Advanced Econometrics 2, Hilary term 2021 Reinforcement learning

Maximilian Kasy

Department of Economics, Oxford University

Agenda

- Markov decision problems: Goal oriented interactions with an environment.
- Expected updates dynamic programming.
 Familiar from economics. Requires complete knowledge of transition probabilities.
- Sample updates: Transition probabilities are unknown.
 - On policy: Sarsa.
 - Off policy: Q-learning.
- Approximation: When state and action spaces are complex.
 - On policy: Semi-gradient Sarsa.
 - Off policy: Semi-gradient Q-learning.
 - Deep reinforcement learning.
 - ▶ Eligibility traces and $TD(\lambda)$.

Takeaways for this part of class

- Markov decision problems provide a general model of goal-oriented interaction with an environment.
- Reinforcement learning considers Markov decision problems where transition probabilities are unknown.
- A leading approach is based on estimating action-value functions.
- If state and action spaces are small, this can be done in tabular form, otherwise approximation (e.g., using neural nets) is required.
- We will distinguish between on-policy and off-policy learning.

Introduction

- Many interesting problems can be modeled as Markov decision problems.
- Biggest successes in game play (Backgammon, Chess, Go, Atari games,...), where lots of data can be generated by self-play.
- Basic framework is familiar from macro / structural micro, where it is solved using dynamic programming / value function iteration.
- Big difference in reinforcement learning:
 Transition probabilities are not known, and need to be learned from data.
- This makes the setting similar to bandit problems, with the addition of changing states.
- We will discuss several approaches based on estimating action-value functions.

Markov decision problems

- ightharpoonup Time periods t = 1, 2, ...
- ▶ States $S_t \in \mathcal{S}$ (This is the part that's new relative to bandits!)
- ▶ Actions $A_t \in \mathscr{A}(S_t)$
- ightharpoonup Rewards R_{t+1}
- Dynamics (transition probabilities):

$$P(S_{t+1} = s', R_{t+1} = r | S_t = s, A_t = a, S_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, ...) = p(s', r | s, a).$$

- The distribution depends only on the current state and action.
- It is constant over time.
- We will allow for continuous states and actions later.

Policy function, value function, action value function

- ▶ Objective: Discounted stream of rewards, $\sum_{t>0} \gamma^t R_t$.
- Expected future discounted reward at time t, given the state $S_t = s$: Value function,

$$V_t(s) = E\left[\sum_{t' \geq t} \gamma^{t'-t} R_{t'} | \mathcal{S}_t = s
ight].$$

Expected future discounted reward at time t, given the state $S_t = s$ and action $A_t = a$: Action value function,

$$Q_t(a,s) = E\left[\sum_{t' \geq t} \gamma^{t'-t} R_{t'} | S_t = s, A_t = a\right].$$

Bellman equation

Consider a policy $\pi(a|s)$, giving the probability of choosing a in state s. This gives us all transition probabilities, and we can write expected discounted returns recursively

$$Q_\pi(a,s) = (\mathscr{B}_\pi Q_\pi)(a,s) = \sum_{s',r} p(s',r|s,a) \left(r + \gamma \cdot \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s') Q_\pi(a',s')
ight).$$

Suppose alternatively that future actions are chosen optimally.
 We can again write expected discounted returns recursively

$$Q_*(a,s) = (\mathscr{B}_*Q_*)(a,s) = \sum_{s',r} p(s',r|s,a) \left(r + \gamma \cdot \max_{a'} Q_*(a',s')\right).$$

Existence and uniequeness of solutions

- The operators \mathcal{B}_{π} and \mathcal{B}_{*} define contraction mappings on the space of action value functions. (As long as $\gamma < 1$.)
- By Banach's fixed point theorem, unique solutions exist.
- The difference between assuming a given policy π , or considering optimal actions $\arg\max_a Q(a,s)$, is the dividing line between on policy and off policy methods in reinforcement learning.

