

---

# Is Mamba Compatible with Trajectory Optimization in Offline Reinforcement Learning?

---

Yang Dai<sup>1</sup> Oubo Ma<sup>2</sup> Longfei Zhang<sup>1</sup> Xingxing Liang<sup>1</sup>  
 Shengchao Hu<sup>3</sup> Mengzhu Wang<sup>4</sup> Shouling Ji<sup>2</sup> Jincal Huang<sup>1\*</sup> Li Shen<sup>5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National University of Defense Technology <sup>2</sup>Zhejiang University

<sup>3</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University <sup>4</sup>Hebei University of Technology <sup>5</sup>Sun Yat-sen University

{daiyang2000,zhanglongfei,liangxingxing,huangjincal}@nudt.edu.cn

{mob, sji}@zju.edu.cn; charles-hu@sjtu.edu.cn; {dreamkily,mathshenli}@gmail.com

## Abstract

Transformer-based trajectory optimization methods have demonstrated exceptional performance in offline Reinforcement Learning (offline RL), yet it poses challenges due to substantial parameter size and limited scalability, which is particularly critical in sequential decision-making scenarios where resources are constrained such as in robots and drones with limited computational power. Mamba, a promising new linear-time sequence model, offers performance on par with transformers while delivering substantially fewer parameters on long sequences. As it remains unclear whether Mamba is compatible with trajectory optimization, this work aims to conduct comprehensive experiments to explore the potential of Decision Mamba in offline RL (dubbed DeMa) from the aspect of data structures and network architectures with the following insights: (1) Long sequences impose a significant computational burden without contributing to performance improvements due to the fact that DeMa's focus on sequences diminishes approximately exponentially. Consequently, we introduce a Transformer-like DeMa as opposed to an RNN-like DeMa. (2) For the components of DeMa, we identify that the hidden attention mechanism is key to its success, which can also work well with other residual structures and does not require position embedding. Extensive evaluations from eight Atari games demonstrate that our specially designed DeMa is compatible with trajectory optimization and surpasses previous state-of-the-art methods, outdoing Decision Transformer (DT) by 80% with 30% fewer parameters, and exceeds DT in MuJoCo with only a quarter of the parameters.

## 1 Introduction

Offline RL [1] has gained significant attention due to its ability to learn strategies without interacting with the environment, which is particularly beneficial in situations where real-time interaction is expensive or risky [2–4]. With a static dataset, it can be implemented through three distinct learning methods [5]: (1) model-based algorithm [6–8], (2) model-free algorithm [9–11], (3) trajectory optimization [12–16]. The first two methods require long-term credit assignment through the Bellman equation, leading to the "deadly triad" problem known to destabilize RL [17]. In contrast, most trajectory optimization methods are based on transformers and can perform credit assignment directly via the attention mechanism, which surpasses the performance of algorithms specifically designed for offline RL by leveraging the powerful modeling capabilities of transformers [18–20].

---

\*Corresponding authors: Li Shen and Jincal Huang.

The transformer attention mechanism [21], which allows the model to focus on the important part of the input sequence [22], has several downsides. The computational demands of the attention mechanism escalate quadratically with the input length, posing a significant constraint on its scalability [23–25]. Moreover, studies [26, 27] suggest that the attention mechanism may not be the actual contributing factor to the effectiveness of transformers. This notion is also supported in offline RL, where [13] discover that the attention mechanism of the DT does not capture local associations effectively, rendering it unsuitable for RL. Given these limitations, we are led to ponder if a more efficient mechanism with fewer parameters and greater scalability exists for offline RL. Recently, a series of state space models (SSMs) [28], particularly Mamba [29], have been proposed as potential solutions with the ability to scale linearly concerning the sequence length. In particular, Mamba introduces a selective hidden attention mechanism [30] for content-based reasoning and employs parallel scan to enhance computational efficiency, resulting in two approaches to employing Mamba in offline RL. The first is the Transformer-like Mamba, a direct substitution of the transformer [31–33] while the other is the RNN-like Mamba, achieving an inference speed with constant time complexity.

Few studies have explored the application of SSMs in offline RL, though they perform well in model-based algorithms [34, 35] and in-context RL learning [36]. Mamba is tailored for memory-required long-sequence tasks, whereas trajectory optimization methods typically utilize short segments during training and inference, as most RL tasks are modeled as Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), i.e. past information may not influence current decisions. Furthermore, due to the lack of a comprehensive investigation of the key component of Mamba, a question has arisen:

***Whether Mamba is compatible with trajectory optimization?***

In this work, we aim to undertake a thorough investigation and in-depth analysis to explore this question. Specifically, our focus is on the data structures and the network architectures in trajectory optimization. The extensive experiments provide strong support for the following key findings. (1) We explore the data structures with an analysis of sequence length and concatenating type. The former reveals that long input sequences present computational challenges without enhancing performance due to the hidden attention scores of DeMa evincing an exponential decay pattern. As a result, we opt for the Transformer-like DeMa as opposed to the RNN-like DeMa for efficiency and effectiveness. The latter finds concatenating in the temporal dimension is better for the Transformer-like DeMa. (2) The hidden attention mechanism plays a pivotal role in DeMa’s effectiveness and is compatible with the transformer’s post up-projection residual structure [37], enabling it to replace the attention layer directly and eliminating the need for position embedding. Extensive evaluations show that with an impressive 80% higher average score and nearly 30% fewer parameters, DeMa significantly outperforms DT in eight Atari games. Furthermore, in nine MuJoCo tasks, DeMa’s performance not only exceeds that of DT but does so with only one-fourth of the parameters, highlighting remarkable improvements in both performance efficiency and model compactness.

In the end, our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. We find the Transformer-like DeMa surpasses the RNN-like DeMa in both efficiency and effectiveness for trajectory optimization. Extensive experiments on sequence length and concatenating type show the impact of the input data, which guides the design of DeMa.
2. Through various ablation experiments, we discover that the hidden attention mechanism is the core component in DeMa and does not require position embedding. This finding enhances the effectiveness and efficiency of our Transformer-like DeMa.
3. Our Transformer-like DeMa achieves state-of-the-art performance in extensive benchmark tasks on both MuJoCo and Atari.

## **2 Related Work**

**Offline RL.** Offline RL is a data-driven reinforcement learning paradigm where the agent learns solely from a pre-collected dataset, rather than learning through interaction with the environment [16]. Due to the impact of distribution shift [11], directly deploying RL algorithms in an offline environment can lead to a significant decrease in performance. To mitigate this problem, various methods have been proposed. According to the study [5], these methods can be categorized into three approaches: (1) learning a dynamics model to generate additional training data [6, 38], (2) learning a policy through a model-free approach by constraining unseen actions or incorporating pessimism

into the value function [10, 11], and (3) trajectory optimization [12, 15]. The method of trajectory optimization is usually based on a causal transformer model and converts an RL problem to a sequence modeling problem [13]. It performs credit assignment directly through the attention mechanism in contrast to Bellman backups, thus modeling a wide distribution of behaviors, enabling better generalization and transfer [12].

