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Suppose there are too many states to write down/visit
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Suppose there are too many states to write down/visit

e.g.

Can we distill the relevant properties of the state into a high-dimensional feature vector?
LINEAR MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES

Assumption: There is a known feature mapping

$$\phi_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$$
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LINEAR MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES

Assumption: There is a known feature mapping

\[ \phi_h : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \]

and rewards/transitions are linear in this representation, i.e.

\[(1) \quad R_h(s, a) = \langle \phi_h(s, a), \theta_h \rangle \quad \text{and} \]
\[(2) \quad \mathbb{T}_h(s'|s, a) = \langle \phi_h(s, a), \mu_{h+1}(s') \rangle \]

Note: There can be an infinite number of states and parameters defining the model

So how do we even represent a policy? Or its value function?
VALUE FUNCTIONS, AGAIN

**Key:** The closure properties, e.g. of dynamic programming
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**Proposition:** An MDP is linear with respect to the feature mapping iff for any function $g : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$R_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s' | s, a}[g(s')] = \langle \phi_h(s, a), \theta \rangle$$

for some vector $\theta$
VALUE FUNCTIONS, AGAIN

**Proposition:** An MDP is linear with respect to the feature mapping iff for any function $g : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$R_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s' \mid s, a}[g(s')] = \langle \phi_h(s, a), \theta \rangle$$

for some vector $\theta$

Now consider the **Q-function** and **V-function** for any policy:

$$Q^\pi_h(s, a) = R_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s' \mid s, a}[V^\pi_{h+1}(s')]$$

$$V^\pi_h(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi}[Q^\pi_h(s, a)]$$
VALUE FUNCTIONS, AGAIN

**Proposition:** An MDP is linear with respect to the feature mapping iff for any function $g: \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$R_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s'|s, a}[g(s')] = \langle \phi_h(s, a), \theta \rangle$$

for some vector $\theta$

Now consider the **Q-function** and **V-function** for any policy:

$$Q_h^\pi(s, a) = R_h(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s'|s, a}[V_{h+1}^\pi(s')]$$

$$V_h^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi}[Q_h^\pi(s, a)]$$

**Corollary:** The Q-function of any policy is linear
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FINDING AN OPTIMAL POLICY

Consider policies of the form

$$\pi(s) = \arg \max_a \langle \phi_h(s, a), \theta \rangle$$

Now use linear regression to fit the Q-function to the observed rewards

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_i (\phi(s_i, a_i)^\top \theta - y_i)^2 + \lVert \theta \rVert^2$$

immediate reward + estimated opt. future reward + expl. bonus

Need a bonus to maintain optimism
CHOOSING A BONUS

Natural bonus function depends on form of error bounds for linear regression; called the elliptic potential

$$\sqrt{\phi(s, a)\Lambda^{-1}\phi(s, a)}$$

which accounts for errors in unexplored directions, where

$$\Lambda = I + \sum_i \phi(s_i, a_i)\phi(s_i, a_i)^\top$$
THE LSVI ALGORITHM

Theorem [Jin, Yang, Wang, Jordan ‘19]: LSVI has

running time: \( \text{poly}(d, |A|, H) \)  
sample complexity: \( \text{poly}(d, H) \)

and returns a near optimal policy in a linear MDP

\[ \text{No dependence on the \# of states} \]
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THE LSVI ALGORITHM

Theorem [Jin, Yang, Wang, Jordan ‘19]: LSVI has

running time: \( \text{poly}(d, |A|, H) \)

sample complexity: \( \text{poly}(d, H) \)

and returns a near optimal policy in a linear MDP

Notes: Does not attempt to estimate model parameters

model-free vs. model-based

Later improvements get optimal sample complexity
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How do we find a good feature mapping in the first place?

Natural approach is to throw in the kitchen sink

- domain expertise
- heuristics
- learned features

But we would pay a steep price in terms of sample complexity for using more features than we truly need.
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FEATURE SELECTION?

Can we automatically discover the relevant dimensions?

