

# SKILL DISCOVERY WITH WELL-DEFINED OBJECTIVES

**Yuu Jinnai, David Abel, Jee Won Park**

Department of Computer Science  
Brown University  
Providence, USA

**D Ellis Hershkowitz**

Computer Science Department  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, USA

**Michael L. Littman, George Konidaris**

Department of Computer Science  
Brown University  
Providence, USA

## ABSTRACT

While many skill discovery methods have been proposed to accelerate learning and planning, most are heuristic methods without a clear relationship to the agent’s objective. The conditions under which the algorithms are effective is therefore often unclear. We claim that we should pursue skill discovery algorithms with explicit relationships to the objective of the agent to understand in what scenarios skill discovery methods are useful. We summarize the analysis on two scenarios, planning and reinforcement learning by Jinnai et al. (2019a;b), and show how to identify skill discovery criteria that directly address the relevant objectives. For planning, we show that finding a set of options that minimizes planning time is NP-hard, and give a polynomial-time algorithm that is approximately optimal under certain conditions. For reinforcement learning, we target goal-based tasks with sparse rewards—specifically, where the agent only receives useful reward signals at the goal state. We show that the difficulty of discovering a distant rewarding state in an MDP is bounded by the *expected cover time* of a random walk over the graph induced by the MDP’s transition dynamics. We therefore propose an algorithm which finds an option which provably reduces the expected cover time.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

An appropriate set of *skills*, or temporally extended actions, can significantly improve the performance of an agent in many scenarios (Sutton et al., 1999). Thus, many heuristic algorithms have proposed to discover skills based on intuitive descriptions of useful skills (Iba, 1989; McGovern & Barto, 2001; Menache et al., 2002; Stolle & Precup, 2002; Şimşek & Barto, 2004; Şimşek et al., 2005; Şimşek & Barto, 2009; Konidaris & Barto, 2009; Machado et al., 2017; Eysenbach et al., 2019). While empirical results show that these algorithms are useful in some scenarios, the conditions under which the methods are effective is often unclear because the relationship between the objective of the skill discovery algorithm and that of the agent is often not established. In fact, Jong et al. (2008) sought to investigate the utility of skills empirically and pointed out that introducing skills might worsen the learning performance.

In order to discover options that are guaranteed to be useful, we claim that we should develop skill discovery algorithms with an explicit connection to the objective of the agent. This allows us to analytically evaluate the performance of the skill discovery algorithms instead of relying solely on empirical evaluations on benchmark tasks.

We summarize our recent work on two scenarios, planning and reinforcement learning (Jinnai et al., 2019a;b). We show that by explicitly targeting the objective function of the agent, it is possible to derive new skill discovery algorithms with a guarantee on how much the algorithms improve the agent’s objective. For planning, we show that the task of finding an option set that minimizes planning time is NP-hard and we provide an approximate algorithm with performance guarantees under certain conditions. For reinforcement learning, we show that minimizing the *expected cover*

*time*—the number of steps required for a random walk to visit every state Broder & Karlin (1989)—reduces the expected number of steps required to reach an unknown rewarding state. We introduce an option discovery method that explicitly aims to minimize the expected cover time and show that the algorithm provably reduces it.

## 2 OBJECTIVE FUNCTIONS FOR SKILL DISCOVERY

We describe our approach to two objectives: planning and exploration in reinforcement learning. We show that by explicitly targeting the appropriate objective, we can derive new skill discovery algorithms with theoretical performance guarantees.

### 2.1 FINDING OPTIONS THAT MINIMIZE PLANNING TIME

First, we consider planning with the value iteration algorithm. We formalize what it means to find the set of options that is optimal for planning. More precisely, we consider the problem of finding a subset of options from a candidate set of options so that planning converges within a given iteration limit:

**Definition 1** MOMI (MinOptionMaxIteration):  
**Given** an MDP  $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, R, T, \gamma)$ , a non-negative real-value  $\epsilon$ , a candidate option set  $\mathcal{O}'$ , and an integer  $\ell$ , **return**  $\mathcal{O}$  minimizing  $|\mathcal{O}|$  subject to  $L(\mathcal{O}) \leq \ell$  and  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}'$ , where  $L(\mathcal{O})$  is the number of value iteration passes to solve the MDP using the option set  $\mathcal{O}$ .