**Sequence Modeling in offline RL.** Following DT [12] and Trajectory Transformer (TT) [15], there has been an increasing trend in employing advanced sequence-to-sequence model to solve RL tasks [14, 39–42].<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, these improvements are usually transformer-based and hence suffer from the common dilemma of the attention mechanism, i.e. over-parameterization and inability to scale to long sequence tasks. What’s more, Emmons et al. [44] find that simply maximizing likelihood with a two-layer feedforward MLP is close to the results of substantially more complex methods based on sequence modeling with Transformers. Similarly, study [45] finds that replacing the attention parameters with those learned in other environments has a minimal impact on the performance. Besides, Decision ConvFormer (DC) [13] indicates that substituting the attention layers with learnable parameters can lead to improved outcomes. These observations suggest significant redundancy in the Transformer architecture, highlighting the potential to explore lighter and more scalable networks for implementation in offline RL. Building on this, the Structure SSM (S4) [46] has emerged as a promising alternative. Studies [34, 35] use S4 in model-based RL, outperforming traditional Transformer and RNN approaches. The capabilities of S4 are further demonstrated by [36], which points to their speed and effectiveness in in-context reinforcement learning tasks.

The most related work to ours is Decision S4 (DS4) [47] and Decision Mamba (DMamba) [48], where the former uses an RNN-like S4 for inference, and the latter simply replaces the attention mechanism with Mamba directly. In contrast, our work finds that Transformer-like DeMa outperforms RNN-like DeMa as the long sequences impose a significant computational burden on Mamba without contributing to performance improvements. What’s more, DMamba simply substitutes Mamba for the attention block rather than the transformer block while our investigation shows the key component is the hidden attention mechanism, which eliminates the need for position embedding and hence achieves better performance with fewer parameters. Overall, our DeMa realizes a more effective and efficient method for trajectory optimization.

### 3 Preliminaries

In this section, we present several necessary preliminaries and terminologies of offline RL, trajectory optimization, state space model, and hidden attention in Mamba.

#### 3.1 Offline RL with Trajectory Optimization

Given a static dataset of transitions  $\tau = \{(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}, r_t)_i\}$ , where  $i$  presents the timestep of a transition in the dataset. The states and actions are generated by the behavior policy  $(s_t, a_t) \sim d^{\pi_\beta}(\cdot)$ , while the next states and rewards are determined by the unknown transition dynamics  $p(s', r|s, a)$ . The goal of offline RL is to find a policy  $\pi(a|\cdot)$  that maximizes expected return  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=0}^N r_t]$ . Due to the lack of interaction with the environment, trajectory optimization methods transform the goal into minimizing reconstruction loss, i.e. minimizing loss  $\mathbb{E}_{(\hat{r}_t, s, a) \sim \tau} [\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE/CE}}(\hat{a}_t; a_t)]$ , where  $\hat{a}_t = \pi(\cdot|s_{-K:t}, \hat{R}_{-K:t}, a_{-K:t-1})$ , and  $\hat{R}_t = \sum_{t'=t}^T r_{t'}$  is the return-to-go. At test time, a target RTG  $R_0$  is manually set to represent the desired performance. We input the trajectories from the last  $K$  timesteps into policy  $\pi$ , which then generates an action for the current timestep. Subsequently, the next state and reward are received from the environment. These elements are concatenated and also input into the model. The policy is approximated through the sequential model [12, 49]. However, these models typically possess a large number of parameters and struggle with handling long sequences effectively. Fortunately, this issue can be addressed by using SSMs [28, 46, 29].

<sup>1</sup>For detailed insights, one may refer to the relevant comprehensive reviews [16, 43].

### 3.2 State Space Model and Mamba

SSM is defined by the following first-order differential equation, which maps a 1-D input signal  $u(t)$  to an  $N$ -D latent state  $h(t)$  before projecting to a 1-D output signal  $y(t)$  [50],

$$h'(t) = Ah(t) + Bu(t), \quad y(t) = Ch(t) + Du(t). \quad (1)$$

As  $u(t)$  is typically discretized as  $\{u_k\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$ , SSM can be discretized by a step size  $\Delta$ .

Moreover, recurrent SSM can be written as a discrete convolution. Let  $h_0 = 0$  and  $D = 0$ , we have

$$y_k = \bar{C}\bar{A}^k\bar{B}u_1 + \bar{C}\bar{A}^{k-1}\bar{B}u_2 + \dots + \bar{C}\bar{A}\bar{B}u_{k-1} + \bar{C}\bar{B}u_k, \quad y = \bar{K} * u, \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}$  is the approximation discrete of  $A, B, C$ , and  $\bar{K}$  is called the SSM convolution kernel and can be represented by filter

$$\bar{K} \in \mathbb{R}^L = (\bar{C}\bar{B}, \bar{C}\bar{A}\bar{B}, \dots, \bar{C}\bar{A}^{L-1}\bar{B}). \quad (3)$$

S4 and other time-invariant models cannot select the previous tokens to invoke from their history records. To solve this problem, Mamba merges the sequence length and batch size of the inputs, allowing the matrices  $B, C$  and the step size  $\Delta$  to depend on the inputs. Therefore, it is a time-varying system and cannot use the convolution view. To make Mamba trains and infers efficiently, parallel scan, kernel fusion, and recomputation are used, thus two types of Mamba can be used. One is the SSM using the recursive view, and the other is the SSM using parallel scan, called RNN-like Mamba and Transformer-like Mamba. The former is akin to DS4 [47], wherein the complete trajectory is taken as a sample and fully inputted into the model for training. Utilizing this approach, which capitalizes on the ability to capture long-term dependencies, the inference speed can be significantly increased. During the inference process, it is sufficient to input only the current tuple  $(r_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, s_t)$  in conjunction with the hidden state  $h_t$ . The latter is a direct replacement for the transformer, where we consistently truncate the input sequences to a fixed length of  $K$  before their introduction into the model throughout the training and inference phases [48, 51–53].