Expected updates - dynamic programming

- Suppose we know the transition probabilities p(s', r|s, a).
- Then we can in principle just solve for the action value functions and optimal policies.
- This is typically assumed in macro, IO models.
- Solutions: Dynamic programming. Iteratively replace
 - $ightharpoonup Q_{\pi}(a,s)$ by $(\mathscr{B}_{\pi}Q_{\pi})(a,s)$, or
 - $ightharpoonup Q_*(a,s)$ by $(\mathscr{B}_*Q_*)(a,s)$.
- Decision problems with terminal states: Can solve in one sweep of backward induction.
- Otherwise: Value function iteration until convergence replace repeatedly.

Sample updates

- In practically interesting settings, agents (human or AI) typically don't know the transition probabilities p(s', r|s, a).
- This is where reinforcement learning comes in.
 Learning from observation while acting in an environment.
- Observations come in the form of tuples

$$\langle s, a, r, s' \rangle$$
.

Based on a sequence of such tuples, we want to learn Q_{π} or Q_* .

Classification of one-step reinforcement learning methods

- 1. Known vs. unknown transition probabilities.
- 2 Value function vs. action value function.
- 3. On policy vs. off policy.
- We will discuss Sarsa and Q-learning.
- Both: unknown transition probabilities and action value functions.
- First: "tabular" methods, where we keep track off all possible values (a, s).
- Then: "approximate" methods for richer spaces of (a, s), e.g., deep neural nets.



 $v_{\pi}(s)$

Expected updates (DP)







 $v_*(s)$









Sarsa

- On policy learning of action value functions.
- ► Recall Bellman equation

$$Q_{\pi}(a,s) = \sum_{s',r} p(s',r|s,a) \left(r + \gamma \cdot \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s') Q_{\pi}(a',s') \right).$$

- Sarsa estimates expectations by sample averages.
- After each observation $\langle s, a, r, s', a' \rangle$, replace the estimated $Q_{\pi}(a, s)$ by

$$Q_{\pi}(a,s) + \alpha \cdot (r + \gamma \cdot Q_{\pi}(a',s') - Q_{\pi}(a,s))$$
.

ightharpoonup lpha is the step size / speed of learning / rate of forgetting.

Sarsa as stochastic (semi-)gradient descent

- ► Think of $Q_{\pi}(a, s)$ as prediction for $Y = r + \gamma \cdot Q_{\pi}(a', s')$.
- Quadratic prediction error:

$$(Y-Q_{\pi}(a,s))^2.$$

• Gradient for minimization of prediction error for current observation w.r.t. $Q_{\pi}(a,s)$:

$$-(Y-Q_{\pi}(a,s)).$$

- Sarsa is thus a variant of stochastic gradient descent.
- Variant: Data are generated by actions where π is chosen as the optimal policy for the current estimate of Q_{π} .
- Reasonable method, but convergence guarantees are tricky.

Q-learning

- Similar to Sarsa, but off policy.
- Like Sarsa, estimate expectation over p(s', r|s, a) by sample averages.
- ▶ Rather than the observed next action a' consider the optimal action $\underset{argmax}{a'} Q_*(a', s')$.
- After each observation $\langle s, a, r, s' \rangle$, replace the estimated $Q_*(a, s)$ by

$$Q_*(a,s) + \alpha \cdot \left(r + \gamma \cdot \max_{a'} Q_*(a',s') - Q_*(a,s)\right).$$

Approximation

- So far, we have implicitly assumed that there is a small, finite number of states s and actions a, so that we can store Q(a,s) in tabular form.
- In practically interesting cases, this is not feasible.
- lnstead assume parametric functional form for $Q(a, s; \theta)$.
- In particular: Deep neural nets!
- Assume differentiability with gradient $\nabla_{\theta} Q(a, s; \theta)$.