MOMI has the following complexity results:

**Theorem 1.**

1. MOMI is  $\Omega(\log n)$  hard to approximate even for deterministic MDPs unless  $P = NP$ .
2. MOMI is  $2^{\log^{1-\epsilon} n}$ -hard to approximate for any  $\epsilon > 0$  even for deterministic MDP unless  $NP \subseteq DTIME(n^{\text{poly} \log n})$ .

Here we describe the outline of the proof (see the Appendix for the full description). The proof is by reduction from the label cover and the set cover problem respectively to a special case of the problem where the set of options are constrained to be *point options*. A point option is a type of option which has exactly one state in initiation set and one state with termination probability set to one. Even for this limited setting, finding a set of point options is  $2^{\log^{1-\epsilon} n}$ -hard to approximate, and  $\Omega(\log n)$ -hard to approximate even for deterministic tasks. As we showed inapproximability for this special case, MOMI is also NP-hard to approximate. *Thus, finding an optimal set of options for planning is NP-hard in general.*

This inapproximability result suggest that efficient option discovery algorithms for planning only exist in a more restricted settings than the above cases. We now present a polynomial-time algorithm A-MOMI for approximately computing the optimal set of point options for tasks with bounded return and goal states:

1. Compute  $d : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  for every state pair where  $d$  is the number of iterations for  $s_i$  to reach  $\epsilon$ -optimal if we add a point option from  $s_j$  to  $g$ , minus one.
2. For every state  $s_i$ , compute a set of states  $X_{s_i}$  within  $\ell - 1$  distance of reaching  $s_i$ . The set  $X_{s_i}$  represents the states that converge within  $\ell$  steps if we add a point option from  $s_i$  to  $g$ .
3. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a set of  $X_{s_i}$  for every  $s_i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus X_g^+$ , where  $X_g^+$  is a set of states that converges within  $\ell$  without any options (and thus can be ignored).
4. Solve the set-cover optimization problem to find a set of subsets that covers the entire state set using the approximate algorithm by Chvatal (1979). This process corresponds to finding a minimum set of subsets  $\{X_{s_i}\}$  that makes every state in  $\mathcal{S}$  converge within  $\ell$  steps.
5. Generate a set of point options with initiation states set to one of the center states in the solution of the set-cover, and termination states set to the goal.

The algorithm has the following properties:

**Theorem 2.**




Figure 1: (a)–(d) Comparison of the optimal point options with options generated by the approximation algorithm. The green square represents the termination state and the blue squares the initiation states. Observe that the approximation algorithm is similar to that of optimal options. Note that the optimal option set is not unique: there can be multiple optimal option sets, and we are visualizing just one returned by the solver. We are only able to find optimal solutions up to 8 iterations for MOMI and four options for MIMO within 10 minutes. (e)–(f) Figures show the number of options generated by A-MOMI and A-MIMO. OPT: an optimal set of options. APPROX: a bounded suboptimal set of options generated by A-MIMO and A-MOMI. BET: betweenness options. EIG: eigenoptions.

1. A-MOMI runs in polynomial time.
2. It guarantees that the MDP is solved within  $\ell$  iterations using the option set acquired by A-MOMI.
3. If the MDP is deterministic, the option set is at most  $O(\log n)$  times larger than the smallest option set that solves the MDP within  $\ell$  iterations.

See the Appendix for the proof.

We also consider MIMO, the complementary problem of finding a set of  $k$  options that minimize the number of iterations until convergence. The problem is also NP-hard and exists a polynomial-time approximate algorithm, A-MIMO. See the Appendix for the proof.

We empirically evaluated the performance of the approximate algorithms against the optimal option set and two heuristic approaches for option discovery, betweenness options (Şimşek & Barto, 2009) and eigenoptions (Machado et al., 2017) in simple grid-world tasks. The results indicate that the approximation algorithm is on par with other heuristic algorithms. While heuristic algorithms have no theoretical performance guarantees (e.g. betweenness options are not necessarily helpful when the task has no bottleneck states), our algorithm offers a performance guarantee in any domain.

