6.231 Dynamic Programming and Stochastic Control Fall 2008

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.

6.231 DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING

LECTURE 25

LECTURE OUTLINE

- Additional topics in ADP
- Nonlinear versions of the projected equation
- Extension of *Q*-learning for optimal stopping
- Basis function adaptation
- Gradient-based approximation in policy space

NONLINEAR EXTENSIONS OF PROJECTED EQ.

• If the mapping T is nonlinear (as for example in the case of multiple policies) the projected equation $\Phi r = \Pi T(\Phi r)$ is also nonlinear.

• Any solution r^* satisfies

$$r^* \in \arg\min_{r\in\Re^s} \left\|\Phi r - T(\Phi r^*)\right\|^2$$

or equivalently

$$\Phi' \big(\Phi r^* - T(\Phi r^*) \big) = 0$$

This is a nonlinear equation, which may have one or many solutions, or no solution at all.

• If ΠT is a contraction, then there is a unique solution that can be obtained (in principle) by the fixed point iteration

$$\Phi r_{k+1} = \Pi T(\Phi r_k)$$

• We have seen a nonlinear special case of projected value iteration/LSPE where ΠT is a contraction, namely optimal stopping.

• This case can be generalized.

LSPE FOR OPTIMAL STOPPING EXTENDED

• Consider a system of the form

$$x = T(x) = Af(x) + b,$$

where $f : \Re^n \mapsto \Re^n$ is a mapping with scalar components of the form $f(x) = (f_1(x_1), \ldots, f_n(x_n)).$

• Assume that each $f_i : \Re \mapsto \Re$ is nonexpansive:

$$\left|f_i(x_i) - f_i(\bar{x}_i)\right| \le |x_i - \bar{x}_i|, \qquad \forall i, x_i, \bar{x}_i \in \Re$$

This guarantees that T is a contraction with respect to any weighted Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|_{\xi}$ whenever A is a contraction with respect to that norm.

• Algorithms similar to LSPE [approximating $\Phi r_{k+1} = \Pi T(\Phi r_k)$] are then possible.

• Special case: In the optimal stopping problem of Section 6.4, x is the Q-factor corresponding to the continuation action, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is a discount factor, $f_i(x_i) = \min\{c_i, x_i\}$, and $A = \alpha P$, where P is the transition matrix for continuing.

• If $\sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{\bar{i}j} < 1$ for some state \bar{i} , and $0 \leq P \leq Q$, where Q is an irreducible transition matrix, then $\Pi((1-\gamma)I+\gamma T)$ is a contraction with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\xi}$ for all $\gamma \in (0,1)$, even with $\alpha = 1$.

BASIS FUNCTION ADAPTATION I

• An important issue in ADP is how to select basis functions.

• A possible approach is to introduce basis functions that are parametrized by a vector θ , and optimize over θ , i.e., solve the problem

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} F(\tilde{J}(\theta))$$

where $\tilde{J}(\theta)$ is the solution of the projected equation.

• One example is

$$F(\tilde{J}(\theta)) = \left\| \tilde{J}(\theta) - T(\tilde{J}(\theta)) \right\|^2$$

• Another example is

$$F(\tilde{J}(\theta)) = \sum_{i \in I} |J(i) - \tilde{J}(\theta)(i)|^2,$$

where I is a subset of states, and J(i), $i \in I$, are the costs of the policy at these states calculated directly by simulation.

BASIS FUNCTION ADAPTATION II

• Some algorithm may be used to minimize $F(\tilde{J}(\theta))$ over θ .

• A challenge here is that the algorithm should use low-dimensional calculations.

• One possibility is to use a form of random search method; see the paper by Menache, Mannor, and Shimkin (Annals of Oper. Res., Vol. 134, 2005)

• Another possibility is to use a gradient method. For this it is necessary to estimate the partial derivatives of $\tilde{J}(\theta)$ with respect to the components of θ .

• It turns out that by differentiating the projected equation, these partial derivatives can be calculated using low-dimensional operations. See the paper by Menache, Mannor, and Shimkin, and a recent paper by Yu and Bertsekas (2008).

APPROXIMATION IN POLICY SPACE I

• Consider an average cost problem, where the problem data are parametrized by a vector r, i.e., a cost vector g(r), transition probability matrix P(r). Let $\eta(r)$ be the (scalar) average cost per stage, satisfying Bellman's equation

$$\eta(r)e + h(r) = g(r) + P(r)h(r)$$

where h(r) is the corresponding differential cost vector.

• Consider minimizing $\eta(r)$ over r (here the data dependence on control is encoded in the parametrization). We can try to solve the problem by nonlinear programming/gradient descent methods.

• **Important fact:** If $\Delta \eta$ is the change in η due to a small change Δr from a given r, we have

$$\Delta \eta = \xi' (\Delta g + \Delta P h),$$

where ξ is the steady-state probability distribution/vector corresponding to P(r), and all the quantities above are evaluated at r:

$$\Delta \eta = \eta(r + \Delta r) - \eta(r),$$

 $\Delta g = g(r + \Delta r) - g(r), \qquad \Delta P = P(r + \Delta r) - P(r)$

APPROXIMATION IN POLICY SPACE II

• **Proof of the gradient formula:** We have, by "differentiating" Bellman's equation,

$$\Delta \eta(r) \cdot e + \Delta h(r) = \Delta g(r) + \Delta P(r)h(r) + P(r)\Delta h(r)$$

By left-multiplying with ξ' ,

$$\xi' \Delta \eta(r) \cdot e + \xi' \Delta h(r) = \xi' \left(\Delta g(r) + \Delta P(r) h(r) \right) + \xi' P(r) \Delta h(r)$$

Since $\xi' \Delta \eta(r) \cdot e = \Delta \eta(r)$ and $\xi' = \xi' P(r)$, this equation simplifies to

$$\Delta \eta = \xi' (\Delta g + \Delta Ph)$$

• Since we don't know ξ , we cannot implement a gradient-like method for minimizing $\eta(r)$. An alternative is to use "sampled gradients", i.e., generate a simulation trajectory (i_0, i_1, \ldots) , and change r once in a while, in the direction of a simulation-based estimate of $\xi'(\Delta g + \Delta Ph)$.

• There is much recent research on this subject, see e.g., the work of Marbach and Tsitsiklis, and Konda and Tsitsiklis, and the refs given there.