Sparsity Assumption: There is an unknown $S \subseteq [d]$ of size $k$ and the rewards/transitions are linear functions of

$$\phi(s, a) \bigg|_S$$

which is a k-dimensional representation

Are there efficient algorithms for learning sparse linear MDPs?

i.e. $\text{poly}(k, \log d)$ sample complexity
Prior work relies on assumptions that obviate the need for exploration

(1) [Hao, Lattimore, Szepesvari, Wang ‘21]: assumes we’re given an exploratory policy up front
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(2)  [Zhu, Wang, Lee ‘23]: assumes every policy induces a well-conditioned feature distribution
Prior work relies on assumptions that obviate the need for exploration

(1) [Hao, Lattimore, Szepesvari, Wang ‘21]: assumes we’re given an exploratory policy up front

(2) [Zhu, Wang, Lee ‘23]: assumes every policy induces a well-conditioned feature distribution

But ignoring computational efficiency, we know such assumptions are unnecessary

(3) [Jiang, Krishnamurthy, Agarwal, Langford, Schapire ‘16]: statistically efficient algorithm under low Bellman rank, but oracle is known to be NP-hard to implement
First end-to-end algorithmic guarantees in general

**Theorem [Golowich, Moitra, Rohatgi ‘24]:** An algorithm with

running time: \( \text{poly}(d, |A|, H) \)

sample complexity: \( \text{poly}(k, |A|, H, \log d) \)

that returns a near optimal policy in a sparse linear MDP
COMPUTATIONALLY EFFICIENT LEARNING

First end-to-end algorithmic guarantees in general

**Theorem [Golowich, Moitra, Rohatgi ‘24]:** An algorithm with

- **running time:** \( \text{poly}(d, |A|, H) \)
- **sample complexity:** \( \text{poly}(k, |A|, H, \log d) \)

that returns a near optimal policy in a sparse linear MDP

Based on a new abstraction we call an **emulator**

“Even though a linear MDP is non-parametric, can we find a parametric approximation to it?”
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SPARSE LINEAR REGRESSION

An aspirational example where sparsity helps:

**Setup:** We are given samples of the form

\[ y = \langle x, \theta^* \rangle + \xi \text{ with } x \sim \nu, \ E[\xi] = 0 \text{ and } |\xi| \leq \sigma \]

where \( \|\theta^*\|_1 \leq k \)
SPARSE LINEAR REGRESSION

An aspirational example where sparsity helps:

**Setup:** We are given samples of the form

\[ y = \langle x, \theta^* \rangle + \xi \quad \text{with} \quad x \sim \nu, \quad \mathbb{E}[\xi] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi| \leq \sigma \]

where \( \|\theta^*\|_1 \leq k \)

**Definition [Tibshirani]:** The **Lasso estimator** is

\[
\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\|\theta\|_1 \leq k} \sum_{i=1}^{n}(\langle x_i, \theta \rangle - y_i)^2
\]
SPARSE LINEAR REGRESSION

An aspirational example where sparsity helps:

**Theorem:** With probability $1 - \delta$, the Lasso satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu} [\langle x, \theta^* - \hat{\theta} \rangle^2] \leq \frac{C(k + \sigma)k \sqrt{\log d/\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}$$
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An aspirational example where sparsity helps:

**Theorem:** With probability $1 - \delta$, the Lasso satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu}[(x, \theta^* - \hat{\theta})^2] \leq \frac{C(k + \sigma)k\sqrt{\log d/\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

This is the kind of improvement we are hoping for in SLMDPs.
SPARSE LINEAR REGRESSION

An aspirational example where sparsity helps:

**Theorem:** With probability $1 - \delta$, the Lasso satisfies

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \nu}[\langle x, \theta^* - \hat{\theta} \rangle^2] \leq \frac{C(k + \sigma)k \sqrt{\log d/\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}
\]

This is the kind of improvement we are hoping for in SLMDPs

But in RL, there is no one fixed distribution --- it depends on the policy we play
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How does sparsity help in reinforcement learning?
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**Definition:** A collection of policies $\Psi$ is an $\alpha$-approximate policy cover at step $h$ if for all states $x$

$$\frac{1}{|\Psi|} \sum_{\pi' \in \Psi} \mathbb{P}_{\pi'}[x_h = x] \geq \alpha \max_{\pi} \mathbb{P}_{\pi}[x_h = x]$$
How does sparsity help in reinforcement learning?

