## CS 542 Stats RL: Homework 3

## October 16, 2024

Submission deadline: Nov. 1 (Friday) before class.

## 1. Bisimulation and Bellman-completeness (5 pts)

Let  $M=(\mathcal{S},\mathcal{A},P,R,\gamma)$  be an MDP and  $\phi:\mathcal{S}\to\mathcal{S}_\phi$  be a state abstraction. Let  $\mathcal{F}^\phi$  be the set of all possible functions over  $\mathcal{S}\times\mathcal{A}$  with value range  $[0,V_{\max}]$  ( $V_{\max}=R_{\max}/(1-\gamma)>0$ ) that are piece-wise constant under  $\phi$ . That is, for any  $f\in\mathcal{F}^\phi$ ,  $\forall s^{(1)},s^{(2)}$  such that  $\phi(s^{(1)})=\phi(s^{(2)})$ , we always have  $f(s^{(1)},a)=f(s^{(2)},a), \forall a\in\mathcal{A}$ .

Prove that the following two conditions are equivalent:

- 1.  $\phi$  is a bisimulation for M.
- 2.  $\mathcal{F}^{\phi}$  is closed under  $\mathcal{T}$ , the Bellman optimality operator of M. That is,  $\mathcal{T}f \in \mathcal{F}^{\phi}$ ,  $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}^{\phi}$ .

Hint: For (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1), try to prove that  $\neg$  (1)  $\Rightarrow$   $\neg$  (2). That is, if  $\phi$  is not a bisimulation, you should be able to construct  $f \in \mathcal{F}^{\phi}$  such that  $\mathcal{T}f \notin \mathcal{F}^{\phi}$ .

- **2.** (5 pts) In the FQE analysis, we assumed that  $\|d_t^{\pi}/\mu\|_{\infty}$  is bounded for all t, where  $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$  is the data distribution. What if we instead assume that  $\|d^{\pi}/\mu\|_{\infty}$  is bounded, that is, we only cover the discounted occupancy  $d^{\pi}$  as a whole?
- (1) (2 pts) To put things more formally, define  $C_t^{\pi} := \|d_t^{\pi}/\mu\|_{\infty}$ , and  $C^{\pi} := \|d^{\pi}/\mu\|_{\infty}$ . Upper bound  $C_t^{\pi}$  as a function of  $C_t^{\pi}$ , and also upper bound  $C_t^{\pi}$  as a function of  $\{C_t^{\pi}\}_{t>0}$ .
- (2) (3 pts) Perform the FQE analysis using  $C^{\pi}$  (in class what we used is essentially  $\max_t C_t^{\pi}$ ). To make your life easier, let's assume that FQE produces  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_K$  that satisfies

$$||f_k - \mathcal{T}^{\pi} f_{k-1}||_{2,\mu} \le \epsilon, \quad \forall k.$$

Your task is to **give a bound** on  $|\mathbb{E}_{s \sim d_0}[f_K(s, \pi)] - J(\pi)|$  as a function of  $\epsilon$ ,  $\gamma$ , K,  $V_{\max} = R_{\max}/(1 - \gamma)$ , and  $C^{\pi}$ , in a form similar to the bound given in the class. Hint: the easiest way is to start with Eq.(5) in HW2.

**3. Refined coverage coefficient (5 pts)** In the FQE/FQI analysis, whenever we use the concentrability condition, it is to perform a change of measure in the form of (for FQI  $\mathcal{T}^{\pi}$  should be replaced by  $\mathcal{T}$ , but the story is similar)

$$||f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi} f'||_{2, d_{t}^{\pi}} \leq \sqrt{C_{t}^{\pi}} ||f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi} f'||_{2, \mu}$$

for some choices of f and f' (e.g.,  $f = f_k$  and  $f' = f_{k-1}$ ). So naturally, we can replace the definition of  $C_t^{\pi}$  with the following one, which can be potentially tighter by leveraging the structure of the  $\mathcal{F}$  class:<sup>1</sup>

$$C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F}) := \max_{f, f' \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\|f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi} f'\|_{2, d_t^{\pi}}^2}{\|f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi} f'\|_{2, \mu}^2}.$$
 (1)

Now consider  $C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  in the "linear-completeness" setting, that is,