### 3.3 Hidden Attention in Mamba

It is well known that the self-attention mechanism of the Transformer enables the model to dynamically focus on different parts of the input sequences by following the formulation

$$\text{Self-Attention}(x) = \alpha V(x), \quad \alpha = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right), \quad (4)$$

where  $Q, K, V$  represent queries, keys, and values respectively, i.e. input sequences after three linear transformations, and  $d_k$  is the dimension of the keys. Similarly, current research suggests that the S6 layer in mamba can be viewed as the hidden attention mechanism with a unique data-control linear operator [30]. By denoting the entire input sequence  $\hat{x} := (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_L) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D}$  where  $\hat{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$  and assuming the initial condition  $h_0 = 0$ , We can obtain a formula similar to Eq. (2)

$$y_i = C_i \sum_{j=1}^t (\Pi_{k=j+1}^i \bar{A}_k) \bar{B}_j x_j, \quad h_i = \sum_{j=1}^i (\Pi_{k=j+1}^i \bar{A}_k) \bar{B}_j x_j, \quad (5)$$

where  $B_i = S_B(\hat{x}_i), C_i = S_C(\hat{x}_i)$  are parameter matrices obtained through linear projection of the input  $\hat{x}_i$  and  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}$  is the discretization of  $A, B$ . Since  $\bar{A}_t$  is a diagonal matrix, [30] simplifies the hidden matrices and gets the attention mechanism of Mamba:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hidden-Attention}(x) &= \tilde{\alpha}x, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{i,j} \approx \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{H}_{i,j} \tilde{K}_j \\ \tilde{Q}_i &:= S_C(\hat{x}_i), \tilde{K}_j := \text{ReLU}(S_\Delta(\hat{x}_j)S_B(\hat{x}_j)), \tilde{H}_{i,j} := \exp\left(\sum_{\substack{k=j+1 \\ S_\Delta(\hat{x}_k) > 0}}^i S_\Delta(\hat{x}_k)\right)A. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, we can visualize the hidden attention matrices in DeMa, thus gaining a deeper understanding of the behavior inside the model.




Figure 1: Variant design of the DeMa in trajectory optimization. (1) Transformer-like DeMa and RNN-like DeMa are presented. (2) The input data can be concatenated in two distinct manners: B3LD and BL3D. (3) Mixer (Hidden attention) can combine with two types of residual structure. (4) Position embedding can be incorporated before the Mamba block alternatively.

## 4 The Analysis of DeMa

Considering that most trajectory optimization methods employ short segments during both training and inference, *the compatibility of Mamba with these methods remains an open question*. This section undertakes an analysis focusing on the data structures and network architectures, as seen in Fig. 1. Specifically, Section 4.1 first examines the comparison between two types of DeMa and seeks to clarify the reasons based on sequence length and the hidden attention mechanism. We discover that the RNN-like DeMa does not confer substantial benefits for trajectory optimization in terms of both effectiveness and efficiency. The key to achieving a balance between performance and efficiency lies in selecting an appropriate sequence length. Moreover, the concatenating type of input data significantly influences the results, with temporal concatenation (i.e., B3LD) proving to be effective. To better determine the key component of DeMa, Section 4.2 conducts various ablation studies, revealing that the hidden attention mechanism plays a crucial role. This aids us in better utilizing DeMa and replacing relevant components. Detailed experimental descriptions and additional experimental results are provided in the **Appendix**.

### 4.1 Input Data Structures

First, we conduct a comparison between the RNN-like DeMa and the Transformer-like DeMa. The average results are shown in Table 1 (with detailed results in Appendix E), where the performance of the RNN-like DeMa is significantly weaker than that of the Transformer-like DeMa, especially in Atari games. These findings suggest that the recurrent mode may be unnecessary in trajectory optimization methods. Given that the hyper-parameters are identical for both types of DeMa except for the sequence length, we assume that variations in sequence length are likely the primary cause of the observed disparities in results. Therefore, we explore the effect of sequence length on the Transformer-like DeMa in subsequent sections.

Table 1: The average result of DT, RNN-like DeMa and Transformer-like DeMa in MuJoCo [54] and Atari [55]. The results are reported with the normalization following [56, 11]. Detailed results can be seen in Appendix E.

Env	DT	RNN-like DeMa	Transformer-like DeMa
Atari	62.2	67.3	<b>97.9</b>
MuJoCo	63.4	61.1	<b>66.0</b>

**How does sequence length affect the computational load?** We investigate the impact of sequence length on single-step training time, single-step inference time and GPU memory usage for models including DT, Transformer-like DeMa, and RNN-like DeMa. Figure 2 shows that the Transformer-like DeMa operates faster than the RNN-like DeMa when dealing with short sequence lengths, despite that the inference time of RNN-like DeMa is independent of the sequence length. With conventional sequence lengths (such as 20), Transformer-like DeMa holds an advantage in forward speed, training speed, and GPU memory consumption.




Figure 2: The impact of sequence length on single-step forward computation time, single-step training time, and GPU memory usage. The sequence length of RNN-like DeMa is 1000. When dealing with shorter sequence lengths, it’s evident that the RNN-like DeMa has slower speed and larger consumption. BL3D and B3LD represent different concatenation types. Section 4.1 gives a comprehensive explanation.

**Finding 1:** Transformer-like DeMa is not only faster but also more memory-efficient than RNN-like DeMa for normal sequence length. The latter only becomes competitive when processing exceptionally long sequences.

**How does sequence length affect the performance of DeMa?** While the computational cost increases linearly with the expansion of the sequence length, it is crucial to recognize that the increased computational cost may not ensure a corresponding enhancement in the model’s performance. Performance may plateau or even decline as the input sequence length exceeds a certain threshold. As illustrated in Figure 3, DeMa’s performance reaches a plateau in the gym environment [57] when the input sequence surpasses a specific length; while performance significantly deteriorates with excessively long input sequences in the Atari environment.




Figure 3: Comparison of Transformer-like DeMa’s Performance on MuJoCo and Atari Tasks. Observations reveal that on these tasks, the model achieves peak performance when operating with shorter sequence durations. We report mean values averaged over 3 seeds, shaded areas represent deviations.

**Finding 2:** Transformer-like DeMa performs well with a short sequence length. Extending the sequence length beyond an optimal threshold does not yield further improvements and may adversely affect the model’s performance.

**Why does DeMa require merely short input sequences?** We calculate the hidden attention scores in DeMa via Eq. (5)-(6), which reflect the importance of historical information to DeMa. Fig. 4 shows the hidden attention scores of the last  $K$  tokens at each decision-making step (from the 300th to the 600th step). It can be seen that the attention scores exhibit exponential decay as the tokens become increasingly distant from the current decision-making moment, which aligns with the forgetting property of a Markov chain [13]. What’s more, the hidden attention across different decision steps

exhibits a periodic pattern towards the current token, suggesting that the model may have learned kinematic features, as agents in these environments engage in periodic movements.<sup>2</sup>




Figure 4: Hidden attention scores of DeMa from the 300th to the 600th timestep in Hopper-medium-replay. The X-axis represents timesteps from 300 to 600, the Y-axis represents the past  $K$  tokens, and the Z-axis indicates the attention scores given to the  $K$  tokens at the time of the current decision. More can be seen in Appendix H.

**Finding 3:** The reason the Transformer-like DeMa requires only short sequences is that the hidden attention mechanism primarily focuses on the current token.

**Which types of concatenation methods are suitable for DeMa?** Models like the Transformer and Mamba typically process inputs token by token. However, given an MDP, there are three elements  $s, a, r$  to consider. Therefore a significant design consideration is the method of concatenating these three elements into a suitable token format for the model. We conduct an experiment to investigate the suitable design for DeMa. By Table 2, concatenating the three elements in the temporal dimension yields better results. This may be due to the significant differences between the three elements of the MDP. As illustrated in [14], states and actions symbolize fundamentally dissimilar notions, concatenating them in the embedding dimension directly may make it more difficult for the model to recognize, leading to poorer results.

