

# Bellman Diffusion Models

Liam Schramm, Abdeslam Boularias

July 18, 2024

## Abstract

Diffusion models have seen tremendous success as generative architectures. Recently, they have been shown to be effective at modelling policies for offline reinforcement learning and imitation learning. We explore using diffusion as a model class for the successor state measure (SSM) of a policy. We find that enforcing the Bellman flow constraints leads to a simple Bellman update on the diffusion step distribution.

## 1 Introduction

The successor state measure is a central object of study in reinforcement learning (RL). A common statement of the objective is to find the policy that induces the state occupancy measure with the highest expected reward [4, 3, 6, 5, 7]. The state occupancy measure (SOM) has also received considerable attention in the RL theory community, as a number of provably efficient exploration schemes revolve around regularizing the state occupancy measure [1, 2, 8]. We explore a closely related concept, the state successor measure (SSM), which is the probability distribution over future states, given that the agent is currently at state  $s$  and takes action  $a$ .

Despite their utility, the problem of learning the successor measure or state occupancy measure has received relatively little attention in the empirical RL community. While the full reasons for this are difficult to pin down, we argue that it is in large part due to the lack of an expressive and learnable representation that can be easily normalized. We argue that diffusion models can address this deficiency.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Diffusion Models

Diffusion models are a form of generative model that has shown significant success in image generation [cite]. More recently, there has been significant interest in using diffusion models as a policy class for reinforcement learning [cite].

In our work, we are primarily concerned with the loss function, and how it can be used to derive a Bellman update for diffusion models. For this reason, we begin with a review of diffusion models and the derivation of the standard diffusion model loss.

Diffusion models are trained using a forward process and a backward process. In the forward process, noise is gradually added to a data point until only noise remains, and the data point is distributed as a multivariate unit Gaussian. Let  $D$  be a dataset and  $x_0$  be a data point in  $D$ . We express the result of the  $K$ -step forward process as a distribution  $q$  where

$$q(x_{0:K}|D) = q(x_0|D) \prod_{i=1}^K q(x_i|x_{i-1}, x_0)$$

$q(x_0|D)$  is defined to be  $\frac{1}{|D|}$  for each point in  $D$  and 0 for all other  $x_0$ .

In the reverse process, the neural network parameterized by weights  $\theta$  outputs a Gaussian distribution, predicting what noise was added during the forward process. The backward process samples a predicted noise from this distribution and this noise is subtracted from the data point. This process

repeats for the same number of steps as the forward process. The probability of a sequence of points  $x_{0:K}$  in the reverse diffusion process is

$$p(x_{0:K}|\theta) = p(x_K) \prod_{i=0}^{K-1} p(x_{i-1}|x_i, \theta)$$

In this work, we seek to learn a diffusion model  $p(x|\theta)$  that minimizes  $KL(q(x)||p(x|\theta))$ . By the convexity of the KL divergence, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} KL(q(x|D)||p(x|\theta)) &\leq KL(q(x_{0:K}|D)||p(x_{0:K}|\theta)) \\ &= KL(q(x_K|x_0)||p(x_K)) + \sum_{i=1}^K KL(q(x_{i-1}|x_i, x_0)||p(x_{i-1}|x_i, \theta)) - \log p(x_0|x_1, \theta) \end{aligned}$$

If  $p(x_{i-1}|x_i, \theta)$  is Gaussian with a fixed variance  $\sigma_K$ , then the portion of the loss  $L$  that depends on  $\theta$  can be written as follows

$$L_{K-1} - C = E_{x_0, \epsilon} \left[ \frac{\beta_i^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \alpha_i (1 - \bar{\alpha}_i) \|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_K}x_0 + (1 - \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_K})\epsilon, i)\|^2 \right]$$

For brevity, we refer to  $\eta_i = \frac{\beta_i^2}{2\sigma_i^2} \alpha_i (1 - \bar{\alpha}_i)$ .

### 3 Derivation

Let  $M$  be a Markov Decision Process with state space  $S$ , action space  $A$ , transition distribution  $T$ , reward function  $R$ , and discount rate  $\gamma$ .

We consider the successor measure of a state and action  $d^\pi(x|s, a)$ , where  $x$  is some future state. This describes the probability that an agent following the policy  $\pi$  will stop at the state  $x$  if it begins in state  $s$ , takes action  $a$ , and has a  $(1 - \gamma)$  chance of stopping after taking each action. The action-conditioned value function  $Q_\pi(s, a)$  is the expected reward of the distribution  $d^\pi(\cdot|s, a)$ ,  $E_{x \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s, a)} [R(x)]$ . The successor measure of a given policy is the unique probability distribution satisfying the Bellman flow constraints. These constraints are as follows:

$$d^\pi(s_f|s, a) = (1 - \gamma)T(s' = s_f|s, a) + \gamma E_{a' \sim \pi(s'), s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a)} [d^\pi(s_f|s', a')]$$

We hope to learn a representation of  $d^\pi(x|s, a)$  that approximately satisfies this constraint. We do this by deriving an upper bound on the KL divergence between the left and right-hand sides of the equation.

