arXiv:2201.12569v2 [cs.LG] 27 Dec 2022

Bellman Meets Hawkes: Model-Based Reinforcement Learning via Temporal Point Processes

Chao Qu[*1], Xiaoyu Tan[*†1], Siqiao Xue[1], Xiaoming Shi[1], James Zhang[1], Hongyuan Mei[2]

[1] Ant Group, Hangzhou, China.
[2] Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago, Chicago, IL, United States.
chaoqu.technion@gmail.com,txywilliam1993@outlook.com, {siqiao.xsq,peter.sxm,james.z}@antgroup.com
hongyuan@ttic.edu

Abstract

We consider a sequential decision making problem where the agent faces the environment characterized by the stochastic discrete events and seeks an optimal intervention policy such that its long-term reward is maximized. This problem exists ubiquitously in social media, finance and health informatics but is rarely investigated by the conventional research in reinforcement learning. To this end, we present a novel framework of the model-based reinforcement learning where the agent's actions and observations are asynchronous stochastic discrete events occurring in continuous-time. We model the dynamics of the environment by Hawkes process with external intervention control term and develop an algorithm to embed such process in the Bellman equation which guides the direction of the value gradient. We demonstrate the superiority of our method in both synthetic simulator and real-data experiments.

Introduction

The last several years have witnessed the great success of reinforcement learning (RL) including the video game playing (Mnih et al. 2015), robot manipulation (Gu et al. 2017), autonomous driving (Shalev-Shwartz, Shammah, and Shashua 2016) and many others (Lazic et al. 2018; Dalal, Gilboa, and Mannor 2016). Most of them focus on the problem where the system of interest evolves continuously with time, e.g., a trajectory of a robot arm.

However, the conventional research in RL may omit a category of system that evolves continuously and may be interrupted by stochastic events *abruptly* (See the jumps at t_1, t_2, t_3 in Figure 1). Such system exists ubiquitously in the social and information science and therefore necessitates the research of reinforcement learning in these domains to extend its applicability in the real-world problems (Farajtabar et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2018), in which the agent seeks an optimal intervention policy so as to improve the future course of events. Concrete examples may include:

- Social media. Social media website allows users to create and share content. Retweet can form as users resharing and broadcasting others' tweet to their friends and followers. Such stochastic events would steer the behaviors of other tweet users (Rizoiu et al. 2017); the platform (agent) may want to seek a policy to effectively mitigate the fake news by optimizing the performance of real news propagation over the network (Farajtabar et al. 2017).
- Medical events. The stream of medical events would include the blood test, diagnosis, treatment and so on. To cure the patients, a doctor (the agent) often seeks the optimal treatments based on the clinical conditions.

In the above problems, given the observed trajectories of the event sequences in continuous-time, the agent can impose the intervention on the environment to maximize the long term reward. For instance, the platform can post the valid news in the social media to steer the spontaneous user mitigation activities of fake news. In the RL context, the action is to post valid news and the observation is the users' following behaviors such as retweet while the reward can be quantified by event exposure counts. However, the following characteristics of event sequences bring new challenges:

1. The inter-event time intervals are *not* constant while conventional RL considers the synchronized action and observations. For instance, the healthy patient with less severe symptoms would visit doctors occasionally, while the unhealthy patients receive the test and treatment more frequently. Thus it is crucial to predict both which events are likely to happen next and when they will happen. Directly adapting conventional RL algorithm to its Semi-MDP (SMDP) version can not address this issue well (see our *ablation study* in Appendix.)
2. How to describe the dynamics of an abrupt event if the agent imposes intervention? Note that these events may help cause or prevent future events in a complex mechanism, e.g., in Figure 1, the platform posts the valid news to steer the spontaneous user activities. In general, the valid news and fake news can inhibit each other. Specifically, the dynamic system characterized by continuous trajectories will be abruptly changed by discrete events. However, the dynamic models of most model-based RL methods are continuous *without* endogenous jumps (e.g., the jump corresponding to the spontaneous user activities), and therefore are not suitable for learning the continuous and discrete dynamics of such hybrid system.

[*]These authors contributed equally.
[†]Corresponding author. txywilliam1993@outlook.com

Copyright © 2023, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

To this end, we propose a novel model-based reinforcement learning, where the agent seeks the long term reward by imposing the interventions (event) on this hybrid system. In our setting, both the actions taken by the agent and the observations from the environment are asynchronous stochastic event in continuous time. To describe the dynamics of the environment, we adapt Neural Hawkes Process (Zhang et al. 2020; Zuo et al. 2020; Mei and Eisner 2017) to the case with exogenous Interventions (i.e., the actions in RL) and name it NHPI for short. Instead of discretizing time into fixed-width intervals in conventional RL, we treat timestamps as random variables. The latent representations of NHPI implicitly describe when and which type of event will happen in the future by learning the intensity function λ. We embed the latent space of the learned dynamic model into the Bellman equation and derive a stochastic value gradient algorithm in the semi-Markov decision process to cope with the challenge of irregular timestamps.

It is known that Hawkes process can be reformulated as stochastic differential equations (SDEs) *with endogenous jumps* caused by stochastic events inside the environment itself. The dynamic model of most traditional model-based RL methods can be described by SDEs or ODEs *without* endogenous jumps (if we adapt them in the continuous-time setting). Thus, it reveals the intrinsic difference between our approach and the previous model-based RL methods, which is evidenced by the experimental results showing that our algorithm outperforms model-free and model-based RL baselines with a notable margin by considering the discontinuity nature of the jumps. We discuss the connections to ODE approach and world model (Hafner et al. 2019a) thoroughly in Appendix.

Contributions: We propose a model-based RL algorithm to solve the problem that can evolve both continuously and can be interrupted by the stochastic event abruptly. Our method captures the jump and the irregular time-interval property in the systems and extends the applicability of RL in the area of social media, medical events and many others. Empirically, we demonstrate that our method surpasses the performances of other state-of-the-art model-free and model-based RL algorithms. We release our code at https://github.com/WilliamBUG/Event_driven_rl/tree/main

Related work

Temporal point processes are prevalent in modeling the sequences of events happening at irregular intervals and have wide applications in e-commerce systems, social media, and traffic prediction (Hawkes and Oakes 1974; Daley and Vere-Jones 2007). Recent works combine temporal point process with deep learning and design algorithms to learn complex behavior from real-world data (Mei and Eisner 2017; Du et al. 2016; Zuo et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2020; Xue et al. 2021, 2022). However, these works just focus on the *prediction* problem rather than the *control* problem, i.e., the agent does not make any decision to impose the intervention on the environment. The only exceptions are (Wang et al. 2018; Zarezade et al. 2017; Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018; Farajtabar et al. 2017). The problem is formulated into SDEs in (Wang et al. 2018; Zarezade et al. 2017) and solved with the optimal control theory. However they assume that the dynamic are known, which is not applicable in most real-world problems. TPPRL proposes a modified version of REINFORCE algorithm (Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018). In general, such simple model-free algorithm suffers from high sample-complexity. The authors in (Farajtabar et al. 2017) use linear least square temporal difference (LSTD) learning to learn a policy to mitigate the fake news over the social media. However, it can only apply to simple problem due to the limitation of LSTD. Our work builds a flexible model to describe the underlying dynamics of the event stream intervened with the action, and then we propose a sample-efficient model-based RL algorithm where the agent seeks the optimal policy to achieve some desired states and to maximize the long-term reward.

There are a few works in literature on the Semi-MDPs and the continuous-time reinforcement learning (Munos 2006; Bradtke and Duff 1995), which are natural formalism for the problem with irregular time intervals. However, these works are generally model-free algorithm and have low sample efficiency. The problem in social science is partially observable in the real-world, which made RNN and its variants popular to summarize the long-term dependencies and describe the belief states in RL (Oh et al. 2015). In model-based approaches (Ha and Schmidhuber 2018; Hafner et al. 2019a,b), a world model is often learned from the past experience and generates new imaginary data to feed the agent. These algorithms also have downsides, i.e., they generally discretize the time evenly. The authors in (Du, Futoma, and Doshi-Velez 2020; Yıldız, Heinonen, and Lähdesmäki 2021) use neural ODE to create the world model and hence can cope with the continuous-time setting. However their work can not handle the hybrid dynamic with jumps and therefore their empirical results focus on the Openai gym (e.g., swimmer) (Brockman et al. 2016). As shown in Appendix, our model can be thought of as SDEs with jumps. To the best of our knowledge, none work mentioned above (except ours) considers the dynamics with jumps sparked by the event, which is essential in modeling real-world problems, since such jump term related to the counting measure reflects the nature in the social science, epidemic process and many others (Cox and Isham 1980; Rasmussen 2018). In our experimental result, we also demonstrate our algorithm outperforms the state of the arts.

Preliminary

As we discussed in the introduction, we need to properly handle the problem with irregular time interval which is caused by the abrupt event. To this end, we introduce temporal point process and the Semi-MDPs, which are building blocks of our work.