**Finding 4:** Concatenating state, action, and  $rtg$  along the embedding dimension has a significant negative impact on the results.

Table 2: Comparison of input concatenation methods. "BL3D" presents concatenating input tokens in embedding dimension, while "B3LD" presents concatenating input tokens in the temporal dimension as shown in Fig. 1. The results are reported with the gamer-normalized, following [56], averaged across three random seeds. Best mean scores are highlighted in bold.

Game	BL3D	B3LD
Breakout	72.8±10.6	<b>314.7±10.7</b>
Qbert	32.2±14.1	<b>54.4±6.8</b>
Pong	<b>101.9±6.9</b>	98.2±12.0
Seaquest	1.3±0	<b>2.7±0.002</b>
Asterix	3.9±0.3	<b>7.8±0.4</b>
Frostbite	26.3±20.9	<b>31.1±0.01</b>
Assault	127.9±7.1	<b>169.4±33.1</b>
Gopher	190.3±60.1	<b>215.8±29.2</b>
<b>Average</b>	69.6	<b>111.8</b>

## 4.2 Rethinking the Essential Attributes of Mamba in Offline RL

Aside from the perspective of input data, this section delves into DeMa from the standpoint of network architecture. We primarily investigate the following questions: (1) Considering that some DTs do not heavily rely on attention mechanism [13, 45], is the hidden attention mechanism crucial for DeMa? (2) As the Mamba block is an integration of the hidden attention mechanism with pre up-projection residual blocks [37], what impact will it have on the performance when integrating it with other residual structures (i.e. the post up-projection residual block in the transformer)? (3) With the inherent recurrent nature of SSM [58], does DeMa need position embedding? (Appendix F)

**Is the hidden attention mechanism crucial for DeMa?** [27] shows that the transformer does not heavily rely on attention, and [13] finds the attention mechanism of DT is not suitable for RL. Given these insights, we aim to investigate whether a similar phenomenon exists in hidden attention. In line with [45], we evaluate DeMa by swapping the hidden attention weights trained in different environments, in addition to randomizing and zeroing these weights. As depicted in Fig. 5, the performance exhibits a marked decrease regardless of whether the parameters are replaced with

<sup>2</sup>It is worth noting that what we want to know is the attention scores to the previous  $K$  tokens at each decision-making step, which is a bit different from the attention scores between output  $y_i$  and input  $x_j$ , which is explained in detail in Appendix H.

those pre-trained in other environments or randomized. Interestingly, when the parameters of hidden attention are set to zero, the model still maintains a certain level of performance. This zeroing of parameters completely removes the hidden attention, ceasing to process historical information and relying solely on residual connections to transmit information. This suggests that the residual connections are functional and the role of hidden attention is crucial for DeMa.




Figure 5: Normalized return after swapping the hidden attention of a single layer from another DeMa at a time. The black dashed line represents the evaluation results of the original model. “1”, “2”, “3” represent the index of swap layers respectively and “all” represents the result after swapping all parameters of the hidden attention. It can be seen that swapping the hidden attention has a significant impact on the results.

**Finding 5:** The hidden attention mechanism plays a significant role in DeMa, unlike the overly parameterized and less useful attention mechanisms in transformers.

**What occurs when combining hidden attention with post up-projection residual blocks?**

Mamba represents the integration of the hidden attention mechanism with pre up-projection residual blocks as discussed in [37]. To determine the contributing factor to the model’s enhanced performance, we explore the combination of hidden attention with post up-projection residual blocks in transformer. According to the results presented in Table 3 and Table 4, although the overall average results of DeMa are slightly better than those of DeMa with post., it is observable that they each have advantages in different environments. Hence, we believe that the performance differences when integrating with the two types of residual blocks are not statistically significant. It suggests that the structure of the residual blocks exerts minimal influence on the outcome. Given that both configurations yield a measurable performance improvement over the DT, it is reasonable to conclude that the hidden attention mechanism within DeMa plays a pivotal role.

Table 3: Performance comparison between DT, hidden attention with post up-projection residual block in the transformer(DeMa with post.) and hidden attention with pre up-projection residual block (DeMa) in Atari.

Game	DT	DeMa with post.	DeMa
Breakout	242.4±31.8	296.2±216.3	<b>314.7±10.7</b>
Qbert	28.8±10.3	<b>56.9±10.4</b>	54.4±6.8
Pong	<b>105.6±2.9</b>	104.6±11.9	98.2±12.0
Seaquest	<b>2.7±0.7</b>	2.6±0.001	<b>2.7±0.002</b>
Asterix	5.2±1.2	6.5±1.8	<b>7.8±0.4</b>
Frostbite	25.6±2.1	<b>31.8±4.8</b>	31.1±0.01
Assault	52.1±36.2	146.4±16.1	<b>169.4±33.1</b>
Gopher	34.8±10.0	<b>228.9±81.5</b>	215.8±29.2
<b>Average</b>	62.2	109.2	<b>111.8</b>

slightly better than those of DeMa with post., it is observable that they each have advantages in different environments. Hence, we believe that the performance differences when integrating with the two types of residual blocks are not statistically significant. It suggests that the structure of the residual blocks exerts minimal influence on the outcome. Given that both configurations yield a measurable performance improvement over the DT, it is reasonable to conclude that the hidden attention mechanism within DeMa plays a pivotal role.

**Finding 6:** The results obtained using both post up-projection and pre up-projection types of residual block structures are similar while they both perform better than DT. Therefore, the hidden attention mechanism is key to its success.

**5 Evaluations on Offline RL Benchmarks**

In this section, we delve into a comparative analysis of DeMa’s performance against various DTs. Our investigation primarily centers on the influence of disparate network architectures on the experimental outcomes. Consistent with antecedent studies, we assessed both discrete (Atari [55]) and continuous



Table 4: Performance comparison between DT, hidden attention with post up-projection residual block in the transformer (DeMa with post.) and hidden attention with pre up-projection residual block (DeMa) in MuJoCo.

Dataset	Env-Gym	DT	DeMa with post.	DeMa
M	HalfCheetah	42.6	42.7±0.02	<b>43±0.01</b>
M	Hopper	68.4	68.4±2.1	<b>74.5±2.9</b>
M	Walker	75.5	<b>77.5±2.2</b>	76.6±0.2
M-R	HalfCheetah	37.0	<b>40.8±0.18</b>	40.7±0.03
M-R	Hopper	85.6	86.1±26.9	<b>90.7±6.1</b>
M-R	Walker	71.2	<b>74.43±2.1</b>	70.5±0.1
M-E	HalfCheetah	88.8	83.8±18	<b>93.2±0.01</b>
M-E	Hopper	109.6	109.8±0.2	<b>111±0.03</b>
M-E	Walker	<b>109.3</b>	<b>109.6±0.3</b>	106±11.7
<b>Average-Gym</b>		76.4	77.0	<b>78.5</b>

control tasks (MuJoCo [59]), presenting the normalized scores accordingly. Given that the sequence length considerably affects the results, we selected the optimal outcomes from sequence lengths  $K = 8$  to  $K = 20$  for DeMa. The detailed hyper-parameters on DeMa are available in Appendix D. Our main results are shown in Table 5 and 6. DeMa achieve an impressive 80% higher average score compared to DT in Atari games and the parameters of DeMa and the number of MACs is 5 times fewer than that of DT as shown in Table 7. Moreover, DeMa has better scalability for input length which can be seen in Fig. 2, it maintains a slow linear growth with the input sequence length increases while the computational cost of the Transformer grows quadratically. These results demonstrate that our transformer-like DeMa is well-suited for integration with trajectory optimization methods.

