Dynamic Programming - I

Judd Chapter 12

David Childers (thanks to Y. Kryukov, K. Judd, and U. Doraszelski)

CMU, Tepper School of Business

April 10 - 12, 2023

Agenda

- Dynamic problems features:
 - Time: Discrete $(\sum_{t=0}^{T} \beta^t)$ or continuous $(\int_0^T e^{-\rho t})$
 - Time horizon: finite $(T \in \mathbb{N})$ or infinite $(\tilde{T} = \infty)$
 - State: discrete or continuous
 - State transition: deterministic or stochastic
- DP gives us Bellman eq's for any combination of these
- onow: Theory: Finite and infinite horizon, with cont. state
- Computation with discrete states
 - Value & Policy iteration
 - Stochastic vs. deterministic transitions
- Computation with continuous state
 - Value function iteration
 - Projection
- Continuous time

Continuous vs. discrete time

- Assume continuous state, deterministic transitions
- A problem in continuous time:

$$\max_{\substack{\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} \pi(x(t), u(t)) dt \\ \text{subject to:}}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} \pi(x(t), u(t)) dt$$

- u = control / policy, x = state
- A problem in discrete time (today):

$$\max_{c} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t} \pi(x_{t}, u_{t})$$
subject to:
$$f\{x_{t}, x_{t+1}, u_{t}\} = 0$$

$$x_{0} = \bar{x}_{0}$$

• Different problems with different solutions!

Deriving Bellman's eq.: finite horizon

$$\max_{u,x \in \mathbb{R}^T} \quad \sum_{t=0}^T \beta^t \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta^{T+1} W(x_{T+1})$$
 subject to: $f\{x_t, x_{t+1}, u_t\} = 0 \ \forall t, \quad x_0 = \bar{x}_0$

• Can re-write objective as

$$\max_{\substack{u_0,..,u_{T-1} \\ x_1,...,x_T}} \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \beta^t \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta^T \max_{u_T, x_{T+1}} \begin{bmatrix} \pi(x_T, u_T) \\ +\beta W(x_{T+1}) \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

• Label the last term as the *Value function* $V(x_T, T)$:

$$V(x_T, T) : = \max_{u_T, x_{T+1}} \pi(x_T, u_T) + \beta W(x_{T+1})$$

s.t.: $f\{x_T, x_{T+1}, u_T\} = 0$,

 x_T is a parameter here (just like x_0 in the full model)

Next transformation

Using $V(\cdot, T)$, rewrite the objective further:

$$\max_{u_0,..,u_{T-2}} \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{T-2} \beta^t \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta^{T-1} \max_{u_{T-1}, x_T} \left[\begin{array}{c} \pi(x_{T-1}, u_{T-1}) \\ +\beta V(x_T, T) \end{array} \right] \right\}$$

and again define

$$V(x_{T-1}, T-1) : = \max_{u_{T-1}, x_T} \pi(x_{T-1}, u_{T-1}) + \beta V(x_T, T)$$

s.t. : $f\{x_{T-1}, x_T, u_{T-1}\} = 0$

State variable x_{T-1} is a *sufficient statistic* for whatever happened before period T-1.

Bellman's principle – finite horizon

Original problem:

$$\max_{u,x \in \mathbb{R}^T} \sum_{t=0}^T \beta^t \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta^{T+1} W(x_{T+1})$$

is equivalent to Bellman equations for t = 1, ..., T:

$$V(x_t, t) = \max_{u_t, x_{t+1}} \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta V(x_{t+1}, t+1)$$
s.t. $f\{x_t, x_{t+1}, u_t\} = 0$, (*)

• $V(\cdot, \cdot) = (\max \text{ of})$ net present value of remaining payoffs:

$$V(x_s, s) = \max_{u, x} \sum_{t=s}^{T} \beta^{t-s} \pi(x_t, u_t) + \beta^{T+1-s} W(x_{T+1})$$

Bellman principle – interpretation

- Instead of solving for $(u_0, x_1, u_1, ..., u_T, x_{T+1})$,
- Solve a sequence of problems for t = T, T 1, ..., 1
 - ullet Each problem has an arbitrary parameter x_t
 - Solution (*Policy function*): $U_t(x_t, t)$
 - Maximized objective (Value function): $V(x_t, t)$
- Can compute time path for the original problem:
 - x_0 known, $u_0 = U(x_0, 0)$,
 - x_1 solves $f\{x_0, x_1, u_0\} = 0$, $u_1 = U(x_1, 1)$, and so on
- Or we can analyze policy and value functions