Temporal Point Process: A temporal point process (TPP) is a random process whose realization consists of a list of discrete events localized in time $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, ..., t_N\}$, where $t_i < t_{i+1}$ (Daley and Vere-Jones 2007). The marked temporal point process is a stochastic process whose realization consists not only the event time but also event type $k \in \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{K} := \{1, ..., K\}$. Let $Es = \{(t_i, k_i)\}_{i=1}^{L}$ be an event




Figure 1: The figure in the left panel illustrates the fake new mitigation problem. The user B may follow the fake news from user A and spread it to others. The moderator may expose valid news to user B to incentivize more spontaneous mitigation events (e.g., valid news at t_3). The right panel is the corresponding intensity function of valid news and the fake news modeled by the Neural Hawkes Process with intervention. The probability that an event occurs in the infinitesimal interval $[t, t + dt]$ is determined by intensity times dt (i.e., $\lambda_i(t)dt$) as that in TPP. Events of valid news and fake news inhibit each other. When events occur at time t_1, t_2, t_3, there are immediate effects (the sudden jumps) and long-term effects (decay with time) in intensity. In addition, the agent has two types of actions to intervene in the event stream: red action to inhibit fake news event and blue one to excite valid news event, which cause instant effects on the intensity of events. In our setting, the agent takes actions at timestamp t_i or with a small delay (see the section of problem setup).

sequence with length L, where k_i is the i-th event of the sequence Es and t_i is the timestamp of the i-th event. Then the history is defined as $\mathcal{H}_t := \{(t_i, k_i)|t_i < t, k_i \in \mathcal{K}\}$. In practice, k_i can represent the messages posted in the social media, or the treatment given by the doctor while t_i is the corresponding occurring time of such event. We use $\lambda_k(t)$ to represent the rate of an event with type k and denote $\lambda(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_k(t)$ as the total intensity of all events. Hawkes process captures the *interactions* between different types of event, in which past events conspire to raise the intensity of each type of event (Hawkes and Oakes 1974). In particular, the intensity with type k is modeled as:$\lambda_k(t) = \mu_k + \sum_{h:t_h<t} \beta_{k_h,k} \exp(-\zeta(t - t_h))$ where μ_k is the base intensity of event type k, $\beta_{j,k} \geq 0$ is the degree to which an event of type j excites type k, and $\zeta > 0$ is the decay rate of that excitation. Random sequence can be generated from the model by the thinning algorithm (Lewis and Shedler 1979). Recent works (Mei and Eisner 2017; Zuo et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2020) combine the progress in deep learning to enhance the capacity of this process, e.g., using RNN or transformer to approximate the intensity function and can predict online and off-line human actions accurately in social media.

Semi-MDPs: A semi-Markov decision process (SMDP) is a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, F, \rho)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is the state space, $\mathcal{A}$ is the action space, $\mathcal{T}$ is a transition time space, $\mathcal{P}$ is the transition probability, and $e^{-\rho}$ is the discount factor with $\rho > 0$ (Bradtke and Duff 1995). A Semi-Markov process evolves as follows. The next state s' is chosen according to the transition probabilities $P(s'|s, a)$. Conditioned on the event that the next state is s', the time interval $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ between the s to s' has the probability distribution of $F(\cdot|a, s, s')$. The reward function $r(t) := R(s(t), a(t))$. The objective of the agent is to find a policy $\pi(a|s)$ to maximize the expected infinite horizon discounted reward $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} r(t)dt]$. The Bellman equation for the SMDPs is defined as follows (Bradtke and Duff 1995).

$$V(s) = \sum_{a,s'} \pi(a|s)P(s'|a, s)[\int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau} r(\tau)d\tau dF(t|s, a, s') + \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} V(s')dF(t|s, a, s')]. \tag{1}$$

In contrast to the constant time interval in MDP, τ in SMDP is stochastic (Sutton, Precup, and Singh 1999). Our high level idea is to model such interval with the temporal point processes so as to describe the dynamics of the control problem in SMDPs. We provide some concrete examples in the social media problem to relate these definitions to the real world problems in the following. The state s is the count of the events with different types, e.g., the numbers of fakes and real news received by the users, or the embedding of these events sequence in the *hidden space* of RNN. The action a is the intervention, e.g., the network moderator exposes different types of the real news (actions) to users to match their exposure to fake news. The reward can be the distance between the target frequency of the event and the current frequency, and the cost of different actions can be different.

Our method

This section is organized as follows: we first describes the setting of the problem. Then we modify the Hawkes process to incorporate the effect of actions. Using NHPI, we derive a model-based stochastic value gradient algorithm for RL in the SMDPs setting. We relate this model to the SDEs with jumps and discuss the key difference between our reinforcement learning algorithm and traditional RL through our SDE reformulation in Appendix.

Problem setup

In many problems, including social media, medical events and many others, the agent observes a steam of the asyn-

chronous stochastic discrete events occurring in continuous-time, such as the user's posts, clicks or likes. We denote the observations from the environment $\mathcal{H}_{\leq t_i}$ up to t_i (including t_i) as $\{(t_1, k_1), ..., (t_i, k_i)\}$. In our setting, the agent can just intervene in the environment or change its actions a_i at timestamp t_i. We denote its action sequence before time t_i (not including t_i) as $a_{<t_i}$. At timestamp t_i, the agent samples its action from a policy, i.e., $a_i \sim \pi(\cdot|\mathcal{H}_{\leq t_i}, a_{<t_i})$. Unless otherwise specified, we assume $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, i.e., the action set is a subset of the total event set. After imposing the intervention on the environment, the agent obtains a reward $r(t)$ and aims to maximize the discounted long-term reward, $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} r(t) dt]$, where the expectation is over the randomness of the transition, time interval and reward in the SMDPs. In practice, the agent may apply the action a_i after t_i with a small delay δt (see the illustration in Figure 1). For instance, after realizing that rumors spreads over the social media, the network moderator may need some response time δt to apply the strategy to block the diffusion. The doctor provide the treatment for the patient after the medical test. This δt can be arbitrary predefined positive value in accordance with tasks. In our experiment, we impose the intervention at the next coming clock tick for simplicity. To ease our notion here, we simply assume a_i occurs at time t_i.

NHPI Model

Recall that our high level idea is to leverage the Hawkes process to model *time intervals* τ in SMDPs so as to describe the underlying dynamics of stochastic event. In the following, we demonstrate how to modify the neural Hawkes process to the RL setting. In particular, we build a dynamic model following the recent progress in attention (Vaswani et al. 2017) and neural Hawkes process (Mei and Eisner 2017; Zhang et al. 2020; Zuo et al. 2020). It is natural to extend the definition of the event stream in the section of preliminary to the event-action stream $Es = \{(t_i, k_i, a_i)\}$ to incorporate exogenous intervention a. The whole structure is summarized in Figure 2, where the latent variable $\boldsymbol{h}(t_i)$ is a key vector which summarizes the history and decides the intensity $\lambda(t_i)$ of the Hawkes process. Then the latent state feeds into the agent as the state information. Besides the policy function and value function, the agent builds the transition and reward model over the latent state .

Encode observations to hidden state $\mathbf{h}$: As the common practice in RL (Ha and Schmidhuber 2018) and TPP (Mei and Eisner 2017), we encode the observations, i.e. the sequence of event types, timestamps and actions $\{(t_i, k_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^L$ into dense embedding $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times N}$ in figure 2. Then such embedding passes through Multi-head attention, $\mathbf{\Lambda} = softmax(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{M_K}})\mathbf{V}$ where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^Q$, $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^K, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^V$ are the query, key and value matrix respectively as that in (Vaswani et al. 2017; Zuo et al. 2020). $\mathbf{W}^Q, \mathbf{W}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M_K}$, $\mathbf{W}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M_V}$ are learned weight matrix. To avoid observing the future, the attention is equipped with masks. When computing the attention $\mathbf{S}(j, :)$, we mask all the future position. Then we feed the self-attention $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ into a feed-forward neural network to generate the hidden representation $\mathbf{H}$. The hidden representation at time step t_i is the i-th column of $\mathbf{H}$, i.e., $\mathbf{h}(t_i) = \mathbf{H}(i, :)$. We defer the description of how to construct embedding $\mathbf{X}$ and parameterizations of neural networks to Appendix.




Figure 2: Structure of NHPI. We embed the (t_i, k_i, a_i) into a dense vector, and pass two multi-head attention+ feed forward modules with masks. The outputs are $\mathbf{h}(t_i), \boldsymbol{\mu}(t_i), \boldsymbol{\eta}(t_i), \boldsymbol{\zeta}(t_i), \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t_i)$. We then feed states, i.e., the latent representation $\tilde{\boldsymbol{h}}$ to our RL module.

Construct intensity function $\lambda_k(t)$*:* We follow the work in (Zhang et al. 2020) to define the intensity function. $\lambda_k(t) = softplus(\mu_k(t_i) + \big(\eta_k(t_i) - \mu_k(t_i)\big) \times \exp\big(-\zeta_k(t_i) \times (t - t_i)\big)$, where $\mu_k(t_i) = Relu(\mathbf{w}_{\mu,k}^T \mathbf{h}(t_i)), \eta_k(t_i) = Relu(\mathbf{w}_{\eta,k}^T \mathbf{h}(t_i))$, $\zeta_k(t_i) = softplus(\mathbf{w}_{\zeta,k}^T \mathbf{h}(t_i))$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\mu,k}^T, \mathbf{w}_{\eta,k}^T, \mathbf{w}_{\zeta,k}^T$ are learned vectors. Notice that now the intensity also depends on the historical action sequence.