Table 5: Results for 1% DQN-replay datasets. We evaluate the performance of DeMa on eight Atari games.

Game	CQL	BC	DT	DC	DC <sup>hybrid</sup>	DeMa(Ours)
Breakout	211.1	142.7	242.4±31.8	352.7±44.7	<b>416.0 ±105.4</b>	314.7±10.7
Qbert	<b>104.2</b>	20.3	28.8±10.3	67.0±14.7	62.6 ±9.4	54.4±6.8
Pong	<b>111.9</b>	76.9	105.6±2.9	106.5±2.0	111.1 ±1.7	98.2±12.0
Seaquest	1.7	2.2	<b>2.7±0.7</b>	2.6±0.3	<b>2.7 ±0.04</b>	<b>2.7±0.002</b>
Asterix	4.6	4.7	5.2±1.2	6.5±1.0	6.3 ±1.8	<b>7.8±0.4</b>
Frostbite	9.4	16.1	25.6±2.1	27.8±3.7	28.0 ±1.8	<b>31.1±0.01</b>
Assault	73.2	62.1	52.1±36.2	73.8±20.3	79.0 ±13.1	<b>169.4±33.1</b>
Gopher	2.8	33.8	34.8±10.0	52.5±9.3	51.6 ±10.7	<b>215.8±29.2</b>
<b>Average</b>	64.9	44.9	62.2	86.2	94.7	<b>111.8</b>

Table 6: Results for MuJoCo. The dataset names are abbreviated as follows: "medium" as "M", "medium-replay" as "M-R". The results are reported with the expert-normalized following [11].

Dataset	Environment	CQL	DS4	RvS	DT	GDT	DeMa(Ours)
M	HalfCheetah	44.0	42.5	41.6	42.6	42.9	43±0.01
M	Hopper	58.5	54.2	60.2	68.4	65.8	<b>74.5±2.9</b>
M	Walker	72.5	78.0	71.7	75.5	77.8	76.6±0.2
M-R	HalfCheetah	45.5	15.2	38	37.0	39.9	40.7±0.03
M-R	Hopper	95.0	49.6	73.5	85.6	81.6	<b>90.7±6.1</b>
M-R	Walker	77.2	69.0	60.6	71.2	<b>74.8</b>	70.5±0.1
M-E	HalfCheetah	91.6	92.7	92.2	88.8	92.4	<b>93.2±0.01</b>
M-E	Hopper	105.4	110.8	101.7	109.6	110.9	<b>111±0.03</b>
M-E	Walker	108.8	105.7	106.0	<b>109.3</b>	<b>109.3</b>	106±11.7
<b>Average</b>		77.6	68.6	71.7	76.4	76.8	<b>78.5</b>

Table 7: The resource usage for training DT, DC on Atari and MuJoCo.

Complexity		DT	DC	DeMa(Ours)
Atari	Training time per step(ms)	55	<b>43</b>	50
	GPU memory usage(GiB)	4.2	<b>3.0</b>	4.2
	MACs	12.1G/46.5G	11.1G/40.6G	<b>8.8G/36.3G</b>
	All params #	2.35M	1.94M	<b>1.7M</b>
Gym	Training time per step(ms)	56/58	<b>53.6/53.9</b>	57.6/58.8
	GPU memory usage(GiB)	0.65/0.8	<b>0.55/0.6</b>	1.0/1.0
	MACs	2.5G/9.5G	1.6G/6.1G	<b>0.7G/2.1G</b>
	All params #	726.2K/2.6M	536K/1.9M	<b>175.5K/500.0K</b>

## 6 Conclusion

To investigate whether Mamba is compatible with trajectory optimization in offline RL, this work conducts comprehensive experiments from the aspect of data structures and network architectures. We find that (1) DeMa needs merely short sequence length and the temporal concatenation method, as its focus on sequences decays approximately exponentially. Thus we introduce a Transformer-like DeMa in trajectory optimization. (2) The hidden attention mechanism is important for DeMa, it can combine with other residual structures and does not need for position embedding. Based on the insights gained from the investigation, we present DeMa. Extensive evaluations shows our DeMa outstrips previous state-of-the-art methods. It yields an 80% improvement over the Decision Transformer (DT) while using 30% fewer parameters. In MuJoCo, DeMa outpaces DT using only one-fourth of the parameters. In conclusion, our DeMa is compatible with trajectory optimization in offline RL.

**Limitations.** We investigate the application of Mamba in the trajectory optimization method. However, the exploration of online and multi-task environments requires a more in-depth approach. The RNN-like DeMa may more suitable for complex tasks that require memory and involve long sequences using more training data. This assumption also warrants further research.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank zigzagcai for his code.

## References

- [1] Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.
- [2] B Ravi Kiran, Ibrahim Sobh, Victor Talpaert, Patrick Mannion, Ahmad A Al Sallab, Senthil Yogamani, and Patrick Pérez. Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous driving: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):4909–4926, 2021.
- [3] David Brandfonbrener, Will Whitney, Rajesh Ranganath, and Joan Bruna. Offline rl without off-policy evaluation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:4933–4946, 2021.
- [4] M Mehdi Afsar, Trafford Crump, and Behrouz Far. Reinforcement learning based recommender systems: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(7):1–38, 2022.
- [5] Rafael Figueiredo Prudencio, Marcos ROA Maximo, and Esther Luna Colombini. A survey on offline reinforcement learning: Taxonomy, review, and open problems. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [6] Rahul Kidambi, Aravind Rajeswaran, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Thorsten Joachims. Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:21810–21823, 2020.
- [7] Cong Lu, Philip J Ball, Jack Parker-Holder, Michael A Osborne, and Stephen J Roberts. Revisiting design choices in offline model-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04135*, 2021.
- [8] Haoyang He. A survey on offline model-based reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03360*, 2023.
- [9] Phillip Swazinna, Steffen Udluft, Daniel Hein, and Thomas Runkler. Comparing model-free and model-based algorithms for offline reinforcement learning. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 55(15):19–26, 2022.

