- 6. (3 pts) What three things form the "deadly triad" the three things that cannot be combined in the same learning situation without risking divergence? (circle three)
	- (a) eligibility traces
	- (b) bootstrapping
		- (c) sample backups
		- (d) ε -greedy action selection
	- (e) linear function approximation
		- (f) off-line updating
		- (g) off-policy learning
			- (h) exploration bonuses

The Deadly Triad

the three things that together result in instability

- 1. Function approximation
- 2. Bootstrapping
- 3. Off-policy training data (e.g., Q-learning, DP)

even if:

- prediction (fixed given policies)
- linear with binary features
- expected updates (as in asynchronous DP, iid)
- 7. True or False: For any stationary MDP, assuming a step-size (α) sequence satisfying the standard stochastic approximation criteria, and a fixed policy, convergence in the prediction problem is guaranteed for
- **TF** (2 pts) online, off-policy TD(1) with linear function approximation T \bf{F} (2 pts) online, on-policy TD(0) with linear function approximation $T(F)(2$ pts) offline, off-policy TD(0) with linear function approximation $T(F)(2$ pts) dynamic programming with linear function approximation $T(F)(2$ pts) dynamic programming with nonlinear function approximation T F (2 pts) gradient-descent Monte Carlo with linear function approximation T F (2 pts) gradient-descent Monte Carlo with nonlinear function approximation 7.5 True or F assuming a stationary MDP, assuming a step-size ($1/2$) sequence satisfying the standard the standard sta

8. True or False: (3 pts) TD(0) with linear function approximation converges to a local minimum (2) pts) the primary determinate of the shape of the shape of generalization is: in the MSE between the approximate value function and the true value function V^{π} .

The Deadly Triad

the three things that together result in instability

- 1. Function approximation
	- linear or more with proportional complexity
	- state aggregation ok; ok if "nearly Markov"
- 2. Bootstrapping
	- $\lambda = 1$ ok, ok if λ big enough (problem dependent)
- 3. Off-policy training
	- may be ok if "nearly on-policy"
	- if policies very different, variance may be too high anyway

Off-policy learning

- Learning about a policy different than the policy being used to generate actions
	- Most often used to learn optimal behaviour from a given data set, or from more exploratory behaviour
	- Key to ambitious theories of knowledge and perception as continual prediction about the outcomes of many options

Baird's counter-example

- *^P* and *d* are not linked
	- *d* is all states with equal probability
	- *^P* is according to this Markov chain:

TD can diverge: Baird's counter-example

 $\alpha = 0.01 \qquad \gamma = 0.99 \qquad \theta_0 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 10, 1)^\top$ deterministic updates

TD(0) can diverge: A simple example

$$
\delta = r + \gamma \theta^{\top} \phi' - \theta^{\top} \phi \n= 0 + 2\theta - \theta \n= \theta
$$

TD update: TD fixpoint: $\Delta\theta = \alpha\delta\phi$ $= \alpha \theta$ $\theta^* = 0$ Diverges! Previous attempts to solve the off-policy problem

- Importance sampling
	- With recognizers
- Least-squares methods, LSTD, LSPI, iLSTD
- Averagers
- Residual gradient methods

Desiderata: We want a TD algorithm that

- Bootstraps (genuine TD)
- Works with linear function approximation (stable, reliably convergent)
- Is simple, like linear TD $O(n)$
- Learns fast, like linear TD
- Can learn off-policy (arbitrary *P* and *d*)
- Learns from online causal trajectories (no repeat sampling from the same state)

A little more theory

$$
\Delta \theta \propto \delta \phi = (r + \gamma \theta^{\top} \phi' - \theta^{\top} \phi) \phi
$$

\n
$$
= \theta^{\top} (\gamma \phi' - \phi) \phi + r\phi
$$

\n
$$
= \phi (\gamma \phi' - \phi)^{\top} \theta + r\phi
$$

\n
$$
\mathbb{E}[\Delta \theta] \propto -\mathbb{E}[\phi (\phi - \gamma \phi')^{\top}] \theta + \mathbb{E}[r\phi]
$$