Training NHPI Model

Given NHPI, the next step is to define the training objective. In the following, we provide the likelihood of the model defined as the density function of (t_i, k_i) given the intervention a_i in the event stream $\{(t_i, k_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^L$ with $t_L < T$. The Hawkes process has a compact form of the log-likelihood function which only depends on λ. The log-likelihood of Hawkes process given observations in $[0, T)$ is $\sum_{i:t_i<T} \log \lambda_{k_i}(t_i) - \int_{t=0}^T \lambda(t) dt$, where $\lambda(t)$ is the sum intensity of all event types, i.e., $\lambda(t) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(t)$ (Rasmussen 2018). We show NHPI has the same form of the log-likelihood function by adapting the proof in Hawkes process to allow external action and include the proof in Appendix for the completeness. The term $\sum_{i:t_i<T} \log \lambda_{k_i}(t_i)$ is easy to obtain from samples, since $\lambda_k(t_i), k \in \{1, ..., K\}$ are the outputs from our model. Specifically, we need to conduct a Monte-Carlo sampling to estimate the integral term and we will defer the details to appendix. Thus the whole objective function can be optimized by stochastic gradient descent.

Planning over the latent space of NHPI

State: Recall that $\mathbf{h}(t_i)$ encodes the history of events and actions $\{(t_j, k_j, a_j)\}_{j=1,..,i}$, e.g., the history of fakes/real news retweeted by the user and mitigation valid news posted by the platform, which is generally be used as belief state in RL (Hafner et al. 2019a). We define another vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t_i)$, which encodes the same history but toggle the last action

$a_i = \mathbf{0}$. It is an embedding of history before an action at timestamp t_i (i.e., $\mathcal{H}_{\leq t_i}, a_{<t_i}$). In our current algorithm, we directly treat $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t_i)$ as our state $s(t_i)$, i.e., $s(t_i) := \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t_i)$ but other transformations on $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ can also be accommodated.

Transition learning: Given NHPI, we can obtain state s (i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$) at every timestamp. Then we use a neural network g to learn the transition such that $s(t_{i+1}) \approx g(s(t_i), a_i, \epsilon(s(t_i))$, where ϵ is the noise term to represent the stochasticity in the transition $P(s(t_{i+1})|s(t_i), a_i)$ of SMDP . In particular, we minimize the error

$$\|s(t_{i+1}) - g(s(t_i), a_i, \epsilon(s_{t_i}))\|_2^2, \tag{2}$$

where g is a neural network with reparameterization trick (Kingma and Welling 2013) to incorporate the noise term $\epsilon(s(t_i))$. For instance, it generates the mean and standard deviation of a Gaussian distribution.

Reward function learning: We minimize the error

$$\|r(t_i) - \kappa\big(s(t_i), a_i, \xi(s(t_i))\big)\|_2^2, \tag{3}$$

where $r(t_i)$ is the true reward at timestamp t_i, e.g., the event exposure counts. ξ is Gaussian noise and κ is a neural network with reparameterization trick.

Value function learning: Let τ_i be the time interval between t_i and t_{i+1}, i.e., $\tau_i = t_{i+1} - t_i$. In SMDPs, the target function for $V(s(t_i))$ is $\hat{V}\big(s(t_i)\big) := \frac{1-e^{-\rho\tau_i}}{\rho} r(t_i) + e^{-\rho\tau_i} V\big(s(t_{i+1})\big)$. Such target function can be derived from (1), in particular, a sampled version of Bellman equation in SMDPs. We defer derivations to Appendix . Comparing with the temporal difference learning in MDPs (Sutton, Barto et al. 1998), we have an additional stochastic term τ corresponding to the inter-event time interval. Recall that we have already obtained the NHPI model, the transition and reward model, and therefore we can generate imaginary state $s(t_{i+1})$ and reward $r(t_i)$ easily. The time interval τ_i can be simulated by NHPI with Thinning algorithm (Ogata 1981), and thus the target function defined above can be easily obtained in practice. Remark that explicitly modelling of τ with NHPI is one *key* advantage of our method over the conventional RL approaches (Haarnoja et al. 2018; Heess et al. 2015). While conventional approach can encode the timestamp using RNN naively, we can capture the stochasticity of the time interval τ much better by TPP. It is evidenced by our experiment, where the inputs of all algorithms are the same, i.e., the sequence of the observation $\{(t_i, k_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^{L}$, while our method outperforms the conventional RL a lot. The term $(1 - e^{-\rho\tau_i})/\rho$ is the accumulated discount factor of the interval. We approximate the value function V by a neural network V_ϕ and minimize the following error term w.r.t ϕ.

$$\|V_\phi(s(t_i)) - \hat{V}_\phi(s(t_i))\|_2^2. \tag{4}$$

Please note that when we optimize above equation, the target value $\hat{V}_\phi$ is fixed, as a common practice in RL community (Haarnoja et al. 2018).

Policy learning: We apply the stochastic policy so that the agent can explore the environment thoroughly (Haarnoja et al. 2018). In particular, we parameterize the policy $\pi(s(t_i))$ by a neural network $\pi_\theta(s(t_i))$. If the action space is discrete, we reparameterize the output by the Gumbel-softmax trick (Jang, Gu, and Poole 2016); If it is continuous, we reparameterize the output by the Gaussian distribution (Kingma and Welling 2013). Again, we sample the Bellman equation (1) but with the learned dynamics and value function (see derivations in Appendix) as that in SVG (Heess et al. 2015) and Dreamer (Hafner et al. 2019a). Specifically, we replace $s(t_{i+1})$ by $g(s(t_i), \pi(s(t_i)), \epsilon(s(t_i)))$, replace $r(t_i)$ by learned reward $\kappa(s(t_i), \pi(s_i), \xi(s(t_i)))$, replace action by $\pi_\theta(s(t_i))$ and rollout Bellman equation one step to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\phi,\theta}(s(t_i)) = (1 - e^{-\rho\tau_i})\kappa\big(s(t_i), \pi_\theta(s(t_i)), \xi(s(t_i))\big)/\rho \\ + e^{-\rho\tau_i} V_\phi\bigg(g\big(s(t_i), \pi_\theta(s(t_i)), \epsilon(s(t_i))\big)\bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We can see $V_{\phi,\theta}$ is a function of policy π_θ. We do one policy improvement step as that in SVG (Heess et al. 2015),

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \frac{\partial V_{\phi,\theta}}{\partial \theta}, \tag{6}$$


where α is the learning rate.

Algorithm: We combine all pieces discussed above and propose the stochastic event driven reinforcement learning (SEDRL) which consists of three parts: 1. The stochastic agent collects the real data trajectory from the environment, and train the NHPI by maximizing the likelihood of NHPI. 2. The agent learns the transition and reward model on $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(t_i)$ (the state $s(t_i)$ in our algorithm). 3. The agent learns the value function V_ϕ and improves the policy using (6). The pseducode of the algorithm is deferred to Appendix .

Experiment

In this section, we evaluate our algorithm SEDRL comprehensively in the synthetic simulation and experiments with real data such as smart broadcasting and improving the engagement of the social media platform. In the real-data experiment, we follow the literature to build the simulator with real-world data (Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018; Zarezade et al. 2017), since directly deploying RL agent in the scenarios like social media and healthcare is difficult and may cause safety and ethics issue. We compare our algorithm with multiple state-of-the-art deep RL methods including model-free algorithms such as Tpprl (Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018), SAC (Haarnoja et al. 2018), TD3 (Fujimoto, Hoof, and Meger 2018), DDQN (Van Hasselt, Guez, and Silver 2016) and model-based ones such as Dreamer (Hafner et al. 2019a) and MBPO (Janner et al. 2019). [1] Among them, Tpprl explicitly considers the stochasticity of the time interval τ and devices a model-free policy gradient algorithm. For the other conventional RL baselines, the problem is formulated as MDP where timestamps are just regular features for the neural networks. We conduct the ablation study on the SMDP formulation in appendix.

[1] There are other related works such as (Wang et al. 2018; Farajtabar et al. 2017; Zarezade et al. 2017), but they either assume the dynamics is known or just can solve simple problem. Therefore we do not report the result here.



(a) 8 events (SI) (b) 16 events (SI) (c) 8 events (USI)

(d) 16 events (USI) (e) Smart broadcasting (f) Improving engagements

Figure 3: Performance of proposed methods and other baselines. The x-axis is the training step and the y-axis is the cumulative reward. Each experiment is tested on ten trials using various random seeds and initialized parameters. The solid line is the mean of the average return. The shaded region represents the standard deviation.