- [10] Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1861–1870. PMLR, 2018.
- [11] Scott Fujimoto, David Meger, and Doina Precup. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2052–2062. PMLR, 2019.
- [12] Lili Chen, Kevin Lu, Aravind Rajeswaran, Kimin Lee, Aditya Grover, Misha Laskin, Pieter Abbeel, Aravind Srinivas, and Igor Mordatch. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:15084–15097, 2021.
- [13] Jeonghye Kim, Suyoung Lee, Woojun Kim, and Youngchul Sung. Decision convformer: Local filtering in metaformer is sufficient for decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03022*, 2023.
- [14] Shengchao Hu, Li Shen, Ya Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. Graph decision transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03747*, 2023.
- [15] Michael Janner, Qiyang Li, and Sergey Levine. Offline reinforcement learning as one big sequence modeling problem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:1273–1286, 2021.
- [16] Shengchao Hu, Li Shen, Ya Zhang, Yixin Chen, and Dacheng Tao. On transforming reinforcement learning by transformer: The development trajectory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14164*, 2022.
- [17] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [18] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- [19] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [20] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [21] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [22] Sneha Chaudhari, Varun Mithal, Gungor Polatkan, and Rohan Ramanath. An attentive survey of attention models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 12(5):1–32, 2021.
- [23] Zhuoran Shen, Mingyuan Zhang, Haiyu Zhao, Shuai Yi, and Hongsheng Li. Efficient attention: Attention with linear complexities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 3531–3539, 2021.
- [24] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5156–5165. PMLR, 2020.
- [25] Tri Dao. Flashattention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.
- [26] Yi Tay, Dara Bahri, Donald Metzler, Da-Cheng Juan, Zhe Zhao, and Che Zheng. Synthesizer: Rethinking self-attention for transformer models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10183–10192. PMLR, 2021.
- [27] Weihao Yu, Mi Luo, Pan Zhou, Chenyang Si, Yichen Zhou, Xinchao Wang, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. Metaformer is actually what you need for vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10819–10829, 2022.
- [28] James D Hamilton. State-space models. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:3039–3080, 1994.
- [29] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00752*, 2023.
- [30] Ameen Ali, Itamar Zimmerman, and Lior Wolf. The hidden attention of mamba models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01590*, 2024.

- [31] Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Yi Wang, Yinan He, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videomamba: State space model for efficient video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06977*, 2024.
- [32] Yue Liu, Yunjie Tian, Yuzhong Zhao, Hongtian Yu, Lingxi Xie, Yaowei Wang, Qixiang Ye, and Yunfan Liu. Vmamba: Visual state space model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10166*, 2024.
- [33] Lianghui Zhu, Bencheng Liao, Qian Zhang, Xinlong Wang, Wenyu Liu, and Xinggang Wang. Vision mamba: Efficient visual representation learning with bidirectional state space model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09417*, 2024.
- [34] Mohammad Reza Samsami, Artem Zhulus, Janarthanan Rajendran, and Sarath Chandar. Mastering memory tasks with world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04253*, 2024.
- [35] Fei Deng, Junyeong Park, and Sungjin Ahn. Facing off world model backbones: Rnns, transformers, and s4. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [36] Chris Lu, Yannick Schroecker, Albert Gu, Emilio Parisotto, Jakob Foerster, Satinder Singh, and Feryal Behbahani. Structured state space models for in-context reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [37] Maximilian Beck, Korbinian Pöppel, Markus Spanring, Andreas Auer, Oleksandra Prudnikova, Michael Kopp, Günter Klambauer, Johannes Brandstetter, and Sepp Hochreiter. xlstm: Extended long short-term memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04517*, 2024.
- [38] Tianhe Yu, Aviral Kumar, Rafael Rafailov, Aravind Rajeswaran, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Combo: Conservative offline model-based policy optimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:28954–28967, 2021.
- [39] Shengchao Hu, Li Shen, Ya Zhang, and Dacheng Tao. Prompt-tuning decision transformer with preference ranking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09648*, 2023.
- [40] Qinqing Zheng, Amy Zhang, and Aditya Grover. Online decision transformer. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 27042–27059. PMLR, 2022.
- [41] Yueh-Hua Wu, Xiaolong Wang, and Masashi Hamaya. Elastic decision transformer. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [42] Kuang-Huei Lee, Ofir Nachum, Mengjiao Sherry Yang, Lisa Lee, Daniel Freeman, Sergio Guadarrama, Ian Fischer, Winnie Xu, Eric Jang, Henryk Michalewski, et al. Multi-game decision transformers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27921–27936, 2022.
- [43] Wenzhe Li, Hao Luo, Zichuan Lin, Chongjie Zhang, Zongqing Lu, and Deheng Ye. A survey on transformers in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.03044*, 2023.
- [44] Scott Emmons, Benjamin Eysenbach, Ilya Kostrikov, and Sergey Levine. Rvs: What is essential for offline rl via supervised learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10751*, 2021.
- [45] Daniel Lawson and Ahmed H Qureshi. Merging decision transformers: Weight averaging for forming multi-task policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07551*, 2023.
- [46] Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Ré. Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00396*, 2021.
- [47] Shmuel Bar David, Itamar Zimmerman, Eliya Nachmani, and Lior Wolf. Decision s4: Efficient sequence-based rl via state spaces layers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [48] Toshihiro Ota. Decision mamba: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling with selective state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19925*, 2024.
- [49] Michael Janner, Yilun Du, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Sergey Levine. Planning with diffusion for flexible behavior synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09991*, 2022.
- [50] Sidd Karamcheti Sasha Rush. The annotated s4. <https://srush.github.io/annotated-s4/>, 2023.
- [51] Jun Ma, Feifei Li, and Bo Wang. U-mamba: Enhancing long-range dependency for biomedical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04722*, 2024.
- [52] Yijun Yang, Zhaohu Xing, and Lei Zhu. Vivim: a video vision mamba for medical video object segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14168*, 2024.

- [53] Zeyu Zhang, Akide Liu, Ian Reid, Richard Hartley, Bohan Zhuang, and Hao Tang. Motion mamba: Efficient and long sequence motion generation with hierarchical and bidirectional selective ssm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07487*, 2024.
- [54] Emanuel Todorov, Tom Erez, and Yuval Tassa. Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 5026–5033. IEEE, 2012.
- [55] Marc G Bellemare, Yavar Naddaf, Joel Veness, and Michael Bowling. The arcade learning environment: An evaluation platform for general agents. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:253–279, 2013.
- [56] Weirui Ye, Shaohuai Liu, Thanard Kurutach, Pieter Abbeel, and Yang Gao. Mastering atari games with limited data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:25476–25488, 2021.
- [57] Greg Brockman, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. Openai gym, 2016.
- [58] Weihao Yu and Xinchao Wang. Mambaout: Do we really need mamba for vision? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07992*, 2024.
- [59] Justin Fu, Aviral Kumar, Ofir Nachum, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. D4rl: Datasets for deep data-driven reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07219*, 2020.
- [60] Rishabh Agarwal, Dale Schuurmans, and Mohammad Norouzi. An optimistic perspective on offline reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 104–114. PMLR, 2020.
- [61] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [62] Aviral Kumar, Aurick Zhou, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. Conservative q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1179–1191, 2020.