First, we note that the KL divergence is convex in both arguments

$$\begin{aligned} KL_{Bellman} &= KL(E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [(1 - \gamma)\delta(s' = x) + \gamma d^\pi(x|s', a')] || d^\pi(x|s, a)) \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma) KL(E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [\delta(s' = x)] || d^\pi(x|s, a)) \\ &\quad + \gamma KL(E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [d^\pi(x|s', a')] || d^\pi(x|s, a)) \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma) KL(T(x|s, a) || d^\pi(x|s, a)) + \gamma KL(E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [d^\pi(x|s', a')] || d^\pi(x|s, a)) \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma) KL(T(x|s, a) || d^\pi(x|s, a)) + \gamma E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [KL(d^\pi(x|s', a') || d^\pi(x|s, a))] \end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that diffusion models generate sequences of increasingly noised variables  $x_i$  from noiseless ( $x_0$ ) to fully random  $x_K$ . Let  $x_{0:K}$  be the full trajectory of noised points from  $x_0$  to  $x_K$ . Observe that  $P(x_0) = \int_{x_{1:K}} P(x_{0:K}) = \int_{x_{1:K}} P(x_0, x_{1:K})$ . Again by convexity, the KL divergence between sequences of noising trajectories  $x_{0:K}$  is greater than the divergence between unnoised points  $x_0$

$$\begin{aligned} KL_{Bellman} &\leq (1 - \gamma) KL(q(x_{1:K}|x_0)T(x_0|s, a) || d^\pi(x_{0:K}|s, a)) \\ &\quad + \gamma E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s, a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [KL(d^\pi(x_{0:K}|s', a') || d^\pi(x_{0:K}|s, a))] \end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that the KL divergence of a Markov chain such as  $q(x_{1:K}|x_0)$  can be expressed as the sum of the divergences of each step. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} KL_{Bellman} &\leq E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s,a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [(1 - \gamma) E_{x_0:K, x_0=s'} [KL(q(x_K)|d^\pi(x_K|s, a))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^K KL(q(x_{i-1}|x_i, x_0)|d^\pi(x_{i-1}|x_i, s, a))] \\ &\quad + \gamma E_{x_0:K, x_0 \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s', a')} [KL(d^\pi(x_K|s', a')|d^\pi(x_K|s, a))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^K KL(d^\pi(x_{i-1}|x_i, s', a')|d^\pi(x_{i-1}|x_i, s, a))] \end{aligned}$$

Now, we wish to approximate  $d^\pi$  with a neural network. As with DDPM [cite], we do this by having a neural network predict  $\epsilon$ , the noise that was added to  $x_0$ . We refer to the output of the network as  $\epsilon_\theta$  and the distribution generated by this diffusion model  $d_{\pi, \theta}$ . Additionally, since this loss function requires measuring the divergence between two neural networks, we use the target network trick common in reinforcement learning. We refer to the target network as  $\epsilon_{target}$  and the distribution generated by the target network as  $d_{\pi, target}$ . Applying these changes, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} KL_{Bellman} &\leq E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s,a), a' \sim \pi(s')} [(1 - \gamma) E_{\epsilon, x_0=s', i} [\eta_i |\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\alpha_K}x_0 + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha_K})\epsilon, s', \pi(s'), i)|^2] \\ &\quad + \gamma E_{x_i \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s', a'), i} [\eta_i |\epsilon_{target}(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i) - \epsilon_\theta(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i)|^2]] + const \end{aligned}$$

The first term is a standard denoising diffusion loss. The second term is similar, but instead sets the target to be the deterministic output of the network at the next state. A key difference between this loss and the standard diffusion loss is that the second term is deterministic and suffers from no variance (at the cost of some bias when  $\epsilon_{target}$  is inaccurate). This is very similar to the use of temporal difference updates in Q learning – biased, low-variance estimates of the value at the next time step are known to converge faster than unbiased, high variance estimates like those used in vanilla policy gradient. A major benefit of this formulation is that it allows us to make the same tradeoff when learning the state occupancy measure.

There are two ways to sample  $x_i \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s', a')$ . The obvious way would be to run the backward process for  $i$  steps, but this is computationally inefficient. Instead, we propose a heuristic method to approximate this distribution with less compute time.

