Choice of objective for approximate policy evaluation

Arthur Guez

Tea talk

Should one compute the Temporal Difference fix point or minimize the Bellman Residual ? The unified oblique projection view

Bruno Scherrer

SCHERRER@LORIA.FR

Reminder: Exact Policy Evaluation

Value for policy π at state *i*:

$$v_{\pi}(i) = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^{k} r(i_{k}) | i_{0} = i]$$

Let $v_{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{N}$, *P* is a matrix $N \times N$ containing transition prob (dynamics + policy). Then v_{π} is the unique **fixed point** of the Bellman operator:

$$\mathcal{T}v := r + \gamma Pv$$

$$v_{\pi} = \mathcal{T}v_{\pi} \implies v_{\pi} = (I - \gamma P)^{-1}r$$

(Note: π fixed, dropping π subscripts)

Suppose *N* is very large (or infinite), parametrize *v* with low-dim vector *w* as:

$$\hat{v}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^m w_j \phi_j(i)$$

with $m \ll N$ and ϕ_j the feature vectors. Denote by $\Phi = (\phi_1 \dots \phi_m)$ the $N \times m$ feature matrix, then:

 $\hat{v} = \Phi w$

- コン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4日ン

Which \hat{v} should we compute to approximate v?

• Ideal \hat{v} : minimize $\|\hat{v} - v\|$ according to some norm.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

Which \hat{v} should we compute to approximate v?

- Ideal \hat{v} : minimize $\|\hat{v} v\|$ according to some norm.
- Usual norm in DP/RL: ξ-weighted quadratic norm

 $(||x||_{\xi} = \sqrt{\sum \xi_i x_i^2} = \sqrt{x' \Xi x})$, where ξ is a distribution on the states.

- コン・4回シュービン・4回シューレー

Which \hat{v} should we compute to approximate v?

- Ideal \hat{v} : minimize $\|\hat{v} v\|$ according to some norm.
- ► Usual norm in DP/RL: ξ -weighted quadratic norm

 $(||x||_{\xi} = \sqrt{\sum \xi_i x_i^2} = \sqrt{x' \Xi x})$, where ξ is a distribution on the states.

$$\hat{v}_{\text{best}} = \Phi w_{\text{best}}$$
$$= \underbrace{\Phi(\Phi' \Xi \Phi)^{-1} \Phi' \Xi}_{\Pi} v$$
$$= \Pi (I - \gamma P)^{-1} r$$

Can't compute directly! Direct Monte-Carlo estimates are possible but high-variance.

Tractable objective: TD(0) fixpoint

- Look for fixed point of ΠT operator.
- Want $\hat{v}_{TD} = \Pi T \hat{v}_{TD}$. Closed-form for weights (if inverse exists):

$$w_{\rm TD} = (\Phi' \Xi L \Phi)^{-1} \Phi' \Xi r \tag{1}$$

▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

Tractable objective: TD(0) fixpoint

- Look for fixed point of ΠT operator.
- Want $\hat{v}_{\text{TD}} = \Pi T \hat{v}_{\text{TD}}$. Closed-form for weights (if inverse exists):

$$w_{\rm TD} = (\Phi' \Xi L \Phi)^{-1} \Phi' \Xi r \tag{1}$$

- By far the most popular objective, both for incremental (online) methods (TD(0), gradient TDs) and batch (LSTD, LSPE, and some iterative methods).
- ► Example: Gradient TD methods minimize error $E_{\text{TD}}(\hat{v}) = \|\hat{v} \Pi \mathcal{T} \hat{v}\|_{\xi}$

Tractable objective: minimize Bellman Residual

- Find \hat{v} that minimize $E_{BR}(\hat{v}) = \|\hat{v} \mathcal{T}\hat{v}\|_{\xi}$
- Closed-form solution for the weights (always exists):

$$w_{\rm BR} = (\Psi' \Xi \Psi)^{-1} \Psi' \Xi r, \qquad (2)$$

with $\Psi = L\Phi$.

Picture and examples

Result

Quality of TD fixpoint and BR solutions on the small example:



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

y axis =
$$\frac{e(w_{TD})}{e(w_{best})}$$
 and $\frac{e(w_{BR})}{e(w_{best})}$

Theoretical guarantees

• **TD**: Yes but only for on-policy sampling ($\xi = p_{\pi}$). (Tsitsiklis & Van Roy, 1996) The fixpoint might exist nonetheless and most methods will converge to it. (see (Kolter 2011) for quality of solution in that case)

 BR: Yes in all cases (can bound the error relative to BR). (See (Williams & Baird, 1993) and (Munos, 2003)) BR not really popular for these reasons:

 Sample-based BR slower to converge (plus might require double-sampling).

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、(E)、(O)へ(C)

• TD finds v_{best} but not BR in some cases.

Oblique projection view

TD and BR are both oblique projections onto span(Φ) and orthogonal to subspace spanned by $X_{TD} = \Xi \Phi$ or $X_{BR} = \Xi L \Phi$.

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Can prove bound for any oblique projection. Not predictive of empirical performance according to results.

Empirical result

Randomly generated Φ and *P* for different *N* and *m*. More situations where TD is better:



Figure 2. TD win ratio.

Empirical result

but TD fails badly with the instabilities:



Conclusion

- ▶ TD(0) objective can be unstable, has advantages in practice.
- What if ξ and p_{π} are not too different? Or if TD(λ) is used?
- In the end, mostly after the results of approximate policy iteration, with a lot more instabilities to deal with (e.g. policy oscillations).

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●