The inputs for all algorithms are the sequences of the observation, i.e., $\{(t_j, k_j, a_j)\}_{j=1,..,L}$. We equip aforementioned baselines with LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber 1997) or Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017) in the value function network and policy network to encode the observations into state rather than simple feed-forward neural networks as usual, since the environment is highly partially observable and the observation is in the form of sequence (Oh et al. 2015). Notice that in our algorithm the hidden space is obtained by the Transformer structure (multi-head attention+MLP). Therefore the performance gap between our SEDRL and baselines are *only* due to the performance of the algorithm itself. Some details of the baselines are in the following: **1)** Tpprl: Tpprl is a model-free RL algorithm tailored for marked temporal point processes (Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018). **2)** Transformer+SAC: SAC is a strong baselines in RL and achieves robust performance in almost all test environment (Haarnoja et al. 2018). We implement Transformer to encode the event sequence (Parisotto et al. 2020; Vaswani et al. 2017) . Specifically, we stack two multi-head attention layers with head number equal two. Then we feed this embedding as the input to discrete action SAC (Haarnoja et al. 2018; Christodoulou 2019). **3)** Transformer+DDQN: This baseline is similar to the Transformer+SAC, but we replace SAC by DDQN. **4)** Transformer+TD3: We replace SAC by discrete action version of TD3. **5)** Dreamer: Dreamer is a model-based algorithm where the deterministic transition model is modeled by LSTM. We replace the CNN in Dreamer by MLP since the input is not image. **6)** MBPO: MBPO applies the model ensemble in the dynamic model learning to enhance the performance. We replace the feed-forward neural network in MBPO by LSTM. **7)** LSTM+SAC: The sequence encoding is obtained by the LSTM. Other details such as the hyperparameter tunnings in SEDRL and baselines are in Appendix.

Experimental result

Synthetic simulation: we simulate the fake news mitigation problem (Farajtabar et al. 2017). The recent proliferation of malicious fake news in social media has been a source of widespread concern. In this simulation, the platform is the agent and the users are the environment. The social media platform hopes to optimize the performance of real news propagation. Intuitively, it wants to steer the spontaneous user mitigation activities by exposing more valid news. The action is an event that is selected from some predefined valid news(event) set, which hopefully can distract the attention of users on the rumor. We create the environment by constructing a simulator of Hawkes process with exogenous intervention (Wang et al. 2018) using Thinning algorithm (Ogata 1981). At time step t_i, the input of the simulator is the action a_i taken by the agent. The k-th action type is encoded as a one-hot vector where k-th entry is one. Zero vector means no action taken. The simulator gets the action as an input and generates the event $v_{i+1} \in \{1, ..., K\}$ at t_{i+1} (K=8 or 16 in our simulation). The parameter such as β_{ij} in the simulator are some predefined values. The goal of the platform is to find the best policy that can control the event (valid and fake news) intensity vector such that it is close to a predefined level $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{target}$. Hence, the reward of our simulation for each time step $r_t = -\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{target} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t\|^2 - 0.1 * \text{cost}(a_t)$ provided by the simulator, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ is the intensity at t. Cost of action is 1 if the agent inserts an event and otherwise 0 if we do nothing.

Two intervention settings are considered in our simulation, i.e., synchronized intervention setting and unsynchronized intervention setting. We use *SI* and *USI* for short respectively. Notice that the events occur asynchronously in both settings. The SI setting is straightforward, with the aim to show that even if in an easy setting, the baselines can

not learn a good policy. Specifically, in the SI setting, the agent can intervene in the sequence at evenly discretized time interval, i.e., at timestamp $\{\Delta t, 2\Delta t, .., i\Delta, ...\}$ (see the illustration in Appendix of experiment setting. This setting is simpler than our original setting (USI) in the section of problem setup, where the intervention can be applied at $\{t_1, t_2, ..., t_i, ..\}$, i.e., at the timestamps of event i. The simulation is terminated when time t exceeds the maximum time horizon (e.g., 100 time units.). In general, in this setting, the agent has more chances to intervene with the environment (in our simulation $\Delta < (t_{i+1} - t_i)$). In addition, since time is evenly discretized, this setting may be more friendly to the baselines. Also note that our algorithm (and baselines) can easily adapt to this setting, since our model can easily accommodate by setting an additional null event occurring at timestamp $i\Delta$. The USI setting is our setting in the problem setup section, which means the agent only makes decision when a specific event happens along the trajectory (see Figure 1), which is more practical in real-world problems. For instance, the doctor would change the treatment only after the patient's visit. In our simulation, the agent inserts actions at the next coming clock tick following the occurrence of events. The simulation is terminated when the time t exceeds the maximum time horizon. In both settings, we conduct two simulations with K=8 and K=16 events respectively. We use half of these events as our action set (i.e., 4 events and 8 events respectively). Details of the synthetic simulation are deferred to the appendix of experiment setting. All experiments in Figure 3 are repeated with ten trials with various random seeds and initial parameters.

Figure 3 (a) and (b) demonstrate the results in the SI setting. In (a), our method SEDRL has the best result followed by Tpprl, Transformer+SAC, LSTM+ SAC, MBPO, Transformer+TD3, Dreamer and then Transformer+DDQN (Trans+Q). In (b), our SEDRL also achieves the best result. The runner up is Dreamer, while other baselines have similar results around -210. Figure 3 (c) and (d) present the results in the USI setting. We can derive similar conclusion as that in the SI setting. Our method outperforms conventional RL algorithm since we consider the dynamics that can be interrupted by the stochastic event. Comparing with Tpprl, our method explicitly embeds the dynamic model into the Bellman equation of SMDPs and therefore it is much more sample efficient than the model-free policy gradient algorithm.

Smart broadcasting: In this problem, the user of the social media wants to decide what to post to elicit the attention from her followers (Spasojevic et al. 2015). The user herself is the agent and she generates action event (post tweets). The environment is formed by her followers and it generates feedback events if her followers retweet. Since we cannot make real interventions on the platform of twitter , we follow the conventions in the literature (Upadhyay, De, and Gomez-Rodriguez 2018; Zarezade et al. 2017) to train a simulator with real-world data. In particular, we use Retweet dataset (Zhao et al. 2015) to learn a model of follower. The Retweets dataset contains sequences of tweets, where each sequence contains origin tweets (i.e., some user initiates a tweet), and some follow-up tweets. We group the post and retweet into three categories event (i.e., K=3) following the work in (Zuo et al. 2020). Then follower's behavior is learned by a neural temporal point process (Zuo et al. 2020) with exogenous excitation (i.e., the origin tweets) (Ding 2020). The users should expose the predefined events (action set are three kinds of post) to her followers to elicit attentions and then observe the feedback event of the followers. Each kind of the feedback event (retweet) and action event (post) corresponds to a predefined reward and cost respectively(appendix G), where the aim of action cost is to discourage too much intervention over the environment. The goal of the agent is to maximize the total reward minus the cost over the simulation time [0,T]. Given the feedback model of the follower (generated by the simulator), we can do simulations through the interactions over the environment. Some details of the experiment setting are deferred to the appendix . In Figure 3 (e), we demonstrate the performance of all algorithm. Our method reaches asymptotic result after only 20k training steps and achieves -10 long-term reward, while the performances of baselines are below -40.

Improving the Engagement: The platforms of e-commerce or social media sometimes award the users to promote engagement in the community. In this problem, we would design a policy to help the platform to hand out awards. Take Stack-Overflow for instance, where users can use post to ask questions or seek advises in various technical areas while the other users can answer the questions freely and the answer will be rated or awarded by other views. Under our problem setting, the agent is the platform, while the environment consist of the users in the website. The action event correspond to badge types, e.g., Nice Question, Good Answer, etc, and the event times correspond to the award times. The platform can encourages user engagement by giving certain types of badges (action) to the user after he receives some other badge. For example, when a user receives "Good Answer" badge, the agent awards a "Great Answer" or "Guru" badge (as an action) to encourage his/her engagement in the website. Then the platform can observe the feedback event from the users. For instance, The user may answer questions more frequently with higher quality (e.g., more useful answers). Each feedback event and action event have a corresponding predefined reward or cost. We sum all of them over a certain period to reflect the engagement rate of the platform. The agent should learn a control policy to maximize the long-term reward by manipulating the action events. Since we can not deploy the policy in the Stack-Overflow, we use the data gathered from Stack-Overflow (Leskovec and Krevl 2014) to learn a feedback model of the users. The data is collected in a two-year period, and we treat each user's reward history as a sequence following the work (Zuo et al. 2020). We pick eleven types of the event in the dataset as the exogenous excitation while the other half as the endogenous one. Therefore, the size of the action set is eleven and $K = 22$ (See more details in appendix). We can learn a user feedback model using neural temporal process with exogenous excitation (Ding 2020). Using this simulator (feedback model) trained from the real data set, we can do experiments through the interactions with the environment. We report results in Figure 3 (f). Our method could achieve -35 cumulative reward after 100k step training, while the

rewards of baselines are below -50.

References

Bradtke, S. J.; and Duff, M. O. 1995. Reinforcement learning methods for continuous-time Markov decision problems. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 393–400.

Brockman, G.; Cheung, V.; Pettersson, L.; Schneider, J.; Schulman, J.; Tang, J.; and Zaremba, W. 2016. Openai gym. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540*.

Chen, R. T.; Amos, B.; and Nickel, M. 2020. Neural Spatio-Temporal Point Processes. *ICLR2021*.

Chen, R. T.; Rubanova, Y.; Bettencourt, J.; and Duvenaud, D. K. 2018. Neural ordinary differential equations. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 6571–6583.

Christodoulou, P. 2019. Soft actor-critic for discrete action settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07207*.

Cox, D. R.; and Isham, V. 1980. *Point processes*, volume 12. CRC Press.

Dalal, G.; Gilboa, E.; and Mannor, S. 2016. Hierarchical decision making in electricity grid management. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2197–2206.