Infinite horizon model

Explicit model:

$$V(x_0, 0) = \max_{u_0, x_1, u_1, \dots} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \pi(x_t, u_t)$$

s.t. : $f\{x_t, x_{t+1}, u_t\} = 0 \ \forall t, x_0 = \bar{x}_0$

Isolate the first term in the objective:

$$\max_{u_0, x_1} \left\{ \pi(x_0, u_0) + \beta \max_{u_1, x_2, u_2, \dots} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta^{t-1} \pi(x_t, u_t) \right\}$$

Define the value function:

$$V(x_1, 1) = \max_{u_1, x_2, u_2, \dots} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta^{t-1} \pi(x_t, u_t)$$

• Compare $V(x_1,1)$ to explicit model (Hint: define $\tau=t-1$)

Bellman principle – infinite horizon

- Time does not affect Value function, only the state does
- **Bellman** equations for infinite time horizon:

$$V(x) = \max_{u,x^{+} \in \mathbb{R}} \pi(x,u) + \beta V(x^{+})$$

s.t. : $f\{x,x^{+},u\} = 0$, (**)

x =state in current period, $x^+ =$ in the next period

- Unlike finite time, there is only one value function V(x)
- Policy function (decision rule):

$$U(x) = \arg \max ...$$

Richard Bellman, 1962



10 / 32

Practical solution to Bellman

• Policy function is defined by:

$$U(x) = \arg\max_{u} \pi(x, u) + \beta V(x^{+}(x, u))$$

- Note; $x^+(u, x)$ solves the constraint for x^+
- Take FOC (w.r.t. u):

$$\pi_u(x, U(x)) + \beta V'(x^+(x, U(x))) x_u^+(x, U(x)) = 0 \quad (***)$$

• If U(x) solves (***), we can replace (**) with:

$$V(x) = \pi(x, U(x)) + \beta V(x^{+}(x, U(x)))$$
 (****)

• (***)-(****) are a system of two functional equations, which we solve for two unknown functions: $V\left(x\right)$ and $U\left(x\right)$

More on Bellman's solution

- $V'(x^+(x,U(x)))$ in (***) nests unknown functions
 - To avoid it, use Envelope theorem for (**):

$$V'(x) = \pi_x(x, U(x)) + \beta V'(x^+(x, U(x)))x_x^+(x, U(x))$$

$$\Rightarrow \beta V'(x^+(x, U(x))) = \left[V'(x) - \pi_x(x, U(x))\right] / x_x^+(x, U(x))$$

- In many models, $x_x^+ = 1$
- Explicit problem solves for infinite sequence $u_1, u_0, ...$; DP solves for functions V(x) and U(x)
- If we want to construct timepath of u_t 's:
 - **1** $u_0 = U(x_0), x_1 \text{ solves } f\{x_0, x_1, u_0\} = 0,$
 - $u_1 = U(x_1)$, and so on

Dynamic Programming theory

- ullet Can often work with bounded support of $V\left(\cdot\right)$:
 - Neigborhood of the steady state x^*
 - Time path: $x \in [x_0, x^*]$
 - or just $x \in [-10^6, +10^6]$
- Functions of such x are a vector space;
 defining a norm makes it a metric space.
- Maximization problem in (**) is an operator on that space:

$$(T(V))(x) \equiv \max_{u,x^{+} \in \mathbb{R}} \pi(x,u) + \beta V(x^{+})$$

Bellman equation is thus a fixed-point problem:

$$V = T(V)$$

• If T is a contraction, a unique solution exists

DP Theory: Contraction mapping

Contraction mapping: T such that for some $\beta \in (0,1)$:

$$||T(V) - T(W)|| \le \beta ||V - W||, \quad \forall V, W$$

Blackwell's sufficient conditions for contraction:

- **1** B(X) is a set of bounded functions $V:X\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$
- **2** Monotonicity: $V, W \in B(X)$ such that $V(x) \leq W(x) \ \forall x \Rightarrow$

$$(T(V))(x) \le (T(W))(x), \forall x \in X$$

1 Discounting: there exists $\beta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$(T(V+a))(x) \le (T(V))(x) + \beta a$$

$$\forall V \in B(X)$$
, $\forall a \geq 0$, $\forall x$

Bellman operator is a contraction if:

- $x \in X$ compact set (e.g. neighborhood of the steady state)
- π is bounded & β < 1 (typically satisfied in Economics)

