

# 1 A Supplementary Material of The Sensory Neuron as a Transformer: 2 Permutation-Invariant Neural Networks for Reinforcement Learning

## 3 A.1 Hyper-parameters

4 In the table below are the hyper-parameters used for each experiment. We did not employ exhaustive  
5 hyper-parameter tuning, but have simply selected parameters that can appropriately size our models  
6 to work with training methods such as evolution strategies, where the number of parameters cannot  
7 be too large. As mentioned in the discussion section about the limitations, we tested a small range of  
8 patch sizes (1 pixel, 4 pixels, 6 pixels), and we find that a patch size of 6x6 works well across tasks.

Table 1: Summary of hyper-parameters.

	CartPole	Ant	CarRacing	Atari Pong
$o_t$	$\mathcal{R}^5$	$\mathcal{R}^{28}$	$\mathcal{R}^{96 \times 96 \times 4}$	$\mathcal{R}^{84 \times 84 \times 4}$
$o_t[i]$	$\mathcal{R}^1$	$\mathcal{R}^1$	$\mathcal{R}^{6 \times 6 \times 4 = 144}$	$\mathcal{R}^{6 \times 6 \times 4 = 144}$
$N$	5	28	$(96/6)^2 = 256$	$(84/6)^2 = 196$
$ A $	1	8	3	6 (one-hot encoding)
$M$	16	32	1024	400
$W_q$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 32}$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 32}$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 16}$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 32}$
$W_k$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 32}$	$\mathcal{R}^{8 \times 32}$	$\mathcal{R}^{111 \times 16}$	$\mathcal{R}^{114 \times 32}$
$W_v$	$I$	$I$	$\mathcal{R}^{144 \times 16}$	$\mathcal{R}^{144 \times 32}$
$\sigma(\cdot)$	$\tanh$	$\tanh$	$\text{softmax}$	$\text{softmax}$
$m_t$	$\mathcal{R}^{16}$	$\mathcal{R}^{32}$	$\mathcal{R}^{1024 \times 16}$	$\mathcal{R}^{400 \times 32}$

## 9 A.2 Description of compute infrastructure used to conduct experiments

10 For all ES results, we train on Google Kubernetes Engines (GKE) with 256 CPUs (N1 series) for  
11 each job. The approximate time, including both training and periodic tests, for the jobs are: 3 days  
12 (CartPole), 5 days (PyBullet Ant ES) and 10 days (CarRacing). For BC results, we train with Google  
13 Computing Engines (GCE) on an instance that has one V100 GPU. The approximate time, including  
14 both training and periodic tests, for the jobs are: 5 days (PyBullet Ant BC), 1 day (Atari Pong).

## 15 A.3 Detailed setups for the experiments

### 16 A.3.1 PyBullet Ant

17 In the PyBullet Ant experiment, we demonstrated that a pre-trained policy can be converted into  
18 a permutation invariant one with behavior cloning (BC). We give detailed task description and  
19 experimental setups here. In AntBulletEnv-v0, the agent controls an ant robot that has 8 joints  
20 ( $|A| = 8$ ), and gets to see an observation vector that has base and joint states as well as foot-ground  
21 contact information at each time step ( $|O| = 28$ ). The mission is to make the ant move along a pre-  
22 defined straight line as fast as possible. The teacher policy is a 2-layer FNN policy that has 32 hidden  
23 units trained with ES. We collected data from 1000 test roll-outs, each of which lasted for 500 steps.  
24 During training, we add zero-mean Gaussian noise ( $\sigma = 0.03$ ) to the previous actions. For the student  
25 policy, We set up two networks. The first policy is a 2-layered network that has the AttentionNeuron  
26 with output size  $m_t \in \mathcal{R}^{32}$  as its first layer, followed by a fully-connected (FC) layer. The second,  
27 larger policy is similar in architecture, but we added one more FC layer and expanded all hidden  
28 size to 128 to increase its expressiveness. We train the students with a batch size of 64, an Adam  
29 optimizer of  $lr = 0.001$  and we clip the gradient at maximum norm of 0.5.

