

REINFORCEMENT LEARNING WITH LINEAR FUNCTION APPROXIMATION AND LQ CONTROL CONVERGES

ISTVÁN SZITA AND ANDRÁS LŐRINCZ

ABSTRACT. Reinforcement learning is commonly used with function approximation. However, very few positive results are known about the convergence of function approximation based RL control algorithms. In this paper we show that TD(0) and Sarsa(0) with linear function approximation is convergent for a simple class of problems, where the system is linear and the costs are quadratic (the LQ control problem). Furthermore, we show that for systems with Gaussian noise and non-completely observable states (the LQG problem), the mentioned RL algorithms are still convergent, if they are combined with Kalman filtering.

1. INTRODUCTION

Reinforcement learning is commonly used with function approximation. However, the technique has little theoretical performance guarantees: for example, it has been shown that even linear function approximators (LFA) can diverge with such often used algorithms as Q-learning or value iteration [1, 7]. There are positive results as well: it has been shown [9, 6, 8] that TD(λ), Sarsa, importance-sampled Q-learning are convergent with LFA, if the policy remains constant (policy evaluation). However, to the best of our knowledge, the only result about the control problem (when we try to find the optimal policy) is the one of Gordon's [4], who proved that TD(0) and Sarsa(0) can not diverge (although they may oscillate around the optimum, as shown in [3])¹.

In this paper, we show that RL control with linear function approximation can be convergent when it is applied to a linear system, with quadratic cost functions (known as the LQ control problem). Using the techniques of Gordon [4], we were prove that under appropriate conditions, TD(0) and Sarsa(0) converge to the optimal value function. As a consequence, Kalman filtering with RL is convergent for observable systems, too.

Although the LQ control task may seem simple, and there are numerous other methods solving it, we think that this Technical Report has some significance: (i) To our best knowledge, this is the first paper showing the convergence of an RL control algorithm using LFA. (ii) Many problems can be translated into LQ form [2].

¹These are results for policy iteration (e.g. [5]). However, by construction, policy iteration could be very slow in practice.

2. THE LQ CONTROL PROBLEM

Consider a linear dynamical system with state $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, control $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, in discrete time t :

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{x}_{t+1} = F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t.$$

Executing control step \mathbf{u}_t in \mathbf{x}_t costs

$$(2) \quad c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) := \mathbf{x}_t^T Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^T R \mathbf{u}_t,$$

and after the N^{th} step the controller halts and receives a final cost of $\mathbf{x}_N^T Q_N \mathbf{x}_N$. The task is to find a control sequence with minimum total cost.

First of all, we slightly modify the problem: the run time of the controller will not be a fixed number N . Instead, after each time step, the process will be stopped with some fixed probability p (and then the controller incurs the final cost $c_f(\mathbf{x}_f) := \mathbf{x}_f^T Q^f \mathbf{x}_f$). This modification is commonly used in the RL literature; it makes the problem more amenable to mathematical treatments.

2.1. The cost-to-go function. Let $V_t^*(\mathbf{x})$ be the optimal cost-to-go function at time step t , i.e.

$$(3) \quad V_t^*(\mathbf{x}) := \inf_{\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{u}_{t+1}, \dots} E[c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) + c(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{u}_{t+1}) + \dots + c_f(\mathbf{x}_f) | \mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{x}].$$

Considering that the controller is stopped with probability p , Eq. 3 assumes the following form

$$(4) \quad V_t^*(\mathbf{x}) = p \cdot c_f(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - p) \inf_{\mathbf{u}} \left(c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) + V_{t+1}^*(F\mathbf{x} + G\mathbf{u}) \right)$$

for any state \mathbf{x} . It is an easy matter to show that the optimal cost-to-go function is time-independent and it is a quadratic function of \mathbf{x} . That is, the optimal cost-to-go action-value function assumes the form

$$(5) \quad V^*(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T \Pi^* \mathbf{x}.$$

Our task is to estimate the optimal value functions (i.e., parameter matrix Π^*) on-line. This can be done by the method of temporal differences.

We start with an arbitrary initial cost-to-go function $V_0(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T \Pi_0 \mathbf{x}$. After this,

- (1) control actions are selected according to the current value function estimate
- (2) the value function is updated according to the experience, and
- (3) these two steps are iterated.