Daley, D. J.; and Vere-Jones, D. 2007. *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume II: general theory and structure*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Ding, R. 2020. *TRAFFIC CONGESTION MODELING WITH DEEP ATTENTION HAWKES PROCESS*. Ph.D. thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Du, J.; Futoma, J.; and Doshi-Velez, F. 2020. Model-based reinforcement learning for semi-markov decision processes with neural odes. *Neurips2020*.

Du, N.; Dai, H.; Trivedi, R.; Upadhyay, U.; Gomez-Rodriguez, M.; and Song, L. 2016. Recurrent marked temporal point processes: Embedding event history to vector. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 1555–1564.

Farajtabar, M.; Yang, J.; Ye, X.; Xu, H.; Trivedi, R.; Khalil, E.; Li, S.; Song, L.; and Zha, H. 2017. Fake news mitigation via point process based intervention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1097–1106. PMLR.

Fujimoto, S.; Hoof, H.; and Meger, D. 2018. Addressing function approximation error in actor-critic methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1587–1596. PMLR.

Gu, S.; Holly, E.; Lillicrap, T.; and Levine, S. 2017. Deep reinforcement learning for robotic manipulation with asynchronous off-policy updates. In *2017 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*, 3389–3396. IEEE.

Ha, D.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2018. World models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.10122*.

Haarnoja, T.; Zhou, A.; Abbeel, P.; and Levine, S. 2018. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1861–1870. PMLR.

Hafner, D.; Lillicrap, T.; Ba, J.; and Norouzi, M. 2019a. Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination. *ICLR2020*.

Hafner, D.; Lillicrap, T.; Fischer, I.; Villegas, R.; Ha, D.; Lee, H.; and Davidson, J. 2019b. Learning latent dynamics for planning from pixels. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2555–2565. PMLR.

Hawkes, A. G.; and Oakes, D. 1974. A cluster process representation of a self-exciting process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 493–503.

Heess, N.; Wayne, G.; Silver, D.; Lillicrap, T.; Tassa, Y.; and Erez, T. 2015. Learning continuous control policies by stochastic value gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.09142*.

Hochreiter, S.; and Schmidhuber, J. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8): 1735–1780.

Jang, E.; Gu, S.; and Poole, B. 2016. Categorical reparameterization with gumbel-softmax. *ICLR2017*.

Janner, M.; Fu, J.; Zhang, M.; and Levine, S. 2019. When to trust your model: Model-based policy optimization. *Neurips2019*.

Jia, J.; and Benson, A. R. 2019. Neural jump stochastic differential equations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 9847–9858.

Kingma, D. P.; and Welling, M. 2013. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*.

Lazic, N.; Boutilier, C.; Lu, T.; Wong, E.; Roy, B.; Ryu, M.; and Imwalle, G. 2018. Data center cooling using model-predictive control. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3814–3823.

Leskovec, J.; and Krevl, A. 2014. SNAP Datasets: Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection. http://snap.stanford.edu/data.

Lewis, P. W.; and Shedler, G. S. 1979. Simulation of nonhomogeneous Poisson processes by thinning. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 26(3): 403–413.

Mei, H.; and Eisner, J. M. 2017. The neural hawkes process: A neurally self-modulating multivariate point process. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30: 6754–6764.

Mnih, V.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; Silver, D.; Rusu, A. A.; Veness, J.; Bellemare, M. G.; Graves, A.; Riedmiller, M.; Fidjeland, A. K.; Ostrovski, G.; et al. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540): 529–533.

Munos, R. 2006. Policy gradient in continuous time. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(May): 771–791.

Ogata, Y. 1981. On Lewis' simulation method for point processes. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 27(1): 23–31.

Oh, J.; Guo, X.; Lee, H.; Lewis, R. L.; and Singh, S. 2015. Action-conditional video prediction using deep networks in atari games. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28: 2863–2871.

Parisotto, E.; Song, F.; Rae, J.; Pascanu, R.; Gulcehre, C.; Jayakumar, S.; Jaderberg, M.; Kaufman, R. L.; Clark, A.; Noury, S.; et al. 2020. Stabilizing transformers for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 7487–7498. PMLR.

Rasmussen, J. G. 2018. Lecture notes: Temporal point processes and the conditional intensity function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00221*.

Rizoiu, M.-A.; Lee, Y.; Mishra, S.; and Xie, L. 2017. A tutorial on hawkes processes for events in social media. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06401*.

Rubanova, Y.; Chen, R. T. Q.; and Duvenaud, D. K. 2019. Latent Ordinary Differential Equations for Irregularly-Sampled Time Series. In Wallach, H.; Larochelle, H.; Beygelzimer, A.; d'Alché-Buc, F.; Fox, E.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.

Shalev-Shwartz, S.; Shammah, S.; and Shashua, A. 2016. Safe, multi-agent, reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03295*.

Shaw, P.; Uszkoreit, J.; and Vaswani, A. 2018. Self-attention with relative position representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02155*.

Spasojevic, N.; Li, Z.; Rao, A.; and Bhattacharyya, P. 2015. When-to-post on social networks. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2127–2136.

Sutton, R. S.; Barto, A. G.; et al. 1998. Introduction to reinforcement learning.

Sutton, R. S.; Precup, D.; and Singh, S. 1999. Between MDPs and semi-MDPs: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial intelligence*.

Upadhyay, U.; De, A.; and Gomez-Rodriguez, M. 2018. Deep reinforcement learning of marked temporal point processes. *Neurips 2018*.

Van Hasselt, H.; Guez, A.; and Silver, D. 2016. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 30.

Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 5998–6008.

Wang, Y.; Theodorou, E.; Verma, A.; and Song, L. 2018. A stochastic differential equation framework for guiding online user activities in closed loop. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1077–1086. PMLR.

Xue, S.; Shi, X.; Hao, H.; Ma, L.; Zhang, J.; Wang, S.; and Wang, S. 2021. A Graph Regularized Point Process Model For Event Propagation Sequence. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, 1–7.

Xue, S.; Shi, X.; Zhang, Y. J.; and Mei, H. 2022. HYPRO: A Hybridly Normalized Probabilistic Model for Long-Horizon Prediction of Event Sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Yıldız, Ç.; Heinonen, M.; and Lähdesmäki, H. 2021. Continuous-Time Model-Based Reinforcement Learning. *ICML2021*.

Zarezade, A.; De, A.; Upadhyay, U.; Rabiee, H. R.; and Gomez-Rodriguez, M. 2017. Steering Social Activity: A Stochastic Optimal Control Point Of View. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18: 205–1.

Zhang, Q.; Lipani, A.; Kirnap, O.; and Yilmaz, E. 2020. Self-attentive hawkes process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 11183–11193. PMLR.

Zhao, Q.; Erdogdu, M. A.; He, H. Y.; Rajaraman, A.; and Leskovec, J. 2015. Seismic: A self-exciting point process model for predicting tweet popularity. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 1513–1522.

Zuo, S.; Jiang, H.; Li, Z.; Zhao, T.; and Zha, H. 2020. Transformer Hawkes Process. *ICML 2020*.

Organization of Appendix

- SDE reformulation and connection to World Model and Neural ODEs
- Parameterization of Neural Hawkes Process with Intervention
- Log-Likelihood of Neural Hawkes Process with Intervention
- Estimation of the Integration in the log-likelihood
- Algorithm details
- Transition,Value Function and Policy Learning
- Experiment Setting
- Settings of baselines and hyperparameters
- Computational resource
- Ablation Study
- Limitations and Future work

SDE reformulation and connection to World Model and Neural ODEs

To begin with, we link Hawkes process to the SDEs with jumps. Then we discuss why our NHPI-based work is different from the conventional model-based RL. First, notice that Hawkes process can be reformulated as an SDE with jumps (Wang et al. 2018), in which

$$d\lambda_k(t) = \zeta\big(\mu_k - \lambda_k(t)\big)dt + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} dN_j(t), \tag{7}$$

where $N_j(t)$ is the counting process for event j.

We follow the proof in (Wang et al. 2018) and present here for completeness. To begin with, we define the convolution operator $*$ as $f(t) * g(t) = \int_0^t f(t-s)g(s)ds$.

Recall that we have Hawkes model as follows

$$\lambda_k(t) = \mu_k + \sum_{h:t_h<t} \beta_{k_h,k} \exp(-\zeta(t-t_h)), k = 1, ..., K \tag{8}$$

We can rewrite the term $\sum_{h:t_h<t} \beta_{k_h,k} \exp(-\zeta(t-t_h))$, i.e., effects of the all past events on the current event with type k as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} \exp(-\zeta t) * dN_j(t). \tag{9}$$

Using the basic knowledge of the calculus, we know $d(f * g) = f(0)g + g * df$.

Take differential operator d at the both sides of (8) and plug in above result and note that μ_k does not depend on t, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\lambda_k(t) &= d\mu_k + d\big(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} \exp(-\zeta t) * dN_j(t)\big) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} dN_j(t) - \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{K} dN_j(t) * \beta_{jk}\zeta exp(-\zeta t)dt}_{(a)} \\ &\overset{(1)}{=} -\zeta\big(\lambda_k(t) - \mu_k\big)dt + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} dN_j(t), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where (1) holds because we use the fact that the term $(a) = \zeta(\lambda_k(t) - \mu_k)dt$ from (8) and (9).

