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## Policy Iteration Algorithm

```
\pi}\leftarrow\mathrm{ Arbitrary policy.
While }\pi\mathrm{ has improvable states:
    \pi
    \pi}\leftarrow\mp@subsup{\pi}{}{\prime}
Return }\pi\mathrm{ .
```

Path taken (and hence the number of iterations) in general depends on the switching strategy.


## Howard's Policy Iteration

- Reference: Howard (1960).
- Greedy; switch all improvable states.
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## Random Policy Iteration

- Reference: Mansour and Singh (1999).
- Switch a non-empty subset of improvable states chosen uniformly at random.



## Simple Policy Iteration

- Reference: Melekopoglou and Condon (1994).
- Assume a fixed indexing of states.
- Switch the improvable state with the highest index.



## Upper and Lower Bounds
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$U(n, k)$ is an upper bound applicable to a set of Pl variants $\mathcal{L}$ if

- for each $n$-state, $k$-action

MDP $M=(S, A, T, R, \gamma)$,

- for each policy $\pi: S \rightarrow A$,
- for each algorithm $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the expected number of policy evaluations performed by $L$ on $M$ if initialised at $\pi$ is at most $U(n, k)$.
$X(n, k)$ is a lower bound applicable to a set of PI variants $\mathcal{L}$ if
- there exists an $n$-state, $k$-action MDP $M=(S, A, T, R, \gamma)$,
- there exists a policy $\pi: S \rightarrow A$,
- there exists an algorithm $L \in \mathcal{L}$, such that the expected number of policy evaluations performed by $L$ on $M$ if initialised at $\pi$ is at least $X(n, k)$.
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## Switching Strategies and Bounds

Upper bounds on number of iterations

## PI Variant

Howard's (Greedy) PI [H60, MS99]

Type
$k=2$
Deterministic
$O\left(\frac{2^{n}}{n}\right)$
$O\left(\frac{k^{n}}{n}\right)$
Mansour and Singh's Random PI [MS99]
Mansour and Singh's Random PI [HPZ14]

| Type | $k=2$ | General $k$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deterministic | $O\left(\frac{2^{n}}{n}\right)$ | $O\left(\frac{k^{n}}{n}\right)$ |
| Randomised | $1.7172^{n}$ | $\approx O\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^{n}$ |
| Randomised | $\operatorname{poly}(n) \cdot 1.5^{n}$ | - |

Lower bounds on number of iterations $\Omega(n) \quad$ Howard's PI on $n$-state, 2-action MDPs [HZ10].
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## PI Variant

Howard's (Greedy) PI [H60, MS99]
Mansour and Singh's Random PI [MS99]
Mansour and Singh's Random PI [HPZ14]

Type
$k=2$
Deterministic

Randomised

Randomised $\operatorname{poly}(n) \cdot 1.5^{n}$

$$
O\left(\frac{2^{n}}{n}\right)
$$

$1.7172^{n}$

General $k$

$$
O\left(\frac{k^{n}}{n}\right)
$$

$$
\approx O\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^{n}
$$

Lower bounds on number of iterations $\Omega(n) \quad$ Howard's PI on $n$-state, 2-action MDPs [HZ10]. $\Omega\left(2^{n}\right)$ Simple PI on $n$-state, 2 -action MDPs [MC94].
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## PI: Some Recent Results

(Polynomial factors ignored. Authors with names underlined once took CS 747!)

