

# STATS 701 – Theory of Reinforcement Learning

## Markov Decision Processes, part 2

Ambuj Tewari

Associate Professor, Department of Statistics, University of Michigan  
tewaria@umich.edu

<https://ambujtewari.github.io/stats701-winter2021/>

Slide Credits: Prof. M. Vidyasagar @ IIT Hyderabad, India

Winter 2021

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation

# Outline

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation

# Outline

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation

# Value of a Policy by Iteration

Each policy  $\pi \in \Pi_d$  results in a Markov process with state transition matrix  $A^\pi$  and reward function  $R_\pi$ .

Define the vector  $\mathbf{v}_\pi$  by

$$\mathbf{v}_\pi = [ V_\pi(x_1) \quad \dots \quad V_\pi(x_n) ],$$

and the reward vector  $\mathbf{r}_\pi$  by

$$\mathbf{r}_\pi = [ R_\pi(x_1) \quad \dots \quad R_\pi(x_n) ].$$

Then  $\mathbf{v}_\pi$  satisfies the familiar relation

$$\mathbf{v}_\pi = \mathbf{r}_\pi + \gamma A^\pi \mathbf{v}_\pi.$$

This equation can be solved by iteration, as before.

# Outline

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation

# Action-Value Function

## Definition

The **action-value function**  $Q : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$Q_{\pi}(x_i, u_k) := E_{\pi} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{\pi}(X_t) \mid X_0 = x_i, U_0 = u_k \right].$$

**Note:** In the definition of  $Q_{\pi}(x_i, u_k)$ , at the **first** instant  $t = 0$  we choose the action  $u_k$  as we wish, not necessarily as  $u_k = \pi(x_i)$ .

But for  $t \geq 1$ , we choose  $U_t = \pi(X_t)$ .

$Q$  can be viewed as a real vector of dimension  $|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{U}|$ .

# Recursive Relationship of Action-Value Function

## Theorem

*The function  $Q$  satisfies the recursive relationship*

$$Q_{\pi}(x_i, u_k) = R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} Q_{\pi}(x_j, \pi(x_j)).$$

Proof in the notes.



# Relationship Between Action-Value and Value Functions

## Theorem

*The functions  $V_\pi$  and  $Q_\pi$  are related via*

$$V_\pi(x_i) = Q_\pi(x_i, \pi(x_i)).$$

In view of this theorem, the recursive equation for  $Q_\pi$ , namely

$$Q_\pi(x_i, u_k) = R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} Q_\pi(x_j, \pi(x_j)).$$

can be rewritten as

$$Q_\pi(x_i, u_k) = R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} V_\pi(x_j).$$

# Optimal Value Function and Optimal Policy

Let  $V^*(x_i)$  denote the maximum value of the discounted future reward, over all policies  $\pi \in \Pi_d$ :

$$V^*(x_i) := \max_{\pi \in \Pi_d} V_\pi(x_i).$$

Note that, though the set  $\Pi_d$  may be huge, it is nevertheless a finite set. Therefore the maximum above exists. Also define

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi_d} V_\pi(x_i).$$

Thus  $\pi^*$  is any policy such that  $V_{\pi^*} = V^*$ .

# Bellman Optimality Equation

## Theorem

Define  $V^*(x_i)$  as above. Then  $V^*(x_i)$  satisfies the recursive relationship

$$V^*(x_i) = \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^{u_k} V^*(x_j) \right].$$

This is known as the **Bellman optimality equation**. Note that it does not help us to **find** the function  $V^*$ ; it just a characterization of  $V^*$ .

# Rationalization of the Bellman Optimality Equation

Suppose that we have somehow determined the maximum possible value  $V^*(1, x_j)$  at time  $t = 1$  for each state  $x_j \in \mathcal{X}$ . Now at time  $t = 0$ , suppose the state  $X_0 = x_i$ . Then each action  $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$  leads to the value

$$R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^{u_k} V^*(1, x_j).$$

So the maximum value at time  $t = 0$ , state  $X_0 = x_i$  is given by

$$V^*(0, x_i) = \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^{u_k} V^*(1, x_j) \right].$$

However, since both the MDP and policy are time-invariant, we must have that  $V(1, x_i) = V(0, x_i)$  for each  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ .

# Recursive Relationship for Optimal Action-Value Function

## Theorem

Define

$$Q^*(x_i, u_k) = R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} V^*(x_j).$$

Then  $Q^*(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfies the relationship

$$Q^*(x_i, u_k) = R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} \max_{w_l \in \mathcal{U}} Q^*(x_j, w_l).$$

Note that the maximum w.r.t.  $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$  is in a different place compared to the Bellman equation. This is crucial.

# Advantage of Optimal Action-Value Function

## Theorem

*Once  $Q^*(\cdot, \cdot)$  is determined, we have that*

$$V^*(x_i) = \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} Q^*(x_i, u_k),$$

$$\pi^*(x_i) = \arg \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} Q^*(x_i, u_k),$$

Moreover, it is easier to “learn”  $Q^*(\cdot, \cdot)$  than to “learn”  $V^*(\cdot)$ , as we shall see.

# Outline

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation

# Value Update Map

Define the optimal value vector  $\mathbf{v}^*$  as

$$\mathbf{v}^* = [ V^*(x_1) \quad \cdots \quad V^*(x_n) ].$$

Next, define a “value update” map  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , as follows:

$$(T\mathbf{v})_i := \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ R(x_i, u) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^u v_j \right].$$

One can think of  $\mathbf{v}$  as the current guess for the vector  $\mathbf{v}^*$ , and of  $T\mathbf{v}$  as an updated guess. The next theorem shows that this intuition is valid.



# Value Iteration

## Theorem

*The map  $T$  is both monotone and a contraction. As a result, for all  $\mathbf{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the sequence of iterations  $\{T^k \mathbf{v}_0\}$  approaches  $\mathbf{v}^*$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .*

# Value Iteration Proof

Monotonicity is easy to prove, hence focus on contraction

$$\begin{aligned}
 & |(T\mathbf{w})_i - (T\mathbf{v})_i| \\
 &= |\max_u [R(x_i, u) + \gamma \sum_j a_{ij}^u w_j] - \max_u [R(x_i, u) + \gamma \sum_j a_{ij}^u v_j]| \\
 &\leq \max_u |\gamma \sum_j a_{ij}^u w_j - \gamma \sum_j a_{ij}^u v_j| \\
 &= \gamma \max_u |(A^u \mathbf{w})_i - (A^u \mathbf{v})_i| \leq \gamma \max_u \|A^u \mathbf{w} - A^u \mathbf{v}\|_\infty \\
 &\leq \gamma \max_u \|A^u\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|_\infty \\
 &\leq \gamma \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{v}\|_\infty
 \end{aligned}$$

# Action-Value Iteration

Define  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{U}|}$  as the vector  $[Q(x_i, u_k), x_i \in \mathcal{X}, u_k \in \mathcal{U}]$ . Define  $F : \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{U}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{U}|}$  by

$$(F\mathbf{q})(x_i, u_k) := R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^{u_k} \max_{w_l \in \mathcal{U}} Q(x_j, w_l).$$

## Theorem

*The map  $F$  is monotone and is a contraction. Therefore for all  $\mathbf{q}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{U}|}$ , the sequence of iterations  $\{T^k(\mathbf{q}_0)\}$  converges to  $\mathbf{q}^*$ .*

# Determining Optimal Policy from Optimal Value Function

Determining the optimal policy  $\pi^*$  from the optimal value function is easy.

## Theorem

*Suppose the optimal value vector  $\mathbf{v}^*$  is known, and define, for each  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ , the policy  $\pi^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  via*

$$\pi^*(x_i) = \arg \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ R(x_i, u) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^{u_k} V^*(x_j) \right].$$

But this requires knowledge of the optimal value function  $\mathbf{v}^*$ .