## 2.2 FINDING OPTIONS THAT MINIMIZE LEARNING TIME FOR HARD EXPLORATION TASKS

We now consider reinforcement learning tasks, where the environment model is not available. In particular, we consider how options can improve exploration in goal-based tasks with sparse reward. We model the initial exploratory behavior of a reinforcement learning agent in a sparse reward task by a random walk induced by a fixed stationary distribution. This is because (1) it is a reasonable model for an agent with no prior knowledge of the task and (2) it serves as a worst-case analysis: it is reasonable to assume that efficient exploration algorithms explore faster than the random policy.

We aim to minimize the time required by an agent to explore the task. More precisely, we aim to minimize the *expected cover time*: the expected number of steps required for a random walk to visit all the vertices in a graph (Broder & Karlin, 1989). The expected cover time quantifies how quickly a random walk reaches to a rewarding state.

**Theorem 3.** *Assume a stochastic shortest path problem to reach a goal state  $g \in \mathcal{S}$  where a non-positive reward  $r_c \leq 0$  is given for non-goal states and  $\gamma = 1$ . Let  $P$  be a random walk transition matrix:  $P(s, s') = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi(s) T(s, a, s')$ :*

$$\forall g : V_g^\pi(s) \geq r_c \mathbb{E}[C(G)],$$

where  $C(G)$  is the expected cover time of the graph  $G$ .

See the Appendix for the proof. The theorem suggests that *the smaller the expected cover time, the easier exploration tends to be*. Now the question is how to reduce the expected cover time of the random walk without prior information about the task.

We now present covering options, an algorithm which discovers options that minimize the expected cover time. The algorithm is approximate since the problem of finding such a set of options is computationally intractable; even a good solution is hard to find due to the Braess’s paradox (Braess, 1968; Braess et al., 2005), which states that the expected cover time does not monotonically decrease as edges are added to the graph. Thus, expected cover time is often minimized indirectly via maximizing algebraic connectivity (Fiedler, 1973; Chung, 1996). The expected cover time is upper bounded by a quantity involving the algebraic connectivity, and by maximizing it the bound can be minimized (Broder & Karlin, 1989). As adding a set of edges to maximize the algebraic connectivity is still NP-hard (Mosk-Aoyama, 2008), we use the approximation method by Ghosh & Boyd (2006):

1. Compute the second smallest eigenvalue and its corresponding eigenvector (i.e., the Fiedler vector) of the Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  of the state transition graph  $G$ .
2. Let  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  be the state with largest and smallest value in the eigenvector respectively. Generate two point options; one with  $\mathcal{I} = \{v_i\}$  and  $\beta = \{v_j\}$  and the other with  $\mathcal{I} = \{v_j\}$  and  $\beta = \{v_i\}$ .
3. Set  $G \leftarrow G \cup \{(v_i, v_j)\}$  and repeat the process until the number of options reaches  $k$ .

The algorithm is guaranteed to reduce the upper bound of the expected cover time:

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that a random walk induced by a policy  $\pi$  is a uniform random walk and the multiplicity of the second smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$  is one. Adding the two options identified by the algorithm improves the upper bound of the cover time:*

$$\mathbb{E}[C(G')] \leq \frac{n^2 \ln n}{\lambda_2(\mathcal{L}) + F} (1 + o(1)), \tag{1}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[C(G')]$  is the expected cover time of the resulting random walk,  $F = \frac{(v_i - v_j)^2}{6/(\lambda_3 - \lambda_2) + 3/2}$ ,  $v_i, v_j$  are the maximum and minimum values of the Fiedler vector, and  $\lambda_2$  is the second smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}$ , and  $n$  is the number of states. If the multiplicity of the second smallest eigenvalue is greater than one, then adding any single option cannot improve the bound.

See the Appendix for the proof. Note that the procedure is similar to eigenoptions, proposed by Machado et al. (2017). Both algorithms use the eigenvectors of the Laplacian matrix to generate options. While eigenoptions have no performance guarantees, by explicitly targeting an objective we are able to derive a lower bound on improving the expected cover time and also achieve better empirical performance (Fig 2). Table 2a shows our preliminary results on comparing the expected cover time on simple tabular domains. Our algorithm successfully generates a set of options which reduce the cover time more than eigenoptions (Machado et al., 2017). In addition, covering options is fast to compute as it only needs to compute the Fiedler vector. Although computing the whole graph spectrum is a computationally complex matrix operation, the Fiedler vector can be computed efficiently even for very large graphs (Koren et al., 2002).