# Supplementary Material for

## Is Mama Compatible with Trajectory Optimization in Offline Reinforcement Learning?

### Contents

<b>A Environment and Dataset</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>B Baselines</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C The Procedure of Training and Inference</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>D Implementation details of DeMa</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>E Detailed results</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>F Further Ablation Study</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>G MuJoCo and Atari Tasks Scores</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>H Types of Hidde Attention Scores</b>	<b>17</b>

### A Environment and Dataset

**MuJoCo.** The MuJoCo domain [54] evaluates the performance of RL algorithms in continuous control tasks. In keeping with previous studies, we select three games from the standard locomotion environments [54] in Gym[57], namely HalfCheetah, Hopper, and Walker, and three different dataset settings, namely medium, medium-replay, and medium-expert [59].

**Atari.** Atari [55] is an ideal platform for evaluating an agent’s ability in long-term credit assignments. We conduct experiments in eight different games: Breakout, Qbert, Pong, Seaquest, Asterix, Frostbite, Assault, and Gopher. We use 1% DQN Replay Dataset [60] as our training dataset, which encompasses a total of 500,000 timesteps worth of samples generated throughout the training process of a DQN agent [61]. It’s worth noting that the version of ‘atari-py’ and ‘gym’ we use is 0.2.5 and 0.19.0 respectively, which is noted by the official code in [https://github.com/google-research/batch\\_rl](https://github.com/google-research/batch_rl).

### B Baselines

**Baselines for MuJoCo.** To evaluate DeMa’s performance in the MuJoCo, we compare DeMa with one value-based method: CQL [62] and four trajectory optimization methods with different network architectures: DS4 [47], RvS [4], DT [12], GDT [14] and obtain baseline performance scores for CQL and DS4 from [13], for RvS from [4] and for GDT from [14].

**Baselines for Atari.** In the Atari domain, we compare DeMa with CQL [62], DT [12], DC and DC<sup>hybrid</sup> [13]. The result of baselines are directly borrowed from [13].

### C The Procedure of Training and Inference

**Training resources** We use one NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 to train each model in MuJoCo and one NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 to train each model in Atari. Training each model typically takes 3-8 hours and 5-14 hours in MuJoCo and Atari respectively. However, since each environment needs to be trained three times with different seeds, the total training time is usually multiplied by three.

Table 8: Hyper-parameters of DeMa for MuJoCo.

Hyper-parameter	Value
Layers	3
Embedding dimension	128
Nonlinearity function	\
Batch size	64
Context length $K$	20
Dropout	0.0
Learning rate	$10^{-4}$
Grad norm clip	0.25
Weight decay	$10^{-4}$
Learning rate decay	Linear warmup for first $10^5$ training steps
d_model	64
d_state	64
expand	2

**The procedure of Transformer-like DeMa** The Training and evaluation for Transformer-like DeMa are similar to variant DTs. Given a dataset of offline trajectories, we randomly select a starting point and truncate it into a sequence of length  $K$ . After forming a batch of data, it is input into the model for training. We minimize the reconstruction loss between the predicted action and the actual action, i.e. the cross-entropy loss for discrete actions and Mean Square Error (MSE) for continuous actions. The input data is also a sequence of length  $K$  in the evaluation phase.

**The procedure of RNN-like DeMa** For RNN-like DeMa, the input during training is a batch of complete trajectories. As different trajectories have different lengths, we pad the trajectories to the same length before inputting them into the model and mask the loss of the padding. However, training with full trajectories rather than truncated sequences may be more inefficient, especially in scenarios where sequence lengths vary widely. In the DQN Replay Dataset in Atari, the lengths of different trajectories varied dramatically. Some trajectories might only be 500 timesteps long, while others could contain a sample with a length of 10,000 timesteps. This causes a lot of computing resources to be wasted on meaningless padding, resulting in inefficiency and ineffectiveness. Some techniques, similar to flash attention, can avoid this issue. One can refer to this PR.

## D Implementation details of DeMa

We implement DeMa using the official DT code (<https://github.com/kzl/decision-transformer>) and incorporate the Mamba network (<https://github.com/state-spaces/mamba.git>). We have also adopted the code from hidden attention to calculate the attention scores of DeMa on the current input sequence at each decision step. Given that the official Mamba code utilizes Triton, we have also employed Mamba-minimal fully based on pytorch to compute the MACs of DeMa.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 provide a comprehensive list of hyper-parameters for our proposed transformer-like DeMa and RNN-like DeMa applied to MuJoCo and Atari environments. To ensure a fair comparison, we adopt similar hyper-parameter settings to DT [12] and DC [13].

### D.1 Hyper-parameters in MuJoCo

For our training on MuJoCo, the majority of the hyper-parameters in Table 8 are adapted from [13]. For the learning rate, we use a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$  for training in hopper-medium, hopper-medium-replay, and walker2d-medium and use  $10^{-3}$  for other environments. For the embedding dimension, we use an embedding dimension of 256 in hopper-medium and hopper-medium-replay, while use 128 in the other environments. What’s more, as DeMa does not use multilayer perceptron (MLP), so there is no nonlinearity function for DeMa. As for DeMa with post. in Table 3, we use ReLU as per convention. For DeMa’s hyper-parameters, we use a d\_model of 128 in all expert datasets, while use 64 in the other environments. As for d\_state and expand, we set 64 and 2 respectively for all env. We keep the experimental parameters consistent for all types of DeMa in MuJoCo.

## D.2 Hyper-parameters in Atari

**Transformer-like DeMa.** For the Atari game we mostly follow those in Table 9 from [12]. The only adjustment made is to the context length  $K$  and return-to-go conditioning. As revealed in Figure 3, the sequence length is not always better when it’s longer. Thus for Qbert and Frostbite we use  $K = 8$ . For other games, we keep  $K = 30$ . As for the return-to-go conditioning, we find the return obtained by DeMa in some games has already exceeded the initial return-to-go set for DT. Therefore, we increase the return-to-go so that DeMa can fully demonstrate its performance.

Table 9: Hyper-parameters of Transformer-like DeMa for Atari.