Extension A: stochastic transition

Explicit model (infinite time):

$$\max_{u} \mathbf{E}_{x} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t} \pi(x_{t}, u_{t}) \right]$$
 where : $x_{t+1} \sim F\left(\cdot | x_{t}, u_{t}\right) \ \forall t, x_{0} = \bar{x}_{0}$

- x_{t+1} is a Markov process conditioned on u_t
- Bellman equation:

$$V(x) = \max_{u,x^+ \in \mathbb{R}} \pi(x,u) + \beta \mathbf{E}_{x^+} \left[V(x^+) | x, u \right],$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{x^{+}}\left[V(x^{+})|x,u\right] = \int_{X} V\left(x^{+}\right) dF\left(x^{+}|x,u\right)$$

FOC:

$$\pi_u(x, U(x)) + \beta \int_X V(x^+) dF_u(x^+|x, U(x)) = 0$$

Extension B: stochastic payoff

Explicit model (determinstic state transitions):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u} \mathbf{E}_{\varepsilon} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t} \pi(x_{t}, u_{t}, \varepsilon_{t}) \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad : \quad f\{x_{t}, x_{t+1}, u_{t}\} = 0 \ \forall t \\ \varepsilon_{t} \quad \sim \quad G\left(\cdot\right), \text{ i.i.d.} \end{aligned}$$

- Agent learns ε_t only in period t (but not before)
- Full-information Bellman eq.:

$$\tilde{V}(x,\varepsilon) = \max_{u} \pi(x,u,\varepsilon) + \beta V(x^{+}(x,u))$$

 $\tilde{U}(x,\varepsilon) = \arg\max...$

Integrated Bellman:

$$V\left(x\right) = \mathbf{E}_{\varepsilon} \tilde{V}\left(x, \varepsilon\right)$$

• "U(x)" is a distribution, driven by ε

Stochastic payoff example

- Stochastic payoff framework is often used to model discrete choice:
 - $u \in \{u_1, ..., u_m\}$, e.g. exit/enter, or work/school/unempl.
 - $\varepsilon_t = \{\varepsilon_{t1}, ..., \varepsilon_{tm}\}$, $\varepsilon_{tj} \sim \text{i.i.d.}$ Type I Extreme Value, multiplied by σ (the variance parameter)
 - Choice-specific shocks: $\pi(x, u_j, \varepsilon) = \pi_j(x) + \varepsilon_j$;
 - let $\delta_j = \pi_j(x) + \beta V(x^+(x, u_j))$
- Then we have closed-form expressions:

$$V(x) = \sigma \log \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \exp \left(\delta_j / \sigma \right) \right\}$$

$$\Pr\left\{U\left(x\right) = u_{j}\right\} = \frac{\exp\left(\delta_{j}/\sigma\right)}{\sum_{l=1}^{m} \exp\left(\delta_{l}/\sigma\right)}$$

Numeric solution: discrete states

- Discrete states are easier to understand
 - Continuous states (next class) might be faster to solve
- States $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ a vector of possible values
 - Value function becomes a vector: $V\left(\cdot\right)=\left\{V_{i}=V\left(x_{i}\right)\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$
- Stochastic transition first-order Markov process:
 - Let current state be x_i and control be u
 - Then, $q_{ij}(u) = \text{probability of next-period state being } x_i$
 - It is common to limit transitions to 2-3 neighboring states
- Deterministic transitions will be covered separately
 - $q_{ij}(u) \in \{0,1\}$, so we cannot differentiate it
 - Policy u becomes discrete as well

Finite horizon

• Finite-horizon case (t = 0, ..., T):

$$V_i^t = \max_{u} \pi(x_i, u, t) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{ij}^t(u) V_j^{t+1}$$

- with terminal condition $V_i^{T+1} \equiv W(x_i)$
- Recursive system of n(T+1) equations in n(T+1) unknowns:
 - Have $V_i^{T+1} \equiv W(x_i)$, maximization problem gives $\left\{V_i^T\right\}_{i=1}^n$
 - ullet Continue using V_i^{t+1} 's to compute V_i^t 's
 - Stop when t = 0 is reached

Discrete states + infinite time horizon

- No more time-dependence: $V_i = V(x_i)$, i = 1, ..., n.
- The Bellman equation is:

$$V_i = \max_{u} \pi(x_i, u) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{ij}(u) V_j.$$
 (1)
$$U_i^* = \arg\max...$$