The t^{th} estimate of V^* is $V_t(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T \Pi_t \mathbf{x}$. The greedy control action according to this is given by

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_t &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \left(c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}) \right) \\ &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \left(\mathbf{u}^T R \mathbf{u} + (F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u})^T \Pi_t (F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}) \right) \\ &= -(R + G^T \Pi_t G)^{-1} (G^T \Pi_t F) \mathbf{x}_t. \end{aligned}$$

The 1-step TD error is

$$(7) \quad \delta_t = \begin{cases} c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) & \text{if } t = t_{STOP}, \\ (c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) + V_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

```

Initialize  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \Pi_0$ 
repeat
   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t$ 
   $\nu_{t+1} :=$  random noise
   $\mathbf{u}_{t+1} = -(R + G^T\Pi_{t+1}G)^{-1}(G^T\Pi_{t+1}F)\mathbf{x}_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}$ 
  with probability  $p$ ,
     $\delta_t = \mathbf{x}_t^T Q^f \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_t^T \Pi_t \mathbf{x}_t$ 
    STOP
  else
     $\delta_t = \mathbf{u}_t^T R \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{x}_{t+1}^T \Pi_t \mathbf{x}_{t+1} - \mathbf{x}_t^T \Pi_t \mathbf{x}_t$ 
   $\Pi_{t+1} = \Pi_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T$ 
   $t = t + 1$ 
end

```

FIGURE 1. TD(0) with linear function approximation for LQ control

and the update rule for the parameter matrix Π_t is

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_{t+1} &= \Pi_t + \alpha_t \cdot \delta_t \cdot \nabla_{\Pi_t} V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\ &= \Pi_t + \alpha_t \cdot \delta_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T, \end{aligned}$$

where α_t is the learning rate.

The algorithm is summarized in Fig. 1.

2.2. Sarsa. The cost-to-go function is used to select control actions, so the action-value function $Q_t^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ is more appropriate for this purpose. The action-value function is defined as

$$Q_t^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) := \inf_{\mathbf{u}_{t+1}, \mathbf{u}_{t+2}, \dots} E[c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) + c(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{u}_{t+1}) + \dots + c_f(\mathbf{x}_f) | \mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{u}],$$

and analogously to V_t^* , it can be shown that it is time independent and can be written in the form

$$(9) \quad Q^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{x}^T \quad \mathbf{u}^T) \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_{11}^* & \Theta_{12}^* \\ \Theta_{21}^* & \Theta_{22}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix} = (\mathbf{x}^T \quad \mathbf{u}^T) \Theta^* \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that Π^* can be expressed by Θ^* using the relationship $V(\mathbf{x}) = \min_{\mathbf{u}} Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$:

$$(10) \quad \Pi^* = \Theta_{11}^* - \Theta_{12}^* (\Theta_{22}^*)^{-1} \Theta_{21}^*$$

If the t^{th} estimate of Q^* is $Q_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = [\mathbf{x}^T, \mathbf{u}^T]^T \Theta_t [\mathbf{x}^T, \mathbf{u}^T]$, then the greedy control action is given as

$$(11) \quad \mathbf{u}_t = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} Q_t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = -\Theta_{22}^{-1} \frac{\Theta_{21}^T + \Theta_{21}}{2} \mathbf{x}_t = -\Theta_{22}^{-1} \Theta_{21} \mathbf{x}_t,$$

where subscript t of Θ has been omitted to improve readability.

The estimation error and the weight update are similar to the state-value case:

$$(12) \quad \delta_t = \begin{cases} c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) - Q_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) & \text{if } t = t_{STOP}, \\ (c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) + Q_t(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \mathbf{u}_{t+1})) - Q_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

```

Initialize  $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \Theta_0$ 
 $\mathbf{z}_0 = (\mathbf{x}_0^T \mathbf{u}_0^T)^T$ 
repeat
   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t$ 
   $\nu_{t+1} :=$  random noise
   $\mathbf{u}_{t+1} = -(\Theta_t)_{22}(\Theta_t)_{21}\mathbf{x}_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}$ 
   $\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = (\mathbf{x}_{t+1}^T \mathbf{u}_{t+1}^T)^T$ 
  with probability  $p$ ,
     $\delta_t = \mathbf{x}_t^T Q^f \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{z}_t^T \Theta_t \mathbf{z}_t$ 
    STOP
  else
     $\delta_t = \mathbf{u}_t^T R \mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{z}_{t+1}^T \Theta_t \mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \mathbf{z}_t^T \Theta_t \mathbf{z}_t$ 
     $\Theta_{t+1} = \Theta_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T$ 
     $t = t + 1$ 
end