We now evaluate the utility of each type of discovered options when learning. We used Q-learning (Watkins & Dayan, 1992) ( $\alpha = 0.1, \gamma = 0.95$ ) for 100 episodes of 100 timesteps each and generated 8 options with each algorithms using the adjacency matrix representing the state-transition of the MDP. Figure 2 shows the comparison of accumulated rewards averaged over 5 runs. In all experiments, covering options outperformed or was on par with eigenoptions.




Figure 2: (a) Comparison of the algebraic connectivity and the expected cover time. For covering options and eigenoptions we add 8 options. (b)–(c) Comparison of performance with different option generation methods. Options are generated offline from the adjacency matrix for four-room and 9x9grid. Reward information is not used for generating options.

### 3 RELATED WORK

While many option discovery algorithms are heuristic, a few have proposed methods with well-defined objectives.

Several works have proposed learning the policy and the termination condition of the option by gradient descent using the observed rewards (Mankowitz et al., 2016; Bacon et al., 2017; Harb et al., 2018). Bacon et al. (2017) proposed the option-critic framework and generated options which directly minimize the expected accumulative reward (i.e. the objective of the agent). Harb et al. (2018) proposed to generate options which minimize the sum of expected accumulative reward and the deliberation cost (Simon, 1957) using the option-critic framework (Bacon et al., 2017). The method successfully sped up the learning time by taking into account of the deliberation cost to prefer options with long duration. However, as they require the reward information, options discovered are task-dependent. Eysenbach et al. (2019) proposed to learn a policy for each option so that the diversity of the trajectories by the set of options are maximized. The method seeks to generate options to explore infrequently visited states. Several works have proposed an architecture to learn goal-conditioned policies (i.e. options) to reach certain subgoal states Vezhnevets et al. (2017); Nachum et al. (2018); Levy et al. (2019). They showed that the method can speed up the learning even in long-horizon problems by discovering short horizon subgoals automatically. Brunskill & Li (2014) targeted the lifelong reinforcement learning setting and proposed an option generation method for lifelong reinforcement learning. They analyzed the sample complexity of RMAX using options and proposed an option discovery targeting to minimize the sample complexity. Solway et al. (2014) formalized an optimal behavioral hierarchy as a model which fits the behavior of the agent in tasks the best.

Mann et al. (2015) analyzed the convergence rate of approximate value iteration with and without options and showed that options lead to faster convergence if their durations are longer and the value function is initialized pessimistically. As in reinforcement learning, how to find efficient temporal abstractions for planning automatically remains an open question.

### 4 CONCLUSIONS

We analyzed two scenarios, planning and reinforcement learning. For planning, we considered the problem of minimizing the size of the option set given a maximum number of iterations (MOMI) and showed that the problem is computationally intractable. We described a polynomial-time approximate algorithm for solving MOMI under certain conditions. For reinforcement learning, we proposed covering options and showed that it has a guarantee on how much it improves the expected cover time of a random walk. These theoretical guarantees are available because the skill discovery algorithms are directly tailored to the objective of the agent.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is supported in part by an AFOSR Young Investigator Grant to George Konidaris, under agreement number FA9550-17-1-0124. D Ellis Hershkowitz is supported in part by NSF grants CCF-1618280, CCF-1814603, CCF-1527110 and NSF CAREER award CCF-1750808.