- Can have constraints on u (e.g. $0 \le c \le k + f(k)$)
- System of 2n nonlinear equations in 2n unknowns:

$$V_{i} = \pi(x_{i}, U_{i}^{*}) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{ij}(U_{i}^{*})V_{j}$$

$$0 = \pi_{u}(x_{i}, U_{i}^{*}) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} q'_{ij}(U_{i}^{*})V_{j}$$

 Can solve using any method, but the most common way is fixed point iteration (next slide)

Value function iteration

Define the operator T pointwise by

$$(TV)_i = \max_{u} \pi(x_i, u) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{ij}(u) V_j, \quad i = 1, ..., n.$$

- Initialization: Choose initial guess V^0 and stopping criterion ϵ .
- Step 1: Compute $V^{k+1} = TV^k$.
- Step 2: If $||V^{k+1} V^k|| < \epsilon$, stop; otherwise, go to step 1.
- The sequence $\left\{V^k\right\}_{k=0}^\infty$ converges linearly at rate β to V^* and:

$$||V^k - V^*|| \le \frac{||V^{k+1} - V^k||}{1 - \beta}.$$

- To ensure $||V^{k+1} V^*|| < \epsilon$, stop if $||V^{k+1} V^k|| \le \epsilon (1 \beta)$.
- Maximization is the slowest part.
 - ullet Good V^0 : monotonicity, concavity as in the solution
 - Good guess for u_i : solution from previous iteration

Policy function iteration – idea

- Let $U = \{U_i \equiv U(x_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be a guess of the policy function
- Value iteration follows chosen policy for one period
- Even if U is close to optimal at each iteration, it can take many iterations to compute the optimal V.
- ullet Once U is computed, update of V is linear
- Define transition matrix $Q\left(U\right):\left[Q\left(U\right)\right]_{ij}=q_{ij}(U_i)$, and payoff vector $\Pi\left(U\right):\left[\Pi\left(U\right)\right]_i=\pi(x_i,U_i)$
- Following policy U indefinitely leads to value f-n V^U that solves a system of linear equations:

$$V^{U} = \Pi(U) + \beta Q(U) V^{U}$$
 (2)
 $V^{U} = (I - \beta Q(U))^{-1} \Pi(U)$.

Policy function iteration – implementation

- Initialization: Choose initial guess V^0 and stopping criterion ϵ . (Or: Choose U^0 instead of V^0 and go to step 2.)
- Compute U^{k+1} by solving (1) with V^k in r.h.s.
- ② Plug U^{k+1} into (2), solve for V^{k+1} .
- **1** If $||V^{k+1} V^k|| < \epsilon$, stop; otherwise, go to step 1.
 - Setting up (2) for Step 2 can be a lot of code
 - ullet (2) computes the value of following policy U^{k+1} indefinitely
 - Modified policy iteration: follow U^{k+1} for m periods:
 - 2.a: Set $W^0 = V^k$.
 - 2.b: Compute $W^{j+1} = \pi (U^{k+1}) + \beta Q (U^{k+1}) W^j$ for j = 0, ..., m-1
 - 2.c: Set $V^{k+1} = W^m$.

Extension: deterministic state transition

- Formally, $q_{ij}(u) \in \{0,1\}$
 - Not differentiable \Rightarrow no more FOC
 - Instead, we use deterministic l.o.m: $x^+ = f(x_i, u)$
- Practically, we have to have $x^+ \in X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$, so u is limited to values that ensure this
 - If $x = x_i$, then for any $x^+ = x_j$, we have $u_{ij} = f^{-1}(x_i, x_j)$
 - This lets us define to $\pi_{ij} \equiv \pi (x_i, u_{ij})$
- Fixed point methods iterate on:

$$V_i^{k+1} = \max_j \pi_{ij} + \beta V_j^k$$

$$U_i = \arg \max ...$$

• Very simple to implement, but there is a cost

Problems with deterministic state transition

- Sawtooth policy function & waves in value function
 - Discrete u creates errors in V, which accumulate until a large correction
- Problems with convergence, or lack of solution altogether
 - You are playing a game against your future self, and restrict this game to pure strategies.
 - ullet Use dampening to try get V to converge
- If you suspect sawtooth pattern or discretization effects:
 - Switch to continuous state (next topic)
 - Try changing number of states, see if shape of policy function changes: Finer grid should lead to smaller teeth.