```

FIGURE 2. Sarsa(0) with linear function approximation for LQ control

$$\begin{aligned}
(13) \quad \Theta_{t+1} &= \Theta_t + \alpha_t \cdot \delta_t \cdot \nabla_{\Theta_t} Q_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) \\
&= \Theta_t + \alpha_t \cdot \delta_t \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \\ \mathbf{u}_t \end{pmatrix}^T.
\end{aligned}$$

The algorithm is summarized in Fig. 2.

3. CONVERGENCE

Theorem 3.1. *If $\Pi_0 \geq \Pi^*$, there exists an L such that $\|F + GL\| \leq 1/\sqrt{1-p}$, there exists an M such that $\|\mathbf{x}_t\| \leq M$ for all t , and the constants α_t satisfy $0 < \alpha_t < 1/M^4$, $\sum_t \alpha_t = \infty$, $\sum_t \alpha_t^2 < \infty$ then Algorithm 1 converges to the optimal policy.*

The proof of the theorem can be found in Appendix A.

The same line of thought can be carried over for the action-value function $Q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{u}^T)^T \Theta (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{u}^T)$, which we do not detail here, giving only the result:

Theorem 3.2. *If $\Theta_0 \geq \Theta^*$, there exists an L such that $\|F + GL\| \leq 1/\sqrt{1-p}$, there exists an M such that $\|\mathbf{x}_t\| \leq M$ for all t , and the constants α_t satisfy $0 < \alpha_t < 1/M^4$, $\sum_t \alpha_t = \infty$, $\sum_t \alpha_t^2 < \infty$ then Sarsa(0) with LFA (Fig. 2) converges to the optimal policy.*

4. KALMAN FILTER LQ CONTROL

Now let us examine the case when we do not know the exact states, but we have to estimate them from noisy observations. Consider a linear dynamical system with state $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, control $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, observation $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$, noises $\xi_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\zeta_t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ (which are assumed to be uncorrelated Gaussians with covariance matrix Ω^ξ and Ω^ζ , respectively), in discrete time t :

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{x}_{t+1} = F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t + \xi_t$$

$$(15) \quad \mathbf{y}_t = H\mathbf{x}_t + \zeta_t.$$

```

Initialize  $\mathbf{x}_0, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0, \mathbf{u}_0, \Pi_0, \Sigma_0$ 
repeat
   $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t + \xi_t$ 
   $\mathbf{y}_t = H\mathbf{x}_t + \zeta_t$ 
   $\Sigma_{t+1} = \Omega^\xi + F\Sigma_t F^T - K_t H \Sigma_t F^T$ 
   $K_t = F\Sigma_t H^T (H\Sigma_t H^T + \Omega^\zeta)^{-1}$ 
   $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} = F\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t + K_t(\mathbf{y}_t - H\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t)$ 
   $\nu_{t+1} :=$  random noise
   $\mathbf{u}_{t+1} = -(R + G^T \Pi_{t+1} G)^{-1} (G^T \Pi_{t+1} F) \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} + \nu_{t+1}$ 
  with probability  $p$ ,
     $\delta_t = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t^T Q^f \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t^T \Pi_t \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ 
    STOP
  else
     $\delta_t = \mathbf{u}_t^T R \mathbf{u}_t + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1}^T \Pi_t \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t^T \Pi_t \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ 
   $\Pi_{t+1} = \Pi_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t^T$ 
   $t = t + 1$ 
end

```

FIGURE 3. Kalman filtering with TD control

Assume that the initial state has mean $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1$, and covariance Σ_1 . Furthermore, assume that executing control step \mathbf{u}_t in \mathbf{x}_t costs

$$(16) \quad c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}_t) := \mathbf{x}_t^T Q \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t^T R \mathbf{u}_t,$$

After each time step, the process will be stopped with some fixed probability p , and then the controller incurs the final cost $c_f(\mathbf{x}_f) := \mathbf{x}_f^T Q^f \mathbf{x}_f$.