First, we use a modified version of the Bellman flow constraints for finite horizons. Suppose there are  $n$  steps remaining in the episode. Then,

$$d^\pi(x|s, a, n) = E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s,a), a' \sim \pi(s')} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \delta(s' = x) + \frac{n-1}{n} d^\pi(x|s', a', n-1) \right]$$

Repeating the above derivation with the modified constraint gives us the loss:

$$\begin{aligned} L &= E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s,a), a' \sim \pi(s')} \left[ \frac{1}{n} E_{\epsilon, x_0=s', i} [\eta_i |\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\alpha_K}x_0 + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha_K})\epsilon, s, \pi(s), i, n)|^2] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{n-1}{n} E_{x_i \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s', a', n-1), i} [\eta_i |\epsilon_{target}(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i, n-1) - \epsilon_\theta(x_i, s, \pi(s), i, n)|^2] \right] \end{aligned}$$

For convenience, we write this as a sum of two losses:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= E_{s' \sim T(\cdot|s,a)} [E_{\epsilon, x_0=s', i} [\eta_i |\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(\sqrt{\alpha_K}x_0 + (1 - \sqrt{\alpha_K})\epsilon, s, \pi(s), i, n)|^2]] \\ L_2 &= E_{x_i \sim d^\pi(\cdot|s', a', n-1), i} [\eta_i |\epsilon_{target}(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i, n-1) - \epsilon_\theta(x_i, s, \pi(s), i, n)|^2]] \\ L &= \frac{1}{n} L_1 + \frac{n-1}{n} L_2 \end{aligned}$$

In this finite-horizon setting, we calculate the state occupancy measure uniformly discounted over a finite number of steps, instead of exponentially discounted over an infinite number. This allows us to sample the future states of  $d^\pi(\cdot|s, a)$  from the future trajectory of  $s, a$  instead of using the network

itself. We then minimize the loss in expectation. We sample a state  $s$  from the replay buffer with  $n$  steps remaining in its trajectory. Then, we sample a second state  $x$  from the future trajectory of  $s$ . If  $x$  is the state immediately after  $s$ , we apply  $L_1$ . Otherwise, we apply  $L_2$ . This gives us a  $\frac{1}{n}$  chance of sampling  $L_1$  and a  $\frac{n-1}{n}$  chance of sampling  $L_2$ .

A limitation of this approach is that it only gives the correct on-policy loss, and may be biased in the off-policy case.

---

**Algorithm 1** Calculate  $d^\pi$  Loss

---

**Have:** Network  $\epsilon_\theta$ , replay buffer  $B$ ;  
 Sample tuple  $(s, a, s', x, t)$ , where  $x$  is a sample from the future trajectory, and  $n$  is the number of steps remaining in the trajectory.  
 Sample  $i \sim Uniform([1, K])$ , where  $K$  is the number of diffusion steps  
 Sample  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$   
 $x_i = \sqrt{\alpha_i}x + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_i}\epsilon$   
**if**  $s' == x$  **then**  
 $L = \eta_i \|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i, n)\|^2$   
**else**  
 $L = \eta_i \|\epsilon_{target}(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i, n - 1) - \epsilon_\theta(x_i, s', \pi(s'), i, n)\|^2$   
**end if**  
**return**  $L$ ;

---

## References

- [1] C. Dann, C.-Y. Wei, and J. Zimmert. Best of both worlds policy optimization, 2023.
- [2] T. Jin, J. Liu, and H. Luo. Improved best-of-both-worlds guarantees for multi-armed bandits: Ftrl with general regularizers and multiple optimal arms, 2023.
- [3] J. Lee, W. Jeon, B.-J. Lee, J. Pineau, and K.-E. Kim. Optidice: Offline policy optimization via stationary distribution correction estimation, 2021.
- [4] L. Lee, B. Eysenbach, E. Parisotto, E. Xing, S. Levine, and R. Salakhutdinov. Efficient exploration via state marginal matching, 2020.
- [5] Y. J. Ma, A. Shen, D. Jayaraman, and O. Bastani. Versatile offline imitation from observations and examples via regularized state-occupancy matching, 2022.
- [6] Y. J. Ma, J. Yan, D. Jayaraman, and O. Bastani. How far i’ll go: Offline goal-conditioned reinforcement learning via  $f$ -advantage regression, 2022.
- [7] O. Nachum and B. Dai. Reinforcement learning via fenchel-rockafellar duality, 2020.
- [8] J. Zimmert and Y. Seldin. Tsallis-inf: An optimal algorithm for stochastic and adversarial bandits, 2022.