In equation 7, $\zeta\big(\mu_k - \lambda_k(t)\big)dt$ is a drift term. $-\lambda_k(t)dt$ is a force in the negative direction, which stabilizes the process and pushes it to the base intensity μ_k. The endogenous jump term is $\sum_{j,k} \beta_{jk} dN_j(t)$ which captures the influence of abrupt events. Recall that $N_j(t)$ is the counting process of event of type j. $dN_j(t) = 1$ when the event of type j happens[2] while $dN_j(t) = 0$

[2]Under the assumption that two events do not happen simultaneously, which is a common assumption in temporal point process.

at other times. Hence this term reflects how the events that occurred before t affect event of type k in the future. One direct way to incorporate the influence of action is

$$d\lambda_k(t) = a_k(t)dt + \zeta\big(\mu_k - \lambda_k(t)\big)dt + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_{jk} dN_j(t) \tag{11}$$

If we replace the endogenous *jump* terms by some *continuous* terms and then approximate μ_k, β_{jk}, ζ by neural networks such as RNN or its variants with input event streams, Equation (11) reduces to the neural ODE (Chen et al. 2018; Du, Futoma, and Doshi-Velez 2020; Yıldız, Heinonen, and Lähdesmäki 2021). Therefore both ODEs approaches and our method allow the environment to be discontinuously updated by exogenous actions (of RL agents); our formulation allows the environment dynamics to have endogenous jumps, which can not be handled by ODEs. By solving this ODE with *even* time interval, we would get the transition function with a recurrent form $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t+1) = f(\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\tau), \mathbf{a}(\tau)\}_{\tau=1\ldots t})$, where the bold $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a vector and the k-th element of it is λ_k. In the partially observable case, we may get a transition function on hidden vector h of RNN. Such recurrent transition model can be thought of as the hidden space of the world model(Ha and Schmidhuber 2018). Its variants may include (Hafner et al. 2019a) when combining with VAE (if the inputs are images) and many other conventional wisdom of model-based RL can apply to this model. However, there are several downsides if we follow this approach: 1) World model neglects the nature of the dynamics in the discrete event stream, i.e., the jump term that captures the abrupt events in the SDEs. Besides it can not solve the problem with irregular time intervals, since its dynamic model (e.g., RNN) discretizes time evenly. 2) The variants of Neural ODE, such as latent ODE (Rubanova, Chen, and Duvenaud 2019) and Jump SDE (Jia and Benson 2019) have the capabilities of modeling discrete event streams. However, if we directly apply the Neural ODE approach, we need expensive numerical solvers with additional issues of convergence stability and data-efficiency (Chen, Amos, and Nickel 2020).

Parameterization of Neural Hawkes Process with Intervention

As shown in the Figure 2, we encode the event types, timestamps and actions into dense embedding. $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times K}$ is an embedding matrix for the event types, where the k-th column is an M-dimensional embedding for event type k. Let $\mathbf{k}_i$ be the onehot encoding of the event with type k_i, then the embedding of event at timestamp t_i is $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{k}_i$.

We then encode the timestamps following the work in (Zuo et al. 2020) to cope with the challenge of the irregular time interval . *Timestamp encoding* is

$$[\mathbf{z}(t_i)]_m = \begin{cases} cos(\omega_m t_i + \omega_m i) & \text{m is even} \\ sin(\omega_m t_i + \omega_m i) & \text{m is odd,} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

where trigonometric functions are used to define a temporal encoding for timestamps t_i, ω_m is a predefined frequency, and the vector $\mathbf{z}(t_i) \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Other temporal encoding methods can also be applied, such as the relative position representation model (Shaw, Uszkoreit, and Vaswani 2018). The action a_i pass an MLP to get an N-dimensional *action embedding* $\mathbf{a}_e(t_i)$.

Embedding of the event sequence $Es = \{(t_i, k_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^{L}$ is then specified by

$$\mathbf{X} = [(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{Z})^T, \mathbf{A}^T],$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, ..., \mathbf{k}_L] \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times L}$ is the collection of event type embedding, $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}(t_1), \mathbf{z}(t_2)..., \mathbf{z}(t_L)] \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times L}$ is the collection of timestamp encoding, while $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a_e}(t_1), \mathbf{a_e}(t_2)..., \mathbf{a_e}(t_L)] \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times L}$ is the collection of action embedding. Then the embedding $\mathbf{X}$ passes through a self-attention module.

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = softmax(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{M_K}})\mathbf{V}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^Q, \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^K, \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W}^V$ are the query, key and value matri, respectively . $\mathbf{W}^Q, \mathbf{W}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{(M+N)\times M_K}$, $\mathbf{W}^V \in \mathbb{R}^{(M+N)\times M_V}$ are learned weight matrix. To avoid observing the furture events, the attention is equipped with masks, specifically when computing the attention $\mathbf{S}(j,:)$, we mask all the future positions.

Then we feed the self-attention $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ into a feed-forward neural network to generate the hidden representation $\mathbf{H}$:

$$\mathbf{H} = Relu(\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{W}_1 + \mathbf{b}_1)\mathbf{W}_2 + \mathbf{b}_2.$$

The hidden representation at time step t_i is the i-th column of $\mathbf{H}$, i.e., $\mathbf{h}(t_i) = \mathbf{H}(i,:)$.

Log-Likelihood of Neural Hawkes Process with Intervention

In this section, we provide the log likelihood for the neural Hawkes process with intervention. The proof mainly follows the conditional intensity function approach in (Rasmussen 2018).

We start with the unmarked case, i.e., there is just one type event. Then we generalize to the case with K types (marked case). Let $f(t_{n+1}|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})$ be the conditional density function of the time of the next event time t_{n+1} given the history

$\{(t_1, a_1), ..., (t_n, a_n)\}$ with $t_n < t$. Here we abuse the notation history $\mathcal{H}_{t_n}$ a little here to include the actions. Note that here we only want to calculate the conditional probability of event given the action in the sequence. Let $F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})$ be the corresponding cumulative distribution function.

Our first claim is that

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{f(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}. \tag{14}$$

We prove this claim in the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})dt}{1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} =& \frac{\mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt]|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{\mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t)|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} \\
=& \frac{\mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt], t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t)|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{\mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t)|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} \\
=& \mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \in [t, t + dt]|t_{n+1} \notin (t_n, t), \mathcal{H}_{t_n}) \\
=& \mathbb{P}(t_{n+1} \in [t + dt]|\mathcal{H}_{t-}) \\
=& \mathbb{E}[N([t, t + dt])|\mathcal{H}_{t-}] \\
=& \lambda(t)dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{t-}$ is the knowledge of time of all events up to but not including time t, and $N([t, t + dt])$ denotes the number of points falling in an interval $[t, t + dt]$.

Using (14), we have

$$\lambda(t) = \frac{\frac{d}{dt}F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} = -\frac{d}{dt}\log(1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})). \tag{16}$$

Therefore

$$\int_{t_n}^{t} \lambda(s)ds = -(\log(1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}))) + \log(1 - F(t_n|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})) = -\log(1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})), \tag{17}$$

where we use the fact that $F(t_n|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}) = 0$.

Using (17), we obtain

$$1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}) = \exp(-\int_{t_n}^{t} \lambda(s)ds) \tag{18}$$

and

$$f(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}) = \lambda(t)\exp(-\int_{t_n}^{t} \lambda(s)ds). \tag{19}$$

For the marked case with total K types, we can specify the distribution of the event k associated with the point t by its conditional density function $f^*(k|t) = f(k|t, \mathcal{H}_{t-})$, which specifies the distribution of the event k given t and the history $\mathcal{H}_{t-}$ including the information of timestamp, action and event type. Note that now the history also includes event type. Remark that $f^*(k|t) = f(k|t, \mathcal{H}_{t_n})$ if t_n is the last point before t, since the additional condition that the next point is located at t means that the history $\mathcal{H}_{t-}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{t_n}$ contain the same information (Recall that the history $\mathcal{H}_{t-}$ does not include time t, while H_{t_n} includes timestamp t_n.)

The conditional intensity function for the marked case is thus

$$\lambda_k(t) = \lambda(t)f^*(k|t),$$

where $\lambda(t)$ is called ground intensity and is exactly the conditional intensity function for the unmarked case.

Using the exactly same argument in (15), we have

$$\lambda_k(t) = \frac{f(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})f^*(k|t)}{1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} = \frac{f(t, k|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})}{1 - F(t|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})} \tag{20}$$

The likelihood function is the joint densithy function of all the points $\{(t_1, k_1), ..., (t_n, k_n)\}, t_n < T$, given the action $\{a_1, ..., a_n\}$.

$$L = f(t_1|\mathcal{H}_{t_0})f(k_1|t_1, \mathcal{H}_{t_0}) \cdots f(t_n|\mathcal{H}_{t_{n-1}})f(k_n|t_n, \mathcal{H}_{t_{n-1}})(1 - F(T|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}))$$

where the term $(1 - F(T|\mathcal{H}_{t_n}))$ accounts for the fact that t_{n+1} happends after T.

$$
\begin{aligned}
L =& \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} f(t_i|\mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) \Big) \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) \Big) (1 - F(T|\mathcal{H}_{t_n})) \\
\overset{(1)}{=} & \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(t_i) \exp(-\int_{t_i-1}^{t_i} \lambda(s)ds) \Big) \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) \Big) \exp\big(-\int_{t_n}^{T} \lambda(s)ds \big) \\
=& \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(t_i) \Big) \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) \Big) \exp\big(-\int_{0}^{T} \lambda(s)ds \big) \\
=& \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(t_i) f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) \Big) \exp\big(-\int_{0}^{T} \lambda(s)ds \big) \\
=& \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_k(t_i) \Big) \exp\big(-\int_{0}^{T} \lambda(s)ds \big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

where (1) holds using (18) and (19), the last equality holds because $f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_{i-1}}) = f(k_i|t_i, \mathcal{H}_{t_i-})$.