By the separation principle, the control law and the state filtering can be computed independently from each other, i.e. we can estimate the state of the system by the standard Kalman filtering equations:

$$(17) \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t+1} = F\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t + G\mathbf{u}_t + K_t(\mathbf{y}_t - H\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t)$$

$$(18) \quad K_t = F\Sigma_t H^T (H\Sigma_t H^T + \Omega^e)^{-1}$$

$$(19) \quad \Sigma_{t+1} = \Omega^w + F\Sigma_t F^T - K_t H \Sigma_t F^T$$

and then use the state estimates to determine the control as described above. The resulting algorithm using TD(0) is summarized in Fig. 3. The algorithm using Sarsa can be derived in a similar manner.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Hungarian National Science Foundation (Grant No. T-32487).

APPENDIX A. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

We will use the following lemma:

Lemma A.1. *Let J be a differentiable function, bounded from below by J^* , and let ∇J be Lipschitz-continuous. Suppose the weight sequence w_t satisfies*

$$w_{t+1} = w_t + \alpha_t b_t$$

for random vectors b_t independent of w_{t+1}, w_{t+2}, \dots , and b_t is a descent direction for J , i.e. $E(b_t|w_t)^T \nabla J(w_t) \leq -\delta(\epsilon) < 0$ whenever $J(w_t) > J^* + \epsilon$. Suppose also that

$$E(\|b_t\|^2|w_t) \leq K_1 J(w_t) + K_2 E(b_t|w_t)^T \nabla J(w_t) + K_3$$

and finally that the constants α_t satisfy $\alpha_t > 0$, $\sum_t \alpha_t = \infty$, $\sum_t \alpha_t^2 < \infty$. Then $J(w_t) \rightarrow J^*$ with probability 1.

In our case, the weight vectors are $n \times n$ dimensional, with $w_{n \cdot i + j} := \Pi_{ij}$. For the sake of simplicity, we denote this by $w_{(ij)}$. Let w^* be the weight vector corresponding to the optimal value function, and let

$$J(w) = \frac{1}{2} \|w - w^*\|^2.$$

Let

$$L^* = -(R + G^T \Pi^* G)^{-1} (G^T \Pi^* F)$$

be the optimal policy, and let $q = 1/\sqrt{1-p}$.

Lemma A.2. *If there exists an L such that $\|F + GL\| < q$, then $\|F + GL^*\| < q$ as well.*

Proof. Indirectly, suppose that $\|F + GL^*\| \geq q$. Then for a fixed \mathbf{x}_0 , let \mathbf{x}_t be the optimal trajectory

$$\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = (F + GL^*)\mathbf{x}_t.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\mathbf{x}_0) &= p c_f(\mathbf{x}_0) + (1-p)c(\mathbf{x}_0, L^*\mathbf{x}_0) \\ &+ (1-p)p c_f(\mathbf{x}_1) + (1-p)^2 c(\mathbf{x}_1, L^*\mathbf{x}_1) \\ &+ (1-p)^2 p c_f(\mathbf{x}_2) + (1-p)^3 c(\mathbf{x}_2, L^*\mathbf{x}_2) \\ &+ \dots, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\mathbf{x}_0) &\geq p(c_f(\mathbf{x}_0) + (1-p)c_f(\mathbf{x}_1) + (1-p)^2 c_f(\mathbf{x}_2) + \dots) \\ &= p \sum (1-p)^k \mathbf{x}_0^T (F + GL^*)^k Q^f (F + GL^*)^k \mathbf{x}_0. \end{aligned}$$

We know that Q^f is positive definite, so there exists an ϵ such that $\mathbf{x}^T Q^f \mathbf{x} \geq \epsilon \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, therefore

$$V^*(\mathbf{x}_0) \geq \epsilon p \sum (1-p)^k \|(F + GL^*)^k \mathbf{x}_0\|^2.$$

If \mathbf{x}_0 is the eigenvector corresponding to the maximal eigenvalue of $F + GL^*$, then $(F + GL^*)\mathbf{x}_0 = \|F + GL^*\| \mathbf{x}_0$, and so $(F + GL^*)^k \mathbf{x}_0 = \|F + GL^*\|^k \mathbf{x}_0$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(\mathbf{x}_0) &\geq \epsilon p \sum (1-p)^k \|F + GL^*\|^{2k} \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 \\ &\geq \epsilon p \sum (1-p)^k \frac{1}{(1-p)^k} \|\mathbf{x}_0\|^2 = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, because of $\|F + GL\| < q$, it is easy to see that the value of following the control law L from \mathbf{x}_0 is finite, therefore we get $V^L(\mathbf{x}_0) < V^*(\mathbf{x}_0)$, which is a contradiction. \square