Example - optimal growth

Discrete time:

$$\max_{\{c_t\}} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t)$$
 subject to: $k_{t+1} - k_t = f(k_t) - c_t$

- ... and state: $k \in K = \{k_1, k_2, ..., k_n\}$
- Constraint implies that: $c_t = k_t + f(k_t) k_{t+1}$, so

$$\max_{\left\{k_{t}\right\}} \sum\nolimits_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t} u\left(k_{t} + f\left(k_{t}\right) - k_{t+1}\right)$$

- I.e. we limit c(k) to a discrete set of values
- Formulate Bellman equation:

$$V(k) = \max_{k^{+} \in K} u(k + f(k) - k^{+}) + \beta V(k^{+})$$

Example - value iteration

- Index states by i = 1, ..., n
- Our simplification implies deterministic state transition: $q_{ij} \in \{0,1\}$
 - This indeed simplifies math & coding
 - But can lead to unreasonable solutions
- \bullet Start with a guess $\left\{V_i^0\right\}_{i=1}^n$
- Step 1: for each *i*, solve:

$$V_i^{k+1} = \max_j u(k_i + f(k_i) - k_j) + \beta V_j^k$$
 (3)

ullet Step 2: check if $\max_i \left| V_i^k - V_i^{k+1}
ight| < arepsilon$; stop if yes.

Example - other methods & extension

Modified policy iteration

- Step 1: same; save $j_i = \arg \max_j ...$
- Step 2a: Set $W_i^0 = V_i^k$, i = 1, ..., n
- Step 2b: Compute $W_i^{\tau+1} = u(k_i + f(k_i) k_{j_i}) + \beta W_{j_i}^{\tau}$, repeat for $\tau = 0, \ldots, n$
- Step 2c: Set $V_i^{k+1} = W_i^{n+1}$, i = 1, ..., n
- **Gauss-Seidel**: use V_j^{k+1} in (3) whenever available
- Can use dampening or acceleration
- Extension: restoring continuity via stochastic transition
 - We want $c_i = c(k_i) \in R_+$. But then, $k^+(k_i)$ might not be on the grid
 - \Rightarrow Modify model: $q_{ij}(c_i)$ randomizes between grid points around $k^+(k_i)$, to form approximation to $V(k^+)$

Note on Gaussian methods

• Value function iteration is **Pre**-Gauss-Jacobi iteration:

$$V_i^{k+1} = \max_{u \in D(x_i)} \pi(x_i, u) + \beta \sum_{j=1}^n q_{ij}(u) V_j^k, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

 V_i^k (old value) appears in r.h.s.

• True Gauss-Jacobi – solve for V_i :

$$V_i^{k+1} = \max_{u \in D(x_i)} \frac{\pi(x_i, u) + \beta \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij}(u) V_j^k}{1 - \beta q_{ii}(u)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

ullet Pre-Gauss-Seidel iteration: use already computed V_i^{k+1} 's

Upwind Gauss-Seidel - idea

Gauss-Seidel method depends on the ordering of states.

- At the steady state, we have a static problem
 - Can solve for V_i and u_i in a single iteration
 - Backward Induction: solve states that transit into the steady one,
 - then states that transit into them, and so on
 - This works best with deterministic state transitions
- Stochastic transition Upwind Gauss-Seidel:
 - Recall: $q_{i,j}(U_i) = \text{prob.}$ of j being the next period's state
 - ullet Record optimal policy U_i^{k-1} from previous iteration
 - Re-order the states so that $q_{i,i+1}(U_i^{k-1}) \leq q_{i+1,i}(U_{i+1}^{k-1})$,
 - ullet Then update V by visiting the states in this new order

Upwind Gauss-Seidel - tricks

- " $q_{i,i+1}(U_i^{k-1}) \leq q_{i+1,i}(U_{i+1}^{k-1})$ " takes time to compute and sort
- Simulated upwind G-S:
 - Simulate the Markov process under U^k , which approximates the limiting distribution
 - Visit the states in the order of decreasing probability
- Alternating sweep G-S:
 - Visit the states in increasing order if *k* is odd, ...
 - ... and decreasing order if *k* is even.
 - ullet \Rightarrow "Right" order on every second iteration.

Additional References

- Dynamic programming in Economics
 - Classics: Ljungqvist and Sargent Recursive Macroeconomic Theory, Stokey, Lucas, and Prescott Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics
 - Modern readable intro: Stachurski Economic Dynamics: Theory and Computation
 - Code: Quantecon
- Reinforcement Learning: CompSci perspective
 - Classic: Sutton and Barto Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction
 - Code: Kochendorfer, Wheeler, Wray Algorithms for Decision Making
 - Notes: Hazan, Computational Control Theory, Agarwal, Jiang, Kakade, Sun Reinforcement Learning: Theory and Algorithms, Silver Introduction to Reinforcement Learning