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Preface

In this book we consider large and challenging multistage decision problems, which can be solved in principle by dynamic programming (DP for short), but their exact solution is computationally intractable. We discuss solution methods that rely on approximations to produce suboptimal policies with adequate performance. These methods are collectively referred to as reinforcement learning, and also by alternative names such as approximate dynamic programming, and neuro-dynamic programming.

Our subject has benefited greatly from the interplay of ideas from optimal control and from artificial intelligence. One of the aims of the book is to explore the common boundary between these two fields and to form a bridge that is accessible by workers with background in either field.

Our primary focus will be on approximation in value space. Here, the control at each state is obtained by optimization of the cost over a limited horizon, plus an approximation of the optimal future cost, starting from the end of this horizon. The latter cost, which we generally denote by $\tilde{J}$, is a function of the state where we may be at the end of the horizon. It may be computed by a variety of methods, possibly involving simulation and/or some given or separately derived heuristic/suboptimal policy. The use of simulation often allows for model-free implementations that do not require the availability of a mathematical model, a major idea that has allowed the use of DP beyond its classical boundaries.

We focus selectively on four types of methods for obtaining $\tilde{J}$:

(a) **Problem approximation**: Here $\tilde{J}$ is the optimal cost function of a related simpler problem, which is solved by exact DP. Certainty equivalent control and enforced decomposition schemes are discussed in some detail.

(b) **Rollout and model predictive control**: Here $\tilde{J}$ is the cost function of some known heuristic policy. The needed cost values to implement a rollout policy are often calculated by simulation. While this method applies to stochastic problems, the reliance on simulation favors deterministic problems, including challenging combinatorial problems for which heuristics may be readily implemented. Rollout may also be combined with adaptive simulation and Monte Carlo tree search,
which have proved very effective in the context of games such as backgammon, chess, Go, and others.

Model predictive control was originally developed for continuous-space optimal control problems that involve some goal state, e.g., the origin in a classical control context. It can be viewed as a specialized rollout method that is based on an optimization algorithm for reaching a goal state.

(c) **Parametric cost approximation:** Here $\tilde{J}$ is chosen from within a parametric class of functions, including neural networks, with the parameters “optimized” or “trained” by using state-cost sample pairs and some type of incremental least squares/regression algorithm. Approximate policy iteration and its variants are covered in some detail, including several actor-critic schemes. These involve policy evaluation with temporal difference-based training methods, and policy improvement that may rely on approximation in policy space.

(d) **Aggregation:** Here the cost function $\bar{J}$ is the optimal cost function of some approximation to the original problem, called aggregate problem, which has fewer states. The aggregate problem can be formulated in a variety of ways, and may be solved by using exact DP techniques. Its optimal cost function is then used as $\bar{J}$ in a limited horizon optimization scheme. Aggregation may also be used to provide local improvements to parametric approximation schemes that involve neural networks or linear feature-based architectures.

We have adopted a gradual expository approach, which proceeds along three directions:

1. **From exact DP to approximate DP:** We first discuss exact DP algorithms, explain why they may be difficult to implement, and then use them as the basis for approximations.

2. **From finite horizon to infinite horizon problems:** We first discuss finite horizon exact and approximate DP methodologies, which are intuitive and mathematically simple in Chapters 1-3. We then progress to infinite horizon problems in Chapters 4 and 5.

3. **From model-based to model-free approaches:** Reinforcement learning methods offer a major potential benefit over classical DP approaches, which were practiced exclusively up to the early 90s: they can be implemented by using a simulator/computer model rather than a mathematical model. In our presentation, we first discuss model-based methods, and then we identify those methods that can be appropriately modified to work with a simulator.

After the first chapter, each new class of methods is introduced as a more sophisticated or generalized version of a simpler method introduced
earlier. We often discuss methods for deterministic problems and then extend them to the stochastic setting. Moreover, we illustrate some of the methods by means of examples, which should be helpful in providing insight into their use, but may also be skipped selectively and without loss of continuity. Detailed solutions to some of the simpler examples are given, and may illustrate some of the implementation details.

The mathematical style of this book is somewhat different from the one of the author’s DP books [Ber12], [Ber17a], [Ber18a], and the 1996 neuro-dynamic programming (NDP) research monograph, written jointly with John Tsitsiklis [BeT96]. While we provide a rigorous, albeit short, account of the theory of finite and infinite horizon DP, and some fundamental approximation methods, we rely more on intuitive explanations and less on proof-based insights. Moreover, our mathematical requirements are quite modest: calculus, elementary probability, and a minimal use of matrix-vector algebra.

Several of the methods that we present are often successful in practice, but have less than solid performance properties. This is a reflection of the state of the art in the field: there are no methods that are guaranteed to work for all or even most problems, but there are enough methods to try on a given problem with a reasonable chance of success in the end. For this process to work, however, it is important to have proper intuition into the inner workings of each type of method, as well as an understanding of its analytical and computational properties. To quote a statement from the preface of the NDP monograph [BeT96]: “It is primarily through an understanding of the mathematical structure of the NDP methodology that we will be able to identify promising or solid algorithms from the bewildering array of speculative proposals and claims that can be found in the literature.”

Another statement from a recent NY Times article [Str18], in connection with DeepMind’s remarkable AlphaZero chess program, is also worth quoting: “What is frustrating about machine learning, however, is that the algorithms can’t articulate what they’re thinking. We don’t know why they work, so we don’t know if they can be trusted. AlphaZero gives every appearance of having discovered some important principles about chess, but it can’t share that understanding with us. Not yet, at least. As human beings, we want more than answers. We want insight. This is going to be a source of tension in our interactions with computers from now on.” To this we may add that human insight can only develop within some structure of human thought, and it appears that mathematical reasoning with algorithmic models is the most suitable structure for this purpose.
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