: A unified framework for policy alignment in reinforcement learning," 2023.
- [25] R. A. Bradley and M. E. Terry, "Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons," *Biometrika*, vol. 39, p. 324, 1952. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:125209808>
- [26] L. Gao, J. Schulman, and J. Hilton, "Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization," 2022.
- [27] P. Evans, "Money, output and goodhart's law: The u.s. experience," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 1985. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1928428>
- [28] R. Rafailov, A. Sharma, E. Mitchell, S. Ermon, C. D. Manning, and C. Finn, "Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model," 2023.
- [29] M. J. Mataric, "Reward functions for accelerated learning," in *Machine learning proceedings 1994*. Elsevier, 1994, pp. 181–189.
- [30] A. Nair, B. McGrew, M. Andrychowicz, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, "Overcoming exploration in reinforcement learning with demonstrations," in *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 6292–6299.
- [31] R. Houthoofd, X. Chen, Y. Duan, J. Schulman, F. De Turck, and P. Abbeel, "Vime: Variational information maximizing exploration," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [32] M. Plappert, R. Houthoofd, P. Dhariwal, S. Sidor, R. Y. Chen, X. Chen, T. Asfour, P. Abbeel, and M. Andrychowicz, "Parameter space noise for exploration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.01905*, 2017.
- [33] D. Pathak, P. Agrawal, A. A. Efros, and T. Darrell, "Curiosity-driven exploration by self-supervised prediction," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 2778–2787.
- [34] S. Chakraborty, A. S. Bedi, A. Koppel, M. Wang, F. Huang, and D. Manocha, "Steering: Stein information directed exploration for model-based reinforcement learning," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12038>
- [35] B. Hao and T. Lattimore, "Regret bounds for information-directed reinforcement learning," 2022.
- [36] A. Y. Ng and S. J. Russell, "Algorithms for inverse reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. ICML '00. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2000, p. 663–670.
- [37] P. Abbeel and A. Y. Ng, "Apprenticeship learning via inverse reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. ICML '04. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2004, p. 1. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1015330.1015430>
- [38] K. Shiarlis, J. Messias, and S. Whiteson, "Inverse reinforcement learning from failure," in *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Autonomous Agents & Multiagent Systems*, ser. AAMAS '16. Richland, SC: International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2016, p. 1060–1068.
- [39] J. Ho, J. K. Gupta, and S. Ermon, "Model-free imitation learning with policy optimization," 2016.
- [40] D. S. Brown, W. Goo, P. Nagarajan, and S. Niekum, "Extrapolating beyond suboptimal demonstrations via inverse reinforcement learning from observations," 2019.
- [41] A. Wilson, A. Fern, and P. Tadepalli, "A bayesian approach for policy learning from trajectory preference queries," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, F. Pereira, C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Weinberger, Eds., vol. 25. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2012/file/16c222aa19898e5058938167c8ab6c57-Paper.pdf
- [42] J. Fürnkranz, E. Hüllermeier, W. Cheng, and S.-H. Park, "Preference-based reinforcement learning: A formal framework and a policy iteration algorithm," *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 89, no. 1–2, p. 123–156, oct 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-012-5313-8>
- [43] M. Dudík, K. Hofmann, R. E. Schapire, A. Slivkins, and M. Zoghi, "Contextual dueling bandits," 2015.
- [44] V. Bengs, R. Busa-Fekete, A. E. Mesaoudi-Paul, and E. Hüllermeier, "Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 1–108, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/18-546.html>
- [45] T. Lékang and A. Lamperski, "Simple algorithms for dueling bandits," 2019.
- [46] A. Pacchiano, A. Saha, and J. Lee, "Dueling rl: Reinforcement learning with trajectory preferences," 2023.
- [47] B. Ibarz, J. Leike, T. Pohlen, G. Irving, S. Legg, and D. Amodei, "Reward learning from human preferences and demonstrations in atari," 2018.
- [48] Z. Cao, K. Wong, and C.-T. Lin, "Weak human preference supervision for deep reinforcement learning," 2020.
- [49] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal policy optimization algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [50] M. Ye, B. Liu, S. Wright, P. Stone, and Q. Liu, "Bome! bilevel optimization made easy: A simple first-order approach," 2022.
- [51] "Technical report," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://raaslab.org/projects/REBEL>