**Definition:** A collection of policies $\Psi$ is an $\alpha$-approximate policy cover at step $h$ if for all states $x$

$$\frac{1}{|\Psi|} \sum_{\pi' \in \Psi} \mathbb{P}_{\pi'}[x_h = x] \geq \alpha \max_{\pi} \mathbb{P}_{\pi}[x_h = x]$$

Can we show size of our policy cover improves with sparsity?
REACHABILITY

Assumption (normalization): For all $s$, $a$ and $h$ we have

$$\|\phi_h(s, a)\|_\infty \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \|\mu_h(s)\|_1 \leq C$$
REACHABILITY

Assumption (normalization): For all s, a and h we have

$$\| \phi_h(s, a) \|_\infty \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \| \mu_h(s) \|_1 \leq C$$

analytic notion of sparsity
REACHABILITY

Assumption (normalization): For all s, a and h we have

\[\|\phi_h(s, a)\|_{\infty} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \|\mu_h(s)\|_1 \leq C\]

For now, we will assume all states are reachable:

Definition: A linear MDP is \(\eta\)-reachable if for all s and h we have

\[\max_{\pi} \mathbb{P}_\pi[x_h = x] \geq \eta \|\mu_h(s)\|_1\]
REACHABILITY

Assumption (normalization): For all s, a and h we have

$$\|\phi_h(s, a)\|_\infty \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s \in S} \|\mu_h(s)\|_1 \leq C$$

For now, we will assume all states are reachable:

**Definition:** A linear MDP is \(\eta\)-reachable if for all s and h we have

$$\max_\pi \mathbb{P}_\pi[x_h = x] \geq \eta \|\mu_h(s)\|_1$$

Assumption can be removed, but highly technical to do so.
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IDEALIZED GREEDY COVER

We will build a policy cover greedily

(0) Initialize policy cover $\Psi = \emptyset$ and uncovered states $B = S$

(1) In each step, find a policy that maximizes the probability of reaching uncovered states

Set $\mu \leftarrow \sum_{x \in B} \mu_{h+1}(s)$, find $\hat{\pi} = \arg \max_\pi \mathbb{E}[\langle \phi(s_h, a_h), \mu \rangle]$.

(2) Break if total probability is small, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\langle \phi(s_h, a_h), \mu \rangle] < \xi$

Otherwise, update $\Psi \leftarrow \Psi \cup \{\hat{\pi}\}$ and set

$$B \leftarrow B \setminus \left\{ s \mid \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}[\langle \phi(s_h, a_h), \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle] \geq \frac{\xi}{2C} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \right\}$$
TERMINATION CONDITIONS

Claim 1 [informal]: No policy $\pi$ reaches the set of uncovered states with nonnegligible probability
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Claim 1: For any policy $\pi$, we have $\mathbb{P}_\pi[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{B}] < \xi$

Proof: We choose $\hat{\pi}$ to maximize this probability, and we only break when it is small. ■

Claim 2 [informal]: For any covered state $s$, no policy $\pi$ reaches it with much larger probability than our cover does.
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TERMINATION CONDITIONS

Claim 1: For any policy \( \pi \), we have
\[
P_{\pi}[s_{h+1} \in B] < \xi
\]

Proof: We choose \( \hat{\pi} \) to maximize this probability, and we only break when it is small. \( \Box \)

Claim 2: For all \( s \in S \setminus B \) there is some \( \pi' \in \Psi \) so that
\[
P_{\pi'}[s_{h+1} = s] \geq \frac{\xi}{2C} \max_{\pi} P_{\pi}[s_{h+1} = s]
\]

Proof: First
\[
P_{\pi}[s_{h+1} = s] = E_{\pi}[\langle \phi_h(s_h, a_h), \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle]
\]
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\]
TERMINATION CONDITIONS

Claim 1: For any policy $\pi$, we have $\mathbb{P}_\pi[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{B}] < \xi$

Proof: We choose $\hat{\pi}$ to maximize this probability, and we only break when it is small. □