Hyper-parameter	Value
Layers	6
Embedding dimension	256
Nonlinearity function	ReLU(state encoder)
Batch size	128
Context length $K$	30
Return-to-go conditioning	90 Breakout, 12000 Qbert 20 Pong, 1750 Seaquest 700 Asterix, 1450 Frostbite 1200 Assault, 6500 Gopher
Dropout	0.1
Learning rate	$6 \times 10^{-4}$
Grad norm clip	1
Weight decay	0.1
Learning rate decay	Linear warmup and cosine decay (see code for details)
Max epochs	10
Adam betas	(0.9, 0.95)
Warmup tokens	512*20
Final tokens	6*500000*K
d_model	128
d_conv	4
d_state	64
expand	2

**RNN-like DeMa.** Due to the fact that the RNN-like DeMa utilizes trajectories for training and the trajectories in Atari are exceptionally lengthy, the available sample size becomes significantly limited when only 1% of the DQN-replay dataset is utilized. If the prior parameter settings were to be used, the training would done after only a few hundred upgrades, thereby resulting in an unsatisfactory performance. Therefore, we consider multiple updates for a single sample, while simultaneously lowering the learning rate as shown in Table 10. What’s more, due to the limitation of GPU memory, we can only set a batch size of 8 for atari games. Specially, For the Frostbite, we set a batch size of 1, a epoch of 50. The other hyper-parameters are kept consistent with those in Table 9.

Table 10: Hyper-parameters of RNN-like DeMa for Atari. The other hyper-parameters are kept consistent with those in Table 9.

Hyper-parameter	Value
Context length	all trajectory
Batch size	8
Learning rate	$10^{-4}$
inner_it	200



## E Detailed results

Table 11 and 12 shows detailed results between RNN-like DeMa<sup>3</sup> and Transformer-like DeMa. It can be observed that the performance of the RNN-like DeMa is not as good as that of the Transformer-like DeMa, and Fig. 2 also shows that the RNN-like DeMa requires more computational overhead. Hence, using the RNN model in trajectory optimization seems to be unnecessary, as section 4.1 finds that past historical information does not provide much assistance to current decision-making. However, in tasks that require memory capability or are model-based, the RNN-like DeMa could be a better choice. This could be a direction for deeper future research based on [34–36].

Table 11: The Comparison of DT, RNN-like DeMa, and Transformer-like DeMa in Atari Games.

Env	DT	RNN-like DeMa	Transformer-like DeMa
Breakout	242.4±31.8	166.0	<b>314.7±10.7</b>
Qbert	28.8±10.3	13.6	<b>54.4±6.8</b>
Pong	105.6±2.9	<b>109.6</b>	98.2±12.0
Seaquest	<b>2.7±0.7</b>	1.7	<b>2.7±0.002</b>
Asterix	5.2±1.2	4.7	<b>7.8±0.4</b>
Frostbite	25.6±2.1	8.6	<b>31.1±0.01</b>
Assault	52.1±36.2	117.8	<b>169.4±33.1</b>
Gopher	34.8±10.0	116.7	<b>215.8±29.2</b>
<b>Average</b>	62.2	67.3	<b>111.8</b>

Table 12: The comparison between DT, RNN-like DeMa and Transformer-like DeMa in MuJoCo.

Dataset	Environment	DT	RNN-like DeMa	Transformer-like DeMa
M	HalfCheetah	42.6	42.6±0	<b>43±0.01</b>
M	Hopper	68.4	61.7±4.9	<b>74.5±2.9</b>
M	Walker	75.5	<b>76.7±0.2</b>	76.6±0.2
M-R	HalfCheetah	37.0	36.9±0.3	<b>40.7±0.03</b>
M-R	Hopper	85.6	80.5±25.8	<b>90.7±6.1</b>
M-R	Walker	<b>71.2</b>	68.1±8.1	<b>70.5±0.1</b>
<b>Average</b>		63.4	61.1	<b>66.0</b>

## F Further Ablation Study

**DeMa does not need the position embedding.** Position embedding is generally used in transformers to help the model understand the sequential nature of the data. It’s a way of encoding the position of tokens in the sequence, and it can be crucial in tasks where the order of the data matters. Although we can use DeMa similar to using a transformer, which has input and output dimensions of (B, L, D) during training and inference, it differs in that it does not require position embedding to help the model have the ability to remember sequential information. As shown in Table 13, the addition of position embedding not only failed to enhance the performance of the model but also led to a significant decrease in performance on certain tasks. Additionally, the introduction of position embedding significantly increased the model’s parameter count, thereby adding to its computational burden. This finding highlights the advantage of the DeMa in terms of lightweight design, indicating its suitability for tasks with limited resources.

## G MuJoCo and Atari Tasks Scores

Table 14 shows the normalized scores used in MuJoCo and Atari tasks, followed by [59] and [56].

## H Types of Hidde Attention Scores

In the previous articles [13], the visualization of attention in DT was in the form of a lower triangular matrix. However, this lower-triangular matrix reflects the attention scores of each generated token to

<sup>3</sup>Due to the high experimental costs, we only run the RNN-like DeMa in Atari once.

Table 13: The effect of position embedding.

Dataset	Env	DeMa with pos. embed.	DeMa without pos. embed.
M	HalfCheetah	42.8±0	<b>43±0.01</b>
M	Hopper	71.2±14.6	<b>74.5±2.9</b>
M	Walker	<b>77.2±0.1</b>	76.6±0.2
M-R	HalfCheetah	40.2±0.1	<b>40.7±0.03</b>
M-R	Hopper	77.2±35	<b>90.7±6.1</b>
M-R	Walker	69.1±10.2	<b>70.5±0.1</b>
<b>Average</b>		63.0	<b>66.0</b>
<b>All params #</b>		431.5K	<b>175.5K</b>

Table 14: MuJoCo and Atari baseline scores used for normalization

	Env/Game	Random	Expert/Gamer
Gym	Hopper	-20.3	3234.3
	Halfcheetah	-280.2	12135
	Walker2d	1.6	4592.3
Atari	Breakout	1.7	30.5
	Qbert	163.9	13455
	Pong	-20.7	14.6
	Seaquest	68.4	42054.7
	Asterix	210	8503
	Frostbite	65	4335
	Assault	222	742
	Gopher	258	2412

the input sequence during the training phase, and it cannot accurately illustrate the context information that the model focuses on at each decision-making step. As can be seen, the element in Fig. 6 at the  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -th column represents the output  $y_i$ 's attention score to input  $x_j$ . In the training phase, all corresponding predicting actions are used to calculate the reconstructed loss with target actions. However, during the evaluation phase, i.e. when interacting with the environment, we input  $x : (1, L, D)$ , and the model also outputs  $y : (1, L, D)$ . At this time, we only use the last one of the model's output, which is  $y[:, -1, :]$ , corresponding to the last row in the matrix. Therefore, it is not quite appropriate to judge the context information the model focuses on at each decision-making step based on the lower-triangular matrix in Fig. 6, as we want to understand the model's decision-making behavior at each step, thus leads to the creation of Fig. 4, 7 and Fig. 8. It also demonstrates strong forgetting characteristics. This aligns with the properties of Markov chains as described in [13], where the sequence of states precisely forms a Markov chain.




Figure 6: Hidden Attention Score Matrix of each channel and layer in Hopper-medium. The element  $A_{ij}$  present the attention score between output  $y_i$  and input  $x_j$




Figure 7: Hidden attention scores of DeMa from the 300th to the 600th timestep in Walker2d-medium.




Figure 8: Hidden attention scores of DeMa from the 300th to the 600th timestep in Halfcheetah-medium-expert.