Stochastic gradient descent

▶ Denote our prediction target for an observation $\langle s, a, r, s', a' \rangle$ by

$$Y = r + \gamma \cdot Q_{\pi}(a', s'; \theta).$$

As before, for the on-policy case, we have the quadratic prediction error

$$(Y-Q_{\pi}(a,s;\theta))^2$$
.

Semi-gradient: Only take derivative for the $Q_{\pi}(a, s; \theta)$ part, but not for the prediction target Y:

$$-(Y-Q_{\pi}(a,s;\theta))\cdot\nabla_{\theta}Q(a,s;\theta).$$

ightharpoonup Stochastic gradient descent updating step: Replace θ by

$$\theta + \alpha \cdot (Y - Q_{\pi}(a, s; \theta)) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} Q(a, s; \theta).$$

Off policy variant

- ightharpoonup As before, can replace a' by the estimated optimal action.
- Change the prediction target to

$$Y = r + \gamma \cdot \max_{a'} Q_*(a', s'; \theta).$$

▶ Updating step as before, replacing θ by

$$\theta + \alpha \cdot (Y - Q_*(a, s; \theta)) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} Q_*(a, s; \theta).$$

Multi-step updates

- All methods discussed thus far are one-step methods.
- After observing $\langle s, a, r, s', a' \rangle$, only Q(a, s) is targeted for an update.
- But we could pass that new information further back in time, since

$$Q(a,s) = E\left[\sum_{t'=t}^{t+k} \gamma^{t'-t} R_t + \gamma^{k+1} Q(A_{t+k+1}, S_{t+k+1}) | A_t = a, S_t = s\right].$$

lacktriangle One possibility: at time t+k+1, update heta using the prediction target

$$Y_t^k = \sum_{t'=t}^{t+k-1} \gamma^{t'-t} R_t + \gamma^k Q_{\pi}(A_{t+k}, S_{t+k}).$$

 \blacktriangleright k-step Sarsa: At time t+k, replace θ by

$$\theta + \alpha \cdot (Y_t^k - Q_{\pi}(A_t, S_t; \theta)) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} Q_{\pi}(A_t, S_t; \theta).$$

$TD(\lambda)$ algorithm

- Multi-step updates can result in faster learning.
- We can also weight the prediction targets for different numbers of steps, e.g. using weights λ^k :

$$egin{aligned} Y_t^k &= \sum_{t'=t}^{t+k} \gamma^{t'-t} R_t + \gamma^{k+1} Q_\pi(A_{t+k+1}, S_{t+k+1}), \ Y_t^\lambda &= (1-\lambda) \sum_{k=1}^\infty \lambda^k \cdot Y_t^k. \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ But don't we have to wait forever before we can make an update based on Y_t^{λ} ?
- Note quite, since we can do the updating piece-wise!
- ▶ This idea leads to the so-called $TD(\lambda)$ algorithm.

Eligibility traces

ightharpoonup For $TD(\lambda)$, we proceed as for one-step Sarsa, using the prediction target

$$Y_t = R_t + \gamma \cdot Q_{\pi}(A_{t+1}, S_{t+1}; \theta).$$

▶ But we replace the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} Q_{\pi}(A_t, S_t; \theta)$ by a weighted average of past gradients, the so-called eligibility trace: Let $Z_0 = 0$ and

$$Z_t = \gamma \lambda \cdot Z_{t-1} + \nabla_{\theta} Q_{\pi}(A_t, S_t; \theta).$$

▶ Updating step: At time t replace θ by

$$\theta + \alpha \cdot (Y_t - Q_{\pi}(A_t, S_t; \theta)) \cdot Z_t.$$

- ▶ This exactly implements the updating by Y_t^{λ} in the long run.
- This is one of the most popular and practically successful reinforcement learning algorithms.

References

- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (2018). Reinforcement learning: An introduction. MIT press.
- François-Lavet, V., Henderson, P., Islam, R., Bellemare, M. G., and Pineau, J. (2018). An introduction to deep reinforcement learning. Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning, 11(3-4):219–354.