Claim 2: For all $s \in S \setminus \mathcal{B}$ there is some $\pi' \in \Psi$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\pi'}[s_{h+1} = s] \geq \frac{\xi}{2C} \max_{\pi} \mathbb{P}_\pi[s_{h+1} = s]$$

Proof: First $\mathbb{P}_\pi[s_{h+1} = s] = \mathbb{E}_\pi[\langle \phi_h(s_h, a_h), \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle]$

$$\leq \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \quad \text{(by normalization)}$$

Claim now follows from rule for removing states from $\mathcal{B}$ □
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Claim 3: Finally $|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi}$

Proof: Suppose $\hat{\pi}$ was added to the policy cover in iteration $t$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{B}_t] \geq \xi$$

because we didn’t break

\[ \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{B}_{t+1}], \text{ want to upper bound} \]
**BOUNDING THE SIZE**

**Claim 3:** Finally \( |\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi} \)

**Proof:** Suppose \( \hat{\pi} \) was added to the policy cover in iteration \( t \)

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in B_t] \geq \xi \quad \text{because we didn't break (1)}
\]

\[
\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in B_{t+1}] \leq \frac{\xi}{2C} \sum_{s \in B_{t+1}} \| \mu_{h+1}(s) \|_1
\]

(1) by rule for constructing \( B_{t+1} \)
Claim 3: Finally $|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi}$

Proof: Suppose $\hat{\pi}$ was added to the policy cover in iteration $t$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in B_t] \geq \xi$$ because we didn’t break

$B_{t+1}$

$G_t$

$B_t$

(1) $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in B_{t+1}] \leq \frac{\xi}{2C} \sum_{s \in B_{t+1}} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1$ (2) $\leq \frac{\xi}{2}$ by sparsity bound
BOUNDING THE SIZE

**Claim 3:** Finally \(|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C'}{\xi}\)

**Proof:** Suppose \(\hat{\pi}\) was added to the policy cover in iteration t
BOUNDING THE SIZE

Claim 3: Finally \(|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi}\)

Proof: Suppose \(\widehat{\pi}\) was added to the policy cover in iteration \(t\)

\[\sum_{s \in \mathcal{G}_t} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{G}_t] \geq \frac{\xi}{2}\]
BOUNDING THE SIZE

Claim 3: Finally $|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi}$

Proof: Suppose $\hat{\pi}$ was added to the policy cover in iteration $t$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{s \in \mathcal{G}_t} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{G}_t] \geq \frac{\xi}{2}$$

But since the sets $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \ldots$ are disjoint, we have

$$C \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \ldots} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \frac{t\xi}{2}$$
**Claim 3:** Finally $|\Psi| \leq \frac{2C}{\xi}$

**Proof:** Suppose $\hat{\pi}$ was added to the policy cover in iteration $t$

\[ \mathbb{E} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{G}_t} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\pi}}[s_{h+1} \in \mathcal{G}_t] \geq \frac{\xi}{2} \]

But since the sets $\mathcal{G}_1$, $\mathcal{G}_2$, ... are disjoint, we have

\[ C \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \ldots} \|\mu_{h+1}(s)\|_1 \geq \frac{t\xi}{2} \]

Now rearranging completes the proof.
In general $\Psi$ is not a policy cover but...
In general \( \Psi \) is not a policy cover but...

**Lemma [informal]:** Under reachability, the collection

\[
\Psi \circ_{h+1} \text{unif}(\mathcal{A})
\]

is a policy cover at step \( h+2 \)
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(1) We can’t afford to iterate over all the states
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MAKING IT EFFICIENT?