- Kalyanakrishnan, Mall, and Goyal (2016) devise the Batch-switching PI algorithm (deterministic), and show an upper bound of $1.6479^{n}$ for $k=2$.
- Gupta and Kalyanakrishnan (2017) give a deterministic PI variant with upper bound $k^{0.7207 n}$. Taraviya and Kalyanakrishnan (2019) improve to $k^{0.7019 n}$.
- Kalyanakrishnan, Misra, and Gopalan (2016) show an upper bound of $(2+\ln (k-1))^{n}$ for a randomised PI variant.
- Taraviya and Kalyanakrishnan (2019) show an upper bound of $(O(\sqrt{k \log (k)}))^{n}$ for a randomised variant of Howard's PI.
- Ashutosh, Consul, Dedhia, Khirwadkar, Shah, and Kalyanakrishnan (2020) show a lower bound of $\sqrt{k}^{n}$ iterations for a deterministic variant of PI.
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## 2. Improvement sets in 2-action MDPs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Non-optimal policies } \pi, \pi^{\prime} \in \Pi \text { cannot } \\
& \text { have the same set of improvable states. } \\
& \begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{array} \\
& \succeq \quad \succeq \\
& \begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0
\end{array} \\
& \text { Contradiction! }
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)
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## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
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## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)

Switch actions in every improvable state.
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## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)

Switch actions in every improvable state.

| $\pi^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| $\pi^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi_{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)

Switch actions in every improvable state.

| $\pi^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi_{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\pi$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

> If $\pi$ has $m$ improvable states and $\pi \xrightarrow{\text { Howard's Pl }} \pi^{\prime}$, then there exist $m$ policies $\pi^{\prime \prime}$ such that $\pi^{\prime} \succeq \pi^{\prime \prime} \succ \pi$.
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## Howard's Policy Iteration (2-action MDPs)

- Take $m^{\star}=\frac{n}{3}$.
- Number of policies with $m^{\star}$ or more improvable states visited

$$
\leq \frac{2^{n}}{m^{\star}}=\frac{2^{n}}{n / 3}
$$

- Number of policies with fewer than $m^{\star}$ improvable states visited

$$
\leq\binom{ n}{0}+\binom{n}{1}+\binom{n}{2}+\cdots+\binom{n}{m^{\star}-1} \leq 3 \frac{2^{n}}{n}
$$

Number of iterations taken by Howard's PI: $O\left(\frac{2^{n}}{n}\right)$ [MS99, HGDJ14].

## Markov Decision Problems

1. Policy iteration: variants and complexity bounds
2. Analysis of bounds

- Basic tools
- Howard's PI with $k=2$
- BSPI with $k=2$
- Open problems

3. Review of MDP planning
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## Batch-Switching Policy Iteration (BSPI)

Partition the states into 2-sized batches; arranged from left to right. Given a policy, improve the rightmost set containing an improvable state.

| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 11 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ | $s_{3}$ | $s_{4}$ | $S_{5}$ | $s_{6}$ | $s_{7}$ | $S_{8}$ | S9 | $s_{10}$ |

## Batch-Switching Policy Iteration (BSPI)

Partition the states into 2-sized batches; arranged from left to right. Given a policy, improve the rightmost set containing an improvable state.

| $\pi_{4}$ |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 $s_{1}$ | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |  | 0 $S_{4}$ |  | ${ }_{5}^{0}$ |  | 0 88 | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | 0 $s_{10}$ |

## Batch-Switching Policy Iteration (BSPI)

Partition the states into 2-sized batches; arranged from left to right. Given a policy, improve the rightmost set containing an improvable state.

| $\pi_{4}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{1}$ | $s_{1}$ |  |  | 0 $S_{4}$ |  |  |  | $S_{8}$ |  | 0 $s_{10}$ |

- Left-most batch can change only when all other columns are non-improvable.


## Batch-Switching Policy Iteration (BSPI)

Partition the states into 2-sized batches; arranged from left to right. Given a policy, improve the rightmost set containing an improvable state.

| $\pi_{4}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{3}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{1}$ | 0 | 11 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ | $s_{3}$ | $S_{4}$ | $S_{5}$ | $s_{6}$ |  | $S_{8}$ | $S_{9}$ | $s_{10}$ |

- Left-most batch can change only when all other columns are non-improvable.
- Left-most batch can change at most 3 times (following previous result).


