# CME241 Notes

### Saakaar Bhatnagar

#### Policy Gradient Method

### 1 Summary

- Value function approximation does not help deal with large/continuous action spaces
- Obtaining a parametrized expression for the policy directly without necessary dealing with the value function can deal with this
- The PG algorithm enables this by replacing the policy improvement step by essentially a gradient ascent step
- The cost function maximized is the expected returns
- The gradients of parameter vector  $\theta$  is calculated based on the above function
- Since the gradient contains an expression for the true action value-function, we replace it by an approximation
- These approximations might suffer from bias and variance issues
- We deal with variance issues by replacing  $Q^{\pi}$  by the advantage function  $A^{\pi}$
- We deal with the bias problem by using the compatible function approximation theorem

#### 2 Score Calculations

#### 2.1 Discrete Action Space

Using a softmax prediction to calculate probabilities:

$$\pi(a, s; \theta) = \frac{\exp\{\theta^T \phi(s, a)\}}{\sum_b \exp\{\theta^T \phi(s, b)\}}$$

Therefore,

$$log\pi = \theta^T \phi(s, a) - log \sum_b \exp\{\theta^T \phi(s, b)\}$$

Differentiate by  $\theta$ 

$$\nabla_{\theta} log \pi(a, s; \theta) = \phi(a, s) - \sum_{b} \pi(s, b; \theta) \phi(s, b)$$

#### 2.2 Continuous Action Space

In this case we set the mean from the linear span, and can use either a fixed or a parametrized variance.

Therefore,

$$f(a) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{\frac{-(a - \theta^T \phi(s))^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\}$$

Hence,

$$log\pi = -0.5 \frac{(a - \theta^T \phi(s))^2}{\sigma^2} - log\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}$$

Differentiate w.r.t  $\theta$ ,

$$\nabla_{\theta} log \pi = \frac{a - \theta^T \phi(s)}{\sigma^2} \phi(s)$$

## 3 Compatible Function Approximation Theorem

Helps reduce the bias present in the updates for  $\theta$ , by changing the objective function we minimize for w. It is based on meeting two conditions:

$$\nabla_{\theta} log \pi(a, s; \theta) = \nabla_{w} Q(a, s; w)$$

and that the function we minimize to obtain w is:

$$\epsilon = \int_{S} \rho^{\pi}(s) \int_{A} \pi(a, s; \theta) (Q^{\pi} - Q)^{2} . da. ds$$

Where Q is a function of w.If we differentiate the second condition by w,

$$0 = \int_{S} \rho^{\pi}(s) \int_{A} \pi(a, s; \theta) (Q^{\pi} - Q) \nabla_{w} Q. da. ds$$

Now if we substitute the first condition and rearrange:

$$\int_{S} \rho^{\pi}(s) \int_{A} \pi(a, s; \theta)(Q^{\pi}) \nabla_{\theta} log \pi. da. ds = \int_{S} \rho^{\pi}(s) \int_{A} \pi(a, s; \theta)(Q) \nabla_{\theta} log \pi. da. ds$$

But since

$$\pi \nabla_{\theta} log \pi = \nabla_{\theta} \pi$$

the LHS is equal to gradient of cost function required, or

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) = \int_{S} \rho^{\pi}(s) \int_{A} \nabla_{\theta} \pi(a, s; \theta) Q(s, a; w). da. ds$$

Therefore RHS is as well, and we have shown that using an approximation for Q will give us the exact same result as true policy gradient, removing the error due to bias.