There are two main issues with our approach:

(1) We can’t afford to iterate over all the states

E.g. when we updated the set of uncovered states

(2) We don’t know the features $\mu_h(s)$

Since the model is non-parametric, it’s not even possible to estimate all these parameters
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EMULATORS

Can we construct a tabular MDP that approximates a linear MDP well enough to be used in Greedy Cover instead?
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(1) they are **analytically sparse**
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2. they have **nonnegative** inner-products with feature maps
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3. they determine the same input-output behavior as the true MDP, for any policy $\pi$
EMULATORS

**Definition:** An emulator at step $h$ for a sparse linear MDP is a collection of vectors $\hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{1}, \hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{2}, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{m}$ that satisfy

1. $\sum_{j} \|\hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{j}\|_1 \leq C'$

2. $\langle \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\phi_{h}(s_{h}, a_{h})], \hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{j} \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\pi$ and $j$

3. There are states $\tilde{s}^{1}, \tilde{s}^{2}, \ldots, \tilde{s}^{m}$ so that for all $\pi$

$$\sum_{s \in S} \langle \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\phi_{h}(s_{h}, a_{h})], \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle \phi^{\text{avg}}_{h+1}(s) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{m} \langle \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\phi_{h}(s_{h}, a_{h})], \hat{\mu}_{h+1}^{j} \rangle \phi^{\text{avg}}_{h+1}(\tilde{s}^{j})$$

**true input-output**

**synthetic input-output**
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

Let’s run Greedy Cover on the $\mu$’s instead!
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Let’s run Greedy Cover on the $\hat{\mu}$’s instead!

uncovered states: $\mathcal{B} = [m] \leftrightarrow \tilde{s}^1, \tilde{s}^2, \ldots, \tilde{s}^m$

target vector: $\mu \leftarrow \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{\mu}^j_{h+1}$
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

Let’s run Greedy Cover on the $\hat{\mu}$'s instead!

uncovered states: $\mathcal{B} = [m] \rightarrow \tilde{s}^1, \tilde{s}^2, \ldots, \tilde{s}^m$

target vector: $\mu \leftarrow \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \hat{\mu}^j_{h+1}$

Essentially, the emulator gives us a tabular approximation, now Greedy Cover is efficient
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

In the analysis of Idealized Greedy Cover we needed to show

$$\sum_{s \in S \setminus B} \langle \mathbb{E}_\pi[\phi_h(s_h, a_h)], \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle \langle \phi_{h+1}^{\text{avg}}(s), \mu_{h+2}(s') \rangle$$

$$\leq \frac{4C^2}{\xi^2} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi} \sim \Psi} \left[ \sum_{s \in S \setminus B} \langle \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}}[\phi_h(s_h, a_h)], \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle \langle \phi_{h+1}^{\text{avg}}(s), \mu_{h+2}(s') \rangle \right]$$

i.e. can’t reach any state s’ much more often than the cover does
PUTTING IT TOGETHER

In the analysis of **Idealized Greedy Cover** we needed to show

\[
\sum_{s \in S \setminus \mathcal{B}} \langle \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\phi_{h}(s_h, a_h)], \mu_{h+1}(s) \rangle \langle \phi_{h+1}^\text{avg}(s), \mu_{h+2}(s') \rangle
\]

i.e. can’t reach any state s’ much more often than the cover does

The properties of an emulator allow us to replace the \( \mu \)'s with \( \hat{\mu} \)'s in the expressions above, and the analysis goes through
Why do small emulators exist? And how do we find them?
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We use convex programming
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We use convex programming

**Main Idea:** Instead of a constraint for each policy, i.e. for all $\pi$

true input-output $\approx$ synthetic input-output
Why do small emulators exist? And how do we find them?

We use convex programming

**Main Idea:** Instead of a constraint for each policy, i.e. for all $\pi$

\[
\text{true input-output} \approx \text{synthetic input-output}
\]

We will draw samples from a policy cover at step $h$, and ask for synthetic features that are good predictors for the output.
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(1) Solve a linear regression problem for all $\ell \in [d]$

$$\widehat{w}_\ell = \arg \min_{\|w\|_1 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \langle \phi_h(s^i_h, a^i_h), w \rangle - \phi^\text{avg}_{h+1}(s^i_{h+1}) \ell \right)^2$$
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A CONVEX PROGRAM

**Input:** Samples drawn from a policy cover $\Psi$ at step $h$

(1) Solve a linear regression problem for all $\ell \in [d]$

$$\hat{w}_\ell = \arg\min_{\|w\|_1 \leq C} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \langle \phi_h(s_h^i, a_h^i), w \rangle - \phi_{h+1}^\text{avg}(s_{h+1}^i \ell) \right)^2$$