Estimation of the Integration

The only difficulty to estimate the gradient ofin the likelihood of NHPI is the integration term $\int_0^T \lambda(t)dt$. We can sample $t \sim Unif(0, T)$. The term $T\lambda(t)$ is the unbiased estimation since its expectation is $\int_0^T \lambda(t)dt$. In practice, we may average over several samples to reduce the variance.

Algorithm details

We present the pseudo-code in Algorithm 1

Algorithm 1: SEDRL

Input: Replay buffer $\mathcal{D}$, replay buffer $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$ to store the event trajectory , policy π_θ, value function V_ϕ, dynamic model g, reward model κ

Train NHPI: Using initial policy to collect M trajectories of event streams $\{\{(t_i^m, k_i^m, a_i^m)\}_{i=1}^{L}\}_{m=1}^{M}$ and store them in $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$. Maximize the likelihood of NHPI.

for each step **do**

1. Interact with environment

Obtain state $s(t_i)$ using NHPI and sample the action $a(t_i)$ from the stochastic policy $\pi_\theta(s(t_i))$. Impose the action on the environment and obtain τ_i,$r(t_i)$, $s(t_{i+1})$. Append tuple $(s(t_i), a(t_i), \tau_i, r(t_i), s(t_{i+1}))$ into replay buffer $\mathcal{D}$.

2. Learn transition and reward model

Sample data from $\mathcal{D}$, update neural network g and κ using (2), (3).

3. Value function learning: Update the value function with (4). There are two options to estimate the target function $\hat{V}$ (see details in):

option 1: sample $s(t_i)$ from $\mathcal{D}$ and use g and NIPH to generate $s(t_{i+1})$ and τ_i (thinning algorithm).

option 2: sample $s(t_i)$ from $\mathcal{D}$. Update Q and V function using (27),(26).

4. Policy improvement Update policy with (6) (see details in)

Update NHPI:

if a trajectory finishes **then**

Append the new event trajectory to $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$. Sample trajectory in $\mathcal{D}_{tr}$ and maximize the likelihood of NHPI.

end if

end for

Transition,Value Function and Policy Learning in Algorithm 1

In this section, we present the detail of the learning of transition, value function from the replay buffer and policy learning from the imagination, which are deferred from the section due to the limitation of the space.

To begin with, we briefly introduce the thinning algorithm (Ogata 1981), which can simulate the time interval and event given the intensity λ_k.

Thinning algorithm:

Thinning algorithm is a common algorithm to simulate the temporal point process including Hawkes process (Ogata 1981; Mei and Eisner 2017). Here we just give a sketch and the readers just need to remember that we can use it to sample the next timestamp t_{i+1} given we are at timestamp t_i. Please refer to (Rizoiu et al. 2017) for details. Generally speaking, it simulates the inter-arrival time τ_i. For instance, the inter-arrival times in a homogeneous Poisson process with intensity λ follow an exponential distribution. Therefore we can use inverse transform sampling technique. Specifically, we can sample u from a uniform distribution $U(0,1)$, then construct inter-arrival time $\tau = \frac{-lnu}{\lambda}$. The event type is determined by the conditional probability λ_i/λ. For non-homogeneous Poisson process, e.g. Hawkes process, it needs an additional rejected sampling step. Please refer to section 1.4 in (Rizoiu et al. 2017) for details.

Transition learning:

Recall that we already have the state s_t through the NHPI model. When learning the transition and reward model, i.e., minimizing the error (2) and (3), we fixed the parameters of the network of NHPI. It says the gradient of g and κ does not back propagate the network of NHPI.

Value function learning:

We need the value function to do the policy improvement in the stochastic value gradient step. Recall that Bellman equation in the SMDPs is

$$V(s) = \sum_{s',a} \pi(a|s)P(s'|a,s)[\int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau} r(\tau) d\tau dF(t|s,a,s') + \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} V(s') dF(t|s,a,s')]. \tag{22}$$

We can do the sampling $s' \sim P(\cdot|a,s)$, $a \sim \pi(\cdot|s)$ in the RHS and obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau} r(\tau) d\tau dF(t|s,a,s') + \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t} V(s') dF(t|s,a,s'). \tag{23}$$

The next step is to do the sampling over the time interval. In particular, we sample t according to $dF(t|s,a,s')$. Note that (23) is in the integration form $\int_0^\infty (\cdot) dF(t|s,a,s)$ w.r.t $dF(t|s,a,s')$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{t\sim dF(\cdot|s,a,s')}(\cdot)$. Therefore we can get a sample $t \sim dF(\cdot|s,a,s')$, which is

$$\int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau} r(\tau) d\tau + e^{-\rho t} V(s'). \tag{24}$$

In general, $\int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau} r(\tau)$ is not easy to estimated for which we assume $r(\tau) = r(0)$, i.e., reward does not change over time between the transition s to s'. In other words, we assume $r(t) = r(t_i)$ for $t_i \le t < t_{i+1}$. In practice, this approximation works well.

Therefore the final sampled version for the Bellman equation is

$$\hat{V}(s) := \frac{1 - e^{-\rho t}}{\rho} r(0) + e^{-\rho t} V(s').$$

We replace s by $s(t_i)$ and s' by $s(t_{i+1})$. Let $\tau_i = t_{i+1} - t_i$, we have

$$\hat{V}(s(t_i)) := \frac{1 - e^{-\rho\tau_i}}{\rho} r(t_i) + e^{-\rho\tau_i} V(s(t_{i+1})). \tag{25}$$

Note that, in our method, we need a value function V_ϕ of *current* policy π_θ. There are generally two options to estimate that.

The *first* one is to fully use the imaginary data generated from the NHPI, transition model and reward model. In particular, given a state $s(t_i)$(that can be obtained from NHPI and event trajectory in D_{tr}), we sample an action from current policy $\pi_\theta(s(t_i))$ and obtain next state $s(t_{i+1})$ using g. Reward $r(t_i)$ can be obtained from learned reward model. Note that using NHPI and thinning algorithm, we can simulate next timestamp t_{i+1}. Therefore we have all element needed in (25) and then minimize the error $\|V_\phi(s(t_i)) - \hat{V}_\phi(s(t_i))\|_2^2$, where $s(t_i)$ is obtain from NHPI and trajectory in replay buffer D_{tr}.


The *second* one is to use real data (we use this approach in our implementation). In this approach, we need to introduce Q function, where Q is approximated by a neural network Q_ψ. In particular, we minimize error of V function

$$\mathbb{E}_{s(t_i)\sim D}[V_\phi(s(t_i)) - \mathbb{E}_{a\sim\pi_\theta} Q_\psi(s(t_i), a)]^2. \tag{26}$$

If the action space is discrete, we can directly calculate $\mathbb{E}_{a\sim\pi_\theta} Q_\psi(s(t_i), a)$ and get the value function V.

The error of Q function is

$$\mathbb{E}_{(s(t_i),a(t_i),r(t_i),\tau_i,s(t_{i+1}))\sim D}[Q_\psi(s(t_i), a(t_i)) - (\frac{1 - e^{-\rho\tau_i}}{\rho} r(t_i) + e^{-\rho\tau_i} V_\phi(s(t_{i+1})))]^2, \tag{27}$$



(a) SI setting

(b) USI setting

Figure 4: The left panel shows the SI setting. The right panel show the USI setting.

as that in (Haarnoja et al. 2018), where $\tau_i = t_{i+1} - t_i$ can be calculated from the real data in replay buffer D. *Remark* that when we store $s(t_i)$ into the replay buffer, we also store its corresponding timestamp t_i. Then this learned V_ϕ of current policy π is used in the following policy learning.

In practice, we use the second approach and find its performance is better. It maybe because that the learned model has bias and we'd better use the real data.

Policy learning:

Recall we have already obtained the NHPI model and transition model g.