#### REFERENCES

- Pierre-Luc Bacon, Jean Harb, and Doina Precup. The option-critic architecture. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1726–1734, 2017.
- Dietrich Braess. Über ein paradoxon aus der verkehrsplanung. *Unternehmensforschung*, 12(1): 258–268, 1968.
- Dietrich Braess, Anna Nagurney, and Tina Wakolbinger. On a paradox of traffic planning. *Transportation science*, 39(4):446–450, 2005.
- Andrei Z Broder and Anna R Karlin. Bounds on the cover time. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 2(1):101–120, 1989.
- Emma Brunskill and Lihong Li. PAC-inspired option discovery in lifelong reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 316–324, 2014.
- Fan RK Chung. *Spectral graph theory*. American Mathematical Society, 1996.
- Vasek Chvatal. A greedy heuristic for the set-covering problem. *Mathematics of operations research*, 4(3):233–235, 1979.
- Benjamin Eysenbach, Abhishek Gupta, Julian Ibarz, and Sergey Levine. Diversity is all you need: Learning skills without a reward function. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Miroslav Fiedler. Algebraic connectivity of graphs. *Czechoslovak mathematical journal*, 23(2): 298–305, 1973.
- Arpita Ghosh and Stephen Boyd. Growing well-connected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6605–6611. IEEE, 2006.
- Jean Harb, Pierre-Luc Bacon, Martin Klissarov, and Doina Precup. When waiting is not an option: Learning options with a deliberation cost. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 3165–3172, 2018.
- Glenn A Iba. A heuristic approach to the discovery of macro-operators. *Machine Learning*, 3(4): 285–317, 1989.
- Yuu Jinnai, David Abel, D Ellis Hershkowitz, Michael Littman, and George Konidaris. Finding options that minimize planning time. In *Proceedings of the 36th international conference on Machine learning (To appear)*, 2019a.
- Yuu Jinnai, Jee Won Park, David Abel, and George Konidaris. Discovering options for exploration by minimizing cover time. In *Proceedings of the 36th international conference on Machine learning (To appear)*, 2019b.
- Nicholas K Jong, Todd Hester, and Peter Stone. The utility of temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 7th international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems-Volume 1*, pp. 299–306, 2008.
- George Konidaris and Andrew Barto. Skill discovery in continuous reinforcement learning domains using skill chaining. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1015–1023, 2009.
- Yehuda Koren, Liran Carmel, and David Harel. Ace: A fast multiscale eigenvectors computation for drawing huge graphs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Symposium on Information*, pp. 137–144, 2002.

- Andrew Levy, George Konidaris, Robert Platt, and Kate Saenko. Learning multi-level hierarchies with hindsight. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Marios C Machado, Marc G Bellemare, and Michael Bowling. A Laplacian framework for option discovery in reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 2295–2304, 2017.
- Daniel J Mankowitz, Timothy A Mann, and Shie Mannor. Adaptive skills adaptive partitions (ASAP). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1588–1596, 2016.
- Timothy A Mann, Shie Mannor, and Doina Precup. Approximate value iteration with temporally extended actions. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 53:375–438, 2015.
- Amy McGovern and Andrew G Barto. Automatic discovery of subgoals in reinforcement learning using diverse density. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 361–368, 2001.
- Ishai Menache, Shie Mannor, and Nahum Shimkin. Q-cut – dynamic discovery of sub-goals in reinforcement learning. In *European Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 295–306, 2002.
- Damon Mosk-Aoyama. Maximum algebraic connectivity augmentation is NP-hard. *Operations Research Letters*, 36(6):677–679, 2008.
- Ofir Nachum, Shixiang Shane Gu, Honglak Lee, and Sergey Levine. Data-efficient hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3303–3313, 2018.
- Herbert A Simon. *Models of man; social and rational*. Wiley, 1957.
- Özgür Şimşek and Andrew G Barto. Using relative novelty to identify useful temporal abstractions in reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 95–102, 2004.
- Özgür Şimşek and Andrew G Barto. Skill characterization based on betweenness. In *Proceedings of the Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1497–1504, 2009.
- Özgür Şimşek, Alicia P Wolfe, and Andrew G Barto. Identifying useful subgoals in reinforcement learning by local graph partitioning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 816–823, 2005.
- Alec Solway, Carlos Diuk, Natalia Córdova, Debbie Yee, Andrew G Barto, Yael Niv, and Matthew M Botvinick. Optimal behavioral hierarchy. *PLoS computational biology*, 10(8):e1003779, 2014.
- Martin Stolle and Doina Precup. Learning options in reinforcement learning. In *International Symposium on abstraction, reformulation, and approximation*, pp. 212–223. Springer, 2002.
- Richard S Sutton, Doina Precup, and Satinder Singh. Between MDPs and semi-MDPs: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 112(1):181–211, 1999.
- Alexander Sasha Vezhnevets, Simon Osindero, Tom Schaul, Nicolas Heess, Max Jaderberg, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Feudal networks for hierarchical reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pp. 3540–3549. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):279–292, 1992.