(2) Find synthetic features that satisfy $\ell_1$ boundedness, nonnegativity, and are also good predictors i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \langle \phi_h(s_h^i, a_h^i), \hat{w}_\ell \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \langle \phi_h(s_h^i, a_h^i), \hat{\mu}_{h+1}^j \rangle \phi_{h+1}^\text{avg}(s_{h+1}^j \ell) \right)^2 \leq \epsilon$$
A CONVEX PROGRAM

Can establish feasibility and correctness
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**Intuition:** The true features, with importance-weighting are feasible with high probability

**Proof of correctness** uses a net on policies, argues that checking constrains on a representative set (i.e. cover) of policies suffices
A CONVEX PROGRAM

Can establish feasibility and correctness

**Intuition:** The true features, with importance-weighting are feasible with high probability

**Proof of correctness** uses a net on policies, argues that checking constrains on a representative set (i.e. cover) of policies suffices

Ultimately we use policy covers at steps \( \leq h \) to (1) build an emulator and (2) solve the optimization problem in Greedy Cover, together **which gives a small cover at step** \( h+2 \)
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BLOCK MDPS

Settings with rich observations ($\mathcal{X}$) but simpler latent state ($\mathcal{S}$)

- e.g. images
- vs.
- physical location
BLOCK MDPS

Settings with rich observations ($\mathcal{X}$) but simpler latent state ($\mathcal{S}$)

Assumption: There is an unknown decoding function

$$\rho^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

in some known class $\Phi$ of functions

e.g. images vs. physical location
Theorem [Du, Krishnamurthy, Jiang, Agarwal, Dudik, Langford ‘19]: There is a framework with sample complexity: \( \text{poly}(|S|, |A|, H, \log |\Phi|) \) that returns a near optimal policy in a sparse linear MDP.
BLOCK MDPS

Key result:

Theorem [Du, Krishnamurthy, Jiang, Agarwal, Dudik, Langford ‘19]: There is a framework with

\[
\text{sample complexity: } \text{poly}(|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|, H, \log |\Phi|)
\]

that returns a near optimal policy in a sparse linear MDP

But it relies on computationally hard oracles
BLOCK MDPS

Key result:

**Theorem [Du, Krishnamurthy, Jiang, Agarwal, Dudik, Langford ‘19]:** There is a framework with

\[
\text{sample complexity: } \text{poly}(|\mathcal{S}|, |\mathcal{A}|, H, \log |\Phi|)
\]

that returns a near optimal policy in a sparse linear MDP

But it relies on computationally hard oracles

When can we get algorithmic guarantees?
THE VIEW FROM SUPERVISED LEARNING

Not hard to show:

Observation: For some class $\Phi$ of decoding functions, if the associated noisy supervised learning problem is hard, then the RL problem is hard too
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What if we start with a class $\Phi$ that can be PAC learned?
THE VIEW FROM SUPERVISED LEARNING

Not hard to show:

**Observation:** For some class $\Phi$ of decoding functions, if the associated noisy supervised learning problem is hard, then the RL problem is hard too

*e.g. if the decoder is a parity function*

**What if we start with a class $\Phi$ that can be PAC learned?**

*e.g. bounded-depth decision trees*
MORE ALGORITHMIC APPLICATIONS

By interpreting decision trees as sparse regressors:

**Corollary:** There is a quasi-polynomial time algorithm for learning a near optimal policy in any block MDP with a bounded depth decision tree decoder.
By interpreting decision trees as sparse regressors:

**Corollary:** There is a quasi-polynomial time algorithm for learning a near optimal policy in any block MDP with a bounded depth decision tree decoder

This gives an RL-style generalization of a classic result in supervised learning
Summary:

• First computationally efficient algorithm for learning in sparse linear MDPs

• Applications to Block MDPs, including an RL-style generalization of learning decision trees

• Meaningful way to approximate nonparametric models through emulators
**Summary:**

- **First computationally efficient algorithm for learning in sparse linear MDPs**
- Applications to Block MDPs, including an RL-style generalization of learning decision trees
- Meaningful way to approximate nonparametric models through *emulators*

**Thanks! Any Questions?**