## Batch-Switching Policy Iteration (BSPI)

Partition the states into 2-sized batches; arranged from left to right. Given a policy, improve the rightmost set containing an improvable state.

| $\pi_{4}$ | 01 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi_{3}$ | $0 \quad 1$ | $10$ |  | $1 \quad 0$ | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{2}$ | 0 1 | 10 | $0 \quad 0$ | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| $\pi_{1}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{0} & 1 \\ s_{1} & s_{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc}1 & 0 \\ s_{3} & s_{4}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ s_{5} & s_{6}\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}1 & 0 \\ s_{7} & s_{8}\end{array}$ | 0 <br> 0 <br> 9 | 0 $s_{10}$ |

- Left-most batch can change only when all other columns are non-improvable.
- Left-most batch can change at most 3 times (following previous result).
- $T(n) \leq 3 \times T(n-2) \leq \sqrt{3}^{n}$.
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The structures above are called Trajectory-bounding Trees (TBTs) [KMG16a] (and correspond to the Order Regularity Problem [H12, GHDJ15]).
BSPI with 3-sized batches gives $T(n) \leq 5 \times T(n-3) \leq 1.71^{n}$.

## Upper Bounds

Batch size Depth of TBT Bound on number of iterations

| 1 | 2 | $2^{n}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 3 | $1.7321^{n}$ |
| 3 | 5 | $1.7100^{n}$ |
| 4 | 8 | $1.6818^{n}$ |
| 5 | 13 | $1.6703^{n}$ |
| 6 | 21 | $1.6611^{n}$ |
| 7 | 33 | $1.6479^{n}$ |
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## Upper Bounds

Batch size Depth of TBT Bound on number of iterations

| 1 | 2 | $2^{n}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 3 | $1.7321^{n}$ |
| 3 | 5 | $1.7100^{n}$ |
| 4 | 8 | $1.6818^{n}$ |
| 5 | 13 | $1.6703^{n}$ |
| 6 | 21 | $1.6611^{n}$ |
| 7 | 33 | $1.6479^{n}$ |

Depth of TBT for batch size 7 due to Gerencsér et al. [GHDJ15]. Will the bound continue to be non-increasing in the batch size?
If so, $1.6479^{n}$ would be an upper bound for Howard's Policy Iteration!

## BSPI: Effect of Batch Size b



Averaged over $n$-state, 2 -action MDPs with randomly generated transition and reward functions. Each point is an average over 100 randomly-generated MDP instances and initial policies [KMG16a].

## Markov Decision Problems

1. Policy iteration: variants and complexity bounds
2. Analysis of bounds

- Basic tools
- Howard's PI with $k=2$
- BSPI with $k=2$
- Open problems

3. Review of MDP planning

## Open Problems

- Is the complexity of Howard's PI on 2-action MDPs upper-bounded by the Fibonacci sequence ( $\approx 1.6181^{n}$ )?
- Is Howard's PI the most efficient among deterministic PI algorithms (worst case over all MDPs)?
- Is there a super-linear lower bound on the number of iterations taken by Howard's PI on 2-action MDPs?
- Is Howard's PI strongly polynomial on deterministic MDPs?
- Is there a variant of PI that can visit all $k^{n}$ policies in some $n$-state, $k$-action MDP-implying an $\Omega\left(k^{n}\right)$ lower bound?
- Is there a strongly polynomial algorithm for MDP planning?


## Markov Decision Problems

1. Policy iteration: variants and complexity bounds
2. Analysis of bounds

- Basic tools
- Howard's PI with $k=2$
- BSPI with $k=2$
- Open problems

3. Review of MDP planning

## Summary of MDP Planning

- MDPs are an abstraction of sequential decision making.
- Many applications; many different formulations.
- Essential solution concept: optimal policy (known to exist).
- Three main families of planning algorithms: value iteration, linear programming, policy iteration.
- Have strengths and weaknesses in theory and in practice. Can combine.
- We showed correctness of all three methods.
- Used Banach's fixed-point theorem, Bellman (optimality) operator.
- What if $T, R$ were not given, but have to be learned from interaction? Can we still learn to act optimally?
- Yes: that's the reinforcement learning problem. Next class!