Theorem A.3 (Theorem 3.1). *If $\Pi_0 \geq \Pi^*$, there exists an L such that $\|F + GL\| \leq q$, there exists an M such that $\|\mathbf{x}_t\| \leq M$ for all t , and the constants α_t satisfy $0 < \alpha_t < 1/M^4$, $\sum_t \alpha_t = \infty$, $\sum_t \alpha_t^2 < \infty$ then Algorithm 1 converges to the optimal policy.*

Proof. We will show that

$$b_t = \delta_t \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T$$

is a descent direction for every t .

$$\begin{aligned} E(b_t | w_t)^T \nabla J(w_t) &= E(\delta_t | w_t) \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T (w_t - w^*) \\ &= E(\delta_t | w_t) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t \\ &= E(\delta_t | w_t) (V_t(x_t) - V^*(x_t)). \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of simplicity, from now on we do not note the dependence on w_t explicitly.

We will show that for all t , $E(\Pi_t) > 0$, $E(\Pi_{t-1}) > E(\Pi_t)$ and $E(\delta_t) \leq -p \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t$. We proceed by induction.

• $t = 0$. $\Pi_0 > \Pi^*$ holds by assumption.

• Induction step part 1: $E(\delta_t) \leq -p \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t$.

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} (20) \quad \mathbf{u}_t &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} (c(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{u}) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + G\mathbf{u})) \\ &= L_t \mathbf{x}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$L_t = -(R + G^T \Pi_t G)^{-1} (G^T \Pi_t F)$$

is the greedy control law with respect to V_t . Clearly, by the definition of L_t ,

$$c(\mathbf{x}_t, L_t \mathbf{x}_t) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL_t \mathbf{x}_t) \leq c(\mathbf{x}_t, L^* \mathbf{x}_t) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t).$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} (21) \quad E(\delta_t) &= p c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) + (1-p)(c(\mathbf{x}_t, L_t \mathbf{x}_t) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL_t \mathbf{x}_t)) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\ &\leq p c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) + (1-p)(c(\mathbf{x}_t, L^* \mathbf{x}_t) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t)) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t). \end{aligned}$$

We know that the optimal value function satisfies the fixed-point equation

$$(22) \quad 0 = \left(p c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) + (1-p)(c(\mathbf{x}_t, L^* \mathbf{x}_t) + V^*(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t)) \right) - V^*(\mathbf{x}_t).$$

Subtracting this from Eq. (21), we get

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} E(\delta_t) &\leq (1-p)(V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t) - V^*(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t)) \\ &\quad - (V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) - V^*(\mathbf{x}_t)). \end{aligned}$$

$$(24) \quad = (1-p) \mathbf{x}_t^T (F + GL^*)^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) (F + GL^*) \mathbf{x}_t$$

$$(25) \quad - \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t.$$

Let $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(p) := 1/(1-p) - \|F + GL^*\|^2 > 0$. Inequality (23) implies

$$(26) \quad E(\delta_t) \leq (1-p) \left(\frac{1}{1-p} - \epsilon_1(p) \right) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t$$

$$(27) \quad = -(1-p) \epsilon_1(p) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t.$$

$$(28) \quad = -\epsilon_2(p) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t,$$

where we defined $\epsilon_2(p) = (1-p)\epsilon_1(p)$

• Induction step part 2: $E(\Pi_{t+1}) > 0$.

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} E(\delta_t) &= p c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) + (1-p)(c(\mathbf{x}_t, L_t \mathbf{x}_t) + V_t(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL_t \mathbf{x}_t)) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\ &\geq p c_f(\mathbf{x}_t) + (1-p)(c(\mathbf{x}_t, L_t \mathbf{x}_t) + V^*(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL_t \mathbf{x}_t)) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting eq. 22, we get

$$(30) \quad \begin{aligned} E(\delta_t) &\geq (1-p)\left((c(\mathbf{x}_t, L_t \mathbf{x}_t) + V^*(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL_t \mathbf{x}_t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (c(\mathbf{x}_t, L^* \mathbf{x}_t) + V^*(F\mathbf{x}_t + GL^* \mathbf{x}_t))\right) + V^*(\mathbf{x}_t) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \\ &\geq V^*(\mathbf{x}_t) - V_t(\mathbf{x}_t) \geq -\|\Pi_t - \Pi^*\| \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$(31) \quad E(\Pi_{t+1}) - \Pi^* \geq \Pi_t + \alpha_t E(\delta_t) \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T - \Pi^*$$

$$(32) \quad \geq (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) - \alpha_t \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4 \|\Pi_t - \Pi^*\| I$$

$$(33) \quad \geq (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) - \alpha_t M^4 \|\Pi_t - \Pi^*\| I > 0,$$

if $\alpha_t \leq 1/M^4$.