- 1.  $\mathcal{F}$  is the linear class induced from feature  $\phi: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{F} = \{(s, a) \to \phi(s, a)^\top \theta: \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ .
- 2.  $\mathcal{F}$  that satisfies Bellman-completeness w.r.t.  $\pi$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}^{\pi}f \in \mathcal{F} \ \forall f \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $\sigma_{\min}$  be the smallest eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_{\mu} := \mathbb{E}_{(s,a) \sim \mu}[\phi(s,a)\phi(s,a)^{\top}] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and assume that

- $\sigma_{\min} > 0$ .
- $\|\phi(s,a)\| \le 1$  (here the norm is the standard  $L_2$  norm for vectors).

Your tasks:

- (1) (4 pts) Derive an upper bound on  $C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  as a function of  $1/\sigma_{\min}$ . Hint: (1) The properties of  $\pi$  and  $d_t^{\pi}$  do not matter at all: the bound holds even if we replace  $d_t^{\pi}$  with an arbitrary distribution over  $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}$ . (2) For matrix A, its smallest eigenvalue can be written as  $\min_{\|x\|=1} x^{\top} Ax$ .
- (2) (1 pts) The tabular setting is a special case when  $d = |\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}|$  and  $\phi(s, a) = \mathbf{e}_{(s, a)}$ , i.e., a vector with the coordinate indexed by (s, a) being 1 and all other coordinates being 0. Give an explicit expression of  $\sigma_{\min}$  as a function of  $\mu$ .

Hint: what kind of special structure does  $\Sigma_{\mu}$  possess in this case?

**Remark** For any definition of  $C^{\pi}$ , the corresponding definition for FQI is typically  $C = \max_{\pi} C^{\pi}$ . When we use the raw density ratio to define  $C^{\pi}$ , in general C will have to scale with  $|\mathcal{A}|$ , which cannot handle large action spaces. The result here shows that tightening  $C^{\pi}$  by leveraging the structure of  $\mathcal{F}$  can potentially avoid dependence on  $|\mathcal{A}|$ , as data distribution  $\mu$  now only needs to cover the directions occupied by  $d_{\pi}^{\pi}$  in the feature space  $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ .

 $<sup>^1</sup>C_\pi$  measures how well  $\mu$  covers policy  $\pi$ , and if we want the analog of concentrability (i.e., covering all policies), we can take  $\max_{\pi} C_{\pi}$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Here  $\phi$  is some general state-action feature map, and should not be confused with the  $\phi$  in Q1 which is a state abstraction.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Thus sometimes this bound can be quite loose.

**4.** (Optional; 3 pts) In the same setting as Q3 (linear complete  $\mathcal{F}$ ), first show that  $C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  in Eq. 1 has a more refined upper bound, given in matrix form:

$$C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F}) \le \sigma_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mu}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{d_t^{\pi}} \Sigma_{\mu}^{-1/2}),\tag{2}$$

where  $\Sigma_{(\cdot)} = \mathbb{E}_{(\cdot)}[\phi\phi^{\top}]$  is the feature covariance matrix under the distribution specified in the subscript, and  $\sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$  is the largest eigenvalue of a matrix. For simplicity we assume that  $\Sigma_{\mu}$  is invertible.

Now, it turns out that a more refined analysis in FQE can further replace  $C_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  with a tighter quantity,  $\bar{C}_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  (you can take this statement as given, but it should be clear if you prove Q2 using Eq.(5) from HW2):

$$\bar{C}_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F}) := \max_{f, f' \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{(\mathbb{E}_{d_t^{\pi}}[f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi}f'])^2}{\|f - \mathcal{T}^{\pi}f'\|_{2, \mu}^2}.$$

**Your second task** is to give an upper bound of  $\bar{C}_t^{\pi}(\mathcal{F})$  in matrix form that is analogous to the RHS of Eq.(2), and the bound can depend on  $\Sigma_{(\cdot)}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{(\cdot)}[\phi]$  for  $(\cdot) = \mu, d_t^{\pi}$ , i.e., the first and second order moments of  $\mu$  and  $d_t^{\pi}$ .

After deriving your bound, make a brief comment about how it compares to Eq.(2) qualitatively. Are there situations where one is bounded but the other can be arbitrarily large?