### 30 A.3.2 Atari Pong

31 In the Atari game Pong, we append a deep CNN to the AttentionNeuron layer in our agent (student  
32 policy). To be concrete, we reshape the AttentionNeuron’s output message  $m_t \in \mathcal{R}^{400 \times 32}$  to  $m_t \in$   
33  $\mathcal{R}^{20 \times 20 \times 32}$  and pass it to the trailing CNN: [Conv(in=32, out=64, kernel=4, stride=2), Conv(in=64,  
34 out=64, kernel=3, stride=1), FC(in=3136, out=512), FC(in=512, out=6)]. We use *ReLU* as the  
35 activation functions in the CNN. We collect the stacked observations and the corresponding logits  
36 output from a pre-trained PPO agent (teacher policy) from 1000 roll-outs, and we minimize the MSE

37 loss between the student policy’s output and the teacher policy’s logits. The learning rate and norm  
38 clip are the same as the previous experiment, but we use a batch size of 256.

39 For the occluded Pong experiment, we randomly remove a certain percentage of the patches across  
40 a training batch of stacked observation patches. In tests, we sample a patch mask to determine the  
41 positions to occlude at the beginning of the episode, and apply this mask throughout the episode.

### 42 A.3.3 CarRacing

43 In AttentionAgent [1], the authors observed that the agent generalizes well if it is forced to make  
44 decisions based on only a fraction of the available observations. Concretely, [1] proposed to segment  
45 the input image into patches and let the patches vote for each other via a modified self-attention  
46 mechanism. The agent would then take into consideration only the top  $K = 10$  patches that have the  
47 most votes and based on the coordinates of which an LSTM controller makes decisions. Because the  
48 voting process involves sorting and pruning that are not differentiable, the agent is trained with ES. In  
49 their experiments, the authors demonstrated that the agent could navigate well not only in the training  
50 environment, but also zero-shot transfer to several modified environments.

51 We need only to reshape the AttentionNeuron layer’s outputs to adapt for AttentionAgent’s policy  
52 network. Specifically, we reshape the output message  $m_t \in \mathcal{R}^{1024 \times 16}$  to  $m_t \in \mathcal{R}^{32 \times 32 \times 16}$  such that  
53 it can be viewed as a 32-by-32 “image” of 16 channels. Then if we make AttentionAgent’s patch  
54 segmentation size 1, the original patch voting becomes voting among the  $m_t$ ’s and thus the output  
55 fits perfectly into the policy network. Except for this patch size, we kept all hyper-parameters in  
56 AttentionAgent unchanged, we also used the same CMA-ES training hyper-parameters.

57 Although the simple settings above allows our augmented agent to learn to drive and generalize  
58 to unseen background changes, we found the car jittered left and right through the courses. We  
59 suspect this is because of the frame differential operation in our  $f_k(o_t, a_{t-1})$ . Specifically, even  
60 when the car is on a straight lane, constantly steering left and right allows  $f_k(o_t, a_{t-1})$  to capture  
61 more meaningful signals related to the changes of the road. To avoid such jittering behavior, we  
62 make  $m_t$  a rolling average of itself:  $m_t = (1 - \alpha)m_t + \alpha m_{t-1}, 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ . In our implementation  
63  $\alpha = g([h_{t-1}, a_{t-1}])$ , where  $h_{t-1}$  is the hidden state from AttentionAgent’s LSTM controller and  
64  $a_{t-1}$  is the previous action.  $g(\cdot)$  is a 2-layer FNN with 16 hidden units and a *sigmoid* output layer.

## 65 References

- 66 [1] Y. Tang, D. Nguyen, and D. Ha. Neuroevolution of self-interpretable agents. In *Proceedings*  
67 *of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, 2020. [https://attentionagent.](https://attentionagent.github.io)  
68 [github.io](https://attentionagent.github.io).