• Induction step part 3: $\Pi_t > E(\Pi_{t+1})$.

$$(34) \quad \Pi_t - E(\Pi_{t+1}) = -\alpha_t E(\delta_t) \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \geq \alpha_t \epsilon_2(p) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T,$$

but $\alpha_t \epsilon_2(p) > 0$, $\mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T > 0$, so their product is positive as well.

The induction is therefore complete.

We finish the proof by showing that the assumptions of Lemma A.1 hold:

b_t is a descent direction. Clearly, if $J(w_t) \geq \epsilon$, then $\|\Pi_t - \Pi^*\| \geq \epsilon_3(\epsilon)$, but $\Pi_t - \Pi^*$ is positive definite, so $\Pi_t - \Pi^* \geq \epsilon_3(\epsilon)I$.

$$\begin{aligned} E(b_t | w_t)^T \nabla J(w_t) &= E(\delta_t | w_t)(V_t(x_t) - V^*(x_t)) \\ &\leq -\epsilon_2(p) \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t \\ &\leq -\epsilon_2 \epsilon_3^2 \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4. \end{aligned}$$

$E(\|b_t\|^2 | w_t)$ is bounded. $|E(\delta_t)| \leq |\mathbf{x}_t^T (\Pi_t - \Pi^*) \mathbf{x}_t|$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E(\|b_t\|^2 | w_t) &\leq |E(\delta_t)|^2 \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^2 \leq \|\Pi_t - \Pi^*\|^2 \|\mathbf{x}_t\|^4 \\ &\leq K \cdot J(w_t) M^4. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, The assumptions of lemma A.1 hold, so the algorithm converges to the optimal value function with probability 1. \square

REFERENCES

1. Leemon C. Baird, *Residual algorithms: Reinforcement learning with function approximation*, International Conference on Machine Learning, 1995, pp. 30–37.

2. S. J. Bradtke, *Reinforcement learning applied to linear quadratic regulation*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 5, Proceedings of the IEEE Conference in Denver (to appear) (San Mateo, CA) (C. L. Giles, S. J. Hanson, and J. D. Cowan, eds.), Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
3. Geoffrey J. Gordon, *Chattering in sarsa(lambda) - a CMU learning lab internal report*, 1996.
4. ———, *Reinforcement learning with function approximation converges to a region*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 13 (Todd K. Leen, Thomas G. Dietterich, and Volker Tresp, eds.), MIT Press, 2001, pp. 1040–1046.
5. T. J. Perkins and D. Precup, *A convergent form of approximate policy iteration*, <http://www.mcb.mcgill.ca/~perkins/publications/PerPreNIPS02.ps>, 2002, Accepted to NIPS-02.
6. Doina Precup, Richard S. Sutton, and Sanjoy Dasgupta, *Off-policy temporal-difference learning with function approximation*, Proc. 18th International Conf. on Machine Learning, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA, 2001, pp. 417–424.
7. R. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1998.
8. V. Tadic, *On the convergence of temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation*, Machine Learning **42** (2001), 241–267.
9. John N. Tsitsiklis and Benjamin Van Roy, *An analysis of temporal-difference learning with function approximation*, Tech. Report LIDS-P-2322, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS
EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCES
PÁZMÁNY PÉTER SÉTÁNY 1/C
1117 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

EMAILS:

ISTVÁN SZITA: SZITYU@STELLA.EOTVOS.ELTE.HU

ANDRÁS LŐRINCZ: LORINCZ@INF.ELTE.HU

WWW:

[HTTP://NIPG.INF.ELTE.HU](http://NIPG.INF.ELTE.HU)

[HTTP://PEOPLE.INF.ELTE.HU/LORINCZ](http://PEOPLE.INF.ELTE.HU/LORINCZ)