In particular, we replace the transition model $P(s'|a, s)$ by the learned transition model $g(s, a, \epsilon(s))$. Since we do the reparameterization, the randomness comes from the ϵ (Kingma and Welling 2013). Thus, the previous expectation in the Bellman equation $\mathbb{E}_{s'}(\cdot)$ (i.e., $\sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a)(\cdot)$) is now $\mathbb{E}_\epsilon(\cdot)$. We can sample over ϵ as that in (Kingma and Welling 2013). For the reward, we do similar things. We also replace the action by the policy, value function by learned one in above section. Thus agent actually do the planning in the imaginary data set.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon,\xi}[\int_0^\infty \int_0^t e^{-\rho\tau}\kappa\big(s(\tau), \pi_\theta(s(\tau)), \xi(s(\tau))\big)d\tau dF(t|s, a, s') + \int_0^\infty e^{-\rho t}V_\phi\Big(g\big(s(t), \pi_\theta(s(t)), \epsilon(s(t))\big)\Big)dF(t|s, a, s')]. \tag{28}$$

There are several ways to do the sampling over the *time interval*, i.e., the sampling according to $dF(t|s, a, s')$. Here we present what we did in the experiment. In particular, we use the dynamic model(NHPI) and the current policy to simulate the next time stamp t_{i+1} with thinning algorithm. Then we calculate the time interval τ_i (Note it may not be same with τ_i in the replay buffer, since the action sampled from the policy is not the same with occurred one). Following the similar derivation in the value function learning, one step rollout of the Bellman equation is

$$V_{\phi,\theta}(s(t_i)) := (1 - e^{-\rho\tau_i})\kappa\big(s(t_i), \pi_\theta(s(t_i)), \xi(s(t_i))\big)/\rho + e^{-\rho\tau_i}V_\phi\Big(g\big(s(t_i), \pi_\theta(s(t_i)), \epsilon(s(t_i))\big)\Big).$$

In practice, we randomly sample a chunk of $s(t_i)$ from the hidden states of NHPI with the input trajectory from the replay buffer D_{tr} or directly randomly sample $s(t_i)$ from D. For instance, in the former case, i can be from l to $l + H$, where l is a random index. We update policy using gradient ascent of above equation.

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha\mathbb{E}_{s\sim D_{tr}}\frac{\partial V_{\phi,\theta}(s)}{\partial\theta}$$

We can also rollout the Bellman equation with several steps as Dreamer rather than one step. However, it may introduce more model bias and we leave it as future work.

Experiment Setting

In this section, we present the details of the experiment deferred from the main text. Event type number K, action num, and maximum simulation length is introduced in the Table 1. The event with type k is encoded as a one-hot vector where k-th entry is one. Since $A \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, the action is encoded in the same way. The zero vector in actions means that we choose to do nothing.

Synthetic experiment setting

Figure 4 (a) demonstrates the SI setting, where the agent can apply the action at evenly discretized intervals regardless when the event happens. In the USI setting (b), the agent can only apply the action after events' occurrence.

In the experiment with K=8 event types, we only seek to control the intensity of the first four event types, i.e., fake news. λ_{target} for these four event types are 0.3,0.3,0.3,0.3, respectively. The last four event types correspond to actions, i.e., valid

news in our experiment. The reward is defined in the main text $r_t = -\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{target} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t\|^2 - 0.1 * \text{cost}(a_t)$. Although we do not care the intensity of these action events, they can lead to cost, since we have a cost of 1 once we apply a action.

In the experiment with 16 events, we also have similar settings and we want to control the intensity of the first eight event types. Their target intensity are $0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1$, respectively.

Real world application

In the problems of smart broadcasting and improving the engagement, to build simulators(the feedback model of followers or users), we modify the state-of-the-art neural Hawkes process model-THP (Zuo et al. 2020) to include the exogenous intervention input following the work in (Ding 2020). In particular, we follow the open source code from the authors to construct our simulator but with an additional input of the exogenous action [3]. For each simulation, we reset the environment by randomly sample one trajectory from the dataset, and use first 10 events in the trajectory as the initial state for the generator. Then, we apply the action to the simulator. The simulator receives the influence of the action and then uses the thinning algorithm (Lewis and Shedler 1979; Mei and Eisner 2017) to sample the next event and timestamps. The parameters of constructing the simulation has been introduced in the Table 1.

In the smart broadcasting, we use the Retweet dataset (Zhao et al. 2015) to fit a model of follower. The Retweet dataset records the user retweet behaviors using *Twitter*, which is a social application used for information posting and sharing. This dataset contains totally 24000 retweet sequences with K=3 event types. These event types correspond to observation event, and the rewards for them are -1,-0.2, -0.1, respectively. It says that the occurrence of type 1 will cause a reward of -1, and occurrence of type 2 will incur a reward of -0.2, while occurrence of type 3 would result in a reward of -0.1. This reward pattern means that the users may want to steer the activity with type 3 of her followers. We also use these three events as the action events, and the cost of each action event is -0.05.

In the problem of improving the engagement, we use the dataset of the Stack-Overflow to fit a feedback model of user. The whole dataset records the user awarding information along the two years time horizon with totally 6633 sequences. There are totally K=22 event type. The first eleven type consists of our observation . The corresponding rewards of this event are (-1.5, -1.2, -1.1, -1.2, -1.4, -1.6, -1.7, -1.8 , -0.1, -0.1, -0.1) respectively. The other eleven event are our action event (e.g., good answer). The cost of each action event is -0.05.

Environment Name	event number K	Action number	Maximum time horizon
8-event SI setting	8	4	100
8-event USI setting	8	4	100
16-event SI setting	16	8	100
16-event USI setting	16	8	100
Smart broadcasting	3	3	100
Improving engagements	22	11	100

Table 1: Event number K, action number , maximum time horizon for each simulation environment implemented in the simulation experiment.

Settings of baselines and hyperparameters

The inputs of baselines are also the event sequence $\{(t_j, k_j, a_j)\}_{j=1,..,L}$. The event with type k is encoded as a one hot vector where the k-th entry is one.. Since $A \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, the action is encoded in the same way. The zero vector (in actions) means that we choose to do nothing. The timestamp is encoded as (12), which is then fed into transformer as that in our NHPI model. Notice that these baselines (except Tpprl) treat the timestamp as a usual feature, and therefore they are formulated as MDP problem. In tpprl, the agent is allowed to impose intervention at any time, where the intervention time is characterized by the intensity function which is one element of the action. To fit our experimental setting, we fix the intervention time at t_i in tpprl and sample the event type from the softmax function.

In the following, we introduce the hyperparameter setting of our proposed model in different simulation and the maximum interaction with the environment is 150K for all experiments.

The hyperparameter is determined by grid searching for both our algorithms and baselines. The number of hidden units is selected from the set $\{64, 128, 256\}$, the learning rate is picked from the set $\{1e-4, 3e-4, 1e-3\}$ and attention dimension is selected from $\{16, 32, 64\}$. The discount rate ρ is selected from $\{0.01, 0.1\}$. Notice we can transfer this value into the usual discount factor γ in RL by $\gamma = e^{-\rho}$. The hyperparameter used in our algorithm is listed in Table 2. For the baselines with Transformer structure,they the same parameters with those of the Transformer in our algorithm, i.e., attention layer, head number and attention dimension. For the baseline with LSTM structure, one layer with hidden size 64 is used.

[3] https://github.com/SimiaoZuo/Transformer-Hawkes-Process

	8 SI	8 USI	16 SI	16 USI	Stack-Overflow	Retweet
Maximum step (interactions with environment)	150k					
Policy Learning Rate	0.0001					
Value Learning Rate	0.0001		0.0003		0.001	
Model Learning Rate	0.0001				0.001	
Value and Policy 2 layer MLP	(128,64)		(256,128)		(256,256)	
Transition 2 layer MLP (output μ, σ)	(128,(64,64))		(256,(128,128))		(256, (128,128))	
Reward 2 layer MLP (output μ, σ)	(128,1)		(256,1)		(256, 1)	
Attention Head	1		2		2	
Attention Layer	2					
Attention Dimension M_K, M_V	16		32		64	
ρ (Discount Rate)	0.01 ($e^{-0.01} \approx 0.99$)				0.1 ($e^{-0.1} \approx 0.905$)	
Embedding dimension M	64					
w_m	$\frac{1}{10000^{(m-1)/M}}$					

Table 2: The hyper-parameter used in our proposed method for each simulation environment. The number in policy, value, and model network architecture indicate the size of hidden units in each layer of MLP structure. The ReLu activation function is implemented in all architectures.

Computational resource


We train our algorithm and all baselines with two Tesla V100 GPUs.

Ablation Study

In this ablation study, we would like to answer two questions: 1. what is the performance of the baseline if we adapt them into SMDPs version. 2. What is the performance of traditional RL algorithm with MLP structure under event-driven setting?

First, we adapt SAC algorithm into it SMDPs counterpart and test it in the 8 and 16 USI setting, for which we replace the target function of Q in SAC by $\frac{1-e^{-\rho\tau_i}}{\rho} r(t_i) + e^{-\rho\tau_i} Q(s_{i+1}, a_{i+1})$, where τ_i is the time interval. The test result is shown in Figure 5(a,b) where we can see its SMDP version can improve the performance over vanilla version. Especially when the length of time interval is unequal in the USI setting simulation. However, we can still observe our proposed method having much better performance, which is contributed by other perspectives such as hidden dynamics from our algorithm.

Then we test the performance of SAC algorithm with usual multilayer perceptron structure (2-layer MLP with hidden size



(a) SMDPs ablation (a) (b) SMDPs ablation (b) (c) MLP ablation

Figure 5: The test results of our ablation study. The x-axis is the training step and y-axis is the cumulative reward. Ten trials are tested in each simulation using various random seeds and initialized parameters. The average return is reported as the solid line and the standard deviation is reported as shaded region.

of (256,128)) under event-driven setting. The test is performed in 16-event USI simulation and the test result is shown in the Figure 5 c. We can observe that the model is barely working under this setting, which is well-expected, since the environment is partially observable.

Limitation and Future Work

One possible limitation of our work is that we use the dynamic model to generate imaginary data to train the agent, which may cause the model bias in RL. In the future work, we would combine model-based and model-free method together to mitigate such issue