\n
$$
\mathbb{E}[\Delta \theta] \propto -\mathring{A}\theta + \mathring{b}
$$
convergent if
\n*A* is pos. def.

therefore, at $A\theta^* = b$ the TD fixpoint: θ^*

LSTD computes this directly

$$
-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\theta} \text{MSPBE} = -A^{\top} C^{-1} (A\theta - b)
$$
\n
$$
C = \mathbb{E} \left[\phi \phi^{\top} \right]
$$
\ncovariance
\nauxys pos. def.

TD(0) Solution and Stability *^G^t .* ⁼ *^Rt*+1 ⁺ *Rt*+2 ⁺ 2*Rt*+3 ⁺ *··· .* (3) = lim*t*!1 P*{S^t* =*s}*, which we assume exists and is positive at all states (any states not violet in die visited with nonzero probability can be removed from the problem). The special term to ρ by the steady-state distribution is the process in it. Let ρ ^P⇡ denote the *^N* ⇥ *^N* matrix of transition probabilities [P⇡]*ij .*

$$
\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t + \alpha \Big(\underbrace{R_{t+1} \phi(S_t)}_{\mathbf{b}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n} - \underbrace{\phi(S_t) (\phi(S_t) - \gamma \phi(S_{t+1}))^\top}_{\mathbf{A}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}} \theta_t \Big)
$$
\n
$$
= \theta_t + \alpha (\mathbf{b}_t - \mathbf{A}_t \theta_t)
$$
\n
$$
= (\mathbf{I} - \alpha \mathbf{A}_t) \theta_t + \alpha \mathbf{b}_t.
$$

$$
\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t+1} \doteq \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t + \alpha (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{A} \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t)
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{\theta}_* = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b}
$$

LSTD(0)

Ideal:

$$
\mathbf{A} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\boldsymbol{\phi}_t (\boldsymbol{\phi}_t - \gamma \boldsymbol{\phi}_{t+1})^{\top}] \qquad \qquad \mathbf{b} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [R_{t+1} \boldsymbol{\phi}_t]
$$

 $\boldsymbol{\theta}_* = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b}$

Algorithm:

 $t\rightarrow\infty$

$$
\mathbf{A}_{t} = \sum_{k} \rho_{k} \phi_{k} (\phi_{k} - \gamma \phi_{k+1})^{\top} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{b}_{t} = \sum_{k}
$$

\n
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbf{A}_{t} = \mathbf{A} \qquad \qquad \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbf{b}_{t} =
$$

\n
$$
\theta_{t} = \mathbf{A}_{t}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{t}
$$

\n
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} \theta_{t} = \theta_{*}
$$

k $\rho_k R_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k$

 $t\rightarrow\infty$ $\mathbf{b}_t = \mathbf{b}$

LSTD(λ)

Ideal:

$$
\mathbf{A} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathbf{e}_t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_t - \gamma \boldsymbol{\phi}_{t+1})^{\top}]
$$

$$
\mathbf{b} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[R_{t+1} \mathbf{e}_t]
$$

 $\boldsymbol{\theta}_* = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b}$

Algorithm:

 $t\rightarrow\infty$

$$
\mathbf{A}_{t} = \sum_{k} \rho_{k} \mathbf{e}_{k} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{k} - \gamma \boldsymbol{\phi}_{k+1})^{\top} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{b}_{t} = \sum_{k}
$$

\n
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbf{A}_{t} = \mathbf{A} \qquad \qquad \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbf{b}_{t} =
$$

\n
$$
\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t} = \mathbf{A}_{t}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{t}
$$

\n
$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{*}
$$

k $\rho_k R_k \mathbf{e}_k$

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbf{b}_t = \mathbf{b}
$$