Is there another way? Yes, to update policy along with value iteration.

# Policy Iteration

Set iteration counter  $k = 0$  and choose some initial policy  $\pi_0$ . Then at iteration  $k$ ,

- Compute the value vector  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} = T_{\pi_k} \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$ . Note that computing  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$  by value iteration would require infinitely many applications of the map  $T_{\pi_k}$  to some arbitrary initial vector.
- Use this value vector  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$  to compute an updated policy  $\pi_{k+1}$ , via

$$\pi_{k+1}(x_i) = \arg \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{j \in [n]} a_{ij}^{u_k} (\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k})_j \right].$$

# Policy Iteration (Cont'd)

Note that the above equation implies that

$$T_{\pi_{k+1}} \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} = T \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} \geq T_{\pi_k} \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} = \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$$

where the last eq. is because  $v_{\pi_k}$  is the value function of  $\pi_k$

Since the map  $T_{\pi_{k+1}}$  is monotone, we can keep applying it to get

$$\forall \ell \geq 1, T_{\pi_{k+1}}^\ell \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} \geq \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$$

Note: LHS converges to  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_{k+1}}$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$

# Convergence of Policy Iteration

Suppose policy iteration doesn't improve the policy, i.e.  $\pi_{k+1} = \pi_k$  and the inequality  $T\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} \geq \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$  is equality. Then we have

$$T\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} = \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$$

So  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k}$  must be the optimal value function and the corresponding greedy policy  $\pi_{k+1} = \pi_k$  must be the optimal policy.

## Theorem

*We have that*

$$\mathbf{v}_{\pi_{k+1}} \geq \mathbf{v}_{\pi_k},$$

*where the dominance is componentwise. Consequently, there exists a finite integer  $k_0$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_{\pi_k} = \mathbf{v}^*$  for all  $k \geq k_0$ .*

# Outline

## 1 Markov Decision Processes: Solution Methodologies

- Value of a Policy by Iteration
- Action-Value Function and the Bellman Optimality Equation
- Value and Policy Iterations
- Linear Programming Formulation



# LP: Primal

Let  $\mathbf{d}$  be **any** distribution over states

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{v}} \quad & \mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{v} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{v} \geq T\mathbf{v} \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that  $\mathbf{v}^*$  is feasible and therefore the minimum is **at most**  $\mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{v}^*$

**Claim:** the minimum above is **equal to**  $\mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{v}^*$

**Why?**  $\mathbf{v} \geq T\mathbf{v}$  implies  $\mathbf{v} \geq T^\ell \mathbf{v} \Rightarrow \mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{v}^* \Rightarrow \mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{d}^\top \mathbf{v}^*$

## LP: equivalent form

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}} d(x_i) V(x_i)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall x_i \in \mathcal{X}, \quad V(x_i) \geq \max_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{X}} a_{ij}^{u_k} V(x_j)$$

# LP: equivalent form

$$\min_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}} d(x_i) V(x_i)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall x_i \in \mathcal{X}, u_k \in \mathcal{U}, \quad V(x_i) \geq R(x_i, u_k) + \gamma \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{X}} a_{ij}^{u_k} V(x_j)$$

This LP has  $n$  unconstrained variables and  $mn$  **inequality** constraints  
 Dual LP will have  $mn$  **non-negative** variables and  $n$  **equality** constraints

# LP: Dual

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max_{\mu} \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}, u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \mu(x_i, u_k) R(x_i, u_k) \\
 & \text{s.t. } \forall x_i \in \mathcal{X}, \sum_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} \mu(x_i, u_k) = d(x_i) + \gamma \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{u_k \in \mathcal{U}} A_{ij}^{u_k} \mu(x_j, u_k)
 \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation of  $\mu$ : discounted state-action visitation frequencies

$$\mu(x_j, u_k) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P(X_t = x_j, U_t = u_k)$$

Solution directly encodes **optimal policy**:  $\pi^*(x_j) = \arg \max_{u_k} \mu^*(x_j, u_k)$