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ABSTRACT

Recent development of Deep Reinforcement Learning has demonstrated superior performance of neural networks in solving challenging problems with large or even continuous state spaces. One specific approach is to deploy neural networks to approximate value functions by minimising the Mean Squared Bellman Error function. Despite great successes of Deep Reinforcement Learning, development of reliable and efficient numerical algorithms to minimise the Bellman Error is still of great scientific interest and practical demand. Such a challenge is partially due to the underlying optimisation problem being highly non-convex or using incomplete gradient information as done in Semi-Gradient algorithms. In this work, we analyse the Mean Squared Bellman Error from a smooth optimisation perspective combined with a Residual Gradient formulation.

Our contribution is two-fold. First, we analyse critical points of the error function and provide technical insights on optimisation and design choices for neural networks. When the existence of global minima is assumed and the objective fulfils certain conditions, we can eliminate suboptimal local minima when using over-parametrised neural networks. We construct an efficient Approximate Newton’s algorithm based on our analysis and confirm theoretical properties of this algorithm such as being locally quadratically convergent to a global minimum numerically.

Second, we demonstrate feasibility and generalisation capabilities of the proposed algorithm empirically using continuous control problems and provide a numerical verification of our critical point analysis. We outline the difficulties of combining Semi-Gradients with Hessian information. To benefit from an approximate Newton’s algorithm complete derivatives of the Mean Squared Bellman error must be considered during training.
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1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL), or more general Dynamic Programming (DP), is a general purpose framework to solve sequential decision making or optimal control problems. It uses Value Function Approximation (VFA) as an important and effective instrument to handle large or even continuous state spaces [Bertsekas, 2012, Sutton and Barto, 2020]. Such VFA methods can be categorised in two groups, namely linear and non-linear. Various efficient Linear Value Function Approximation (LVFA) algorithms have been developed and analysed in the field, e.g. [Nedić and Bertsekas, 2003, Bertsekas et al., 2004, Parr et al., 2008, Geist and Pietquin, 2013]. Despite their significant simplicity and convergence stability, the performance of LVFA methods depends heavily on construction and selection of linear features, which is a time consuming and hardly scalable process [Parr et al., 2007, Böhmer et al., 2013]. Therefore, recent research efforts have focused more on Non-Linear Value Function Approximation (NL-VFA) methods.
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As a popular non-linear mechanism, kernel tricks have been successfully adopted to VFA, and demonstrated their convincing performance in various applications [Xu et al., 2007, Taylor and Parr, 2009, Bhat et al., 2012]. Unfortunately, due to the nature of kernel learning, these algorithms can easily suffer from a high computational burden due to the required number of samples. Furthermore, kernel-based VFA algorithms can also have serious problems with over-fitting. As an alternative, Neural Networks (NN) have been another common and powerful approach to approximate value functions [Lin, 1993, Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1996]. Impressively so, the successes of NNs in solving challenging problems in pattern recognition, computer vision, and speech recognition and game playing [LeCun et al., 2015, Yu and Deng, 2015, Mnih et al., 2015, Silver et al., 2017] have further triggered increasing efforts in applying NNs to VFA [van Hasselt et al., 2016]. More specifically, NN-based Value Function Approximation (NN-VFA) approaches have demonstrated their superior performance in many challenging domains, e.g. Atari games [Mnih et al., 2015] or the game Go [Silver et al., 2016, 2017]. Despite these advances, development of more efficient NN-VFA based algorithms is still of great demand for even more challenging applications. So far, these impressive successes are generally only possible, if a plethora of training samples is available.

Aside from some early work in [Baird III, 1995], called Residual Gradient (RG) algorithms, omitting gradients of the TD-target has been a common practice, see e.g. [Riedmiller, 2005], and is recently referred to as Semi-Gradient (SG) algorithms [Sutton and Barto, 2020]. Reasons for choosing Semi-Gradients over Residual Gradients include inferior learning speed [Baird III, 1995], limitation with non-Markovian feature space [Sutton et al., 2008] and non-differentiable operators, e.g. the max-operator involved in Q-learning. In favour of Residual Gradients stand convergence guarantees and the applicability of “classic” gradient based optimization techniques.

In this work, we study the problem of minimising the Mean Squared Bellman Error (MSBE) with NN-VFA from the global analysis perspective. More specifically, we work in the framework of geometric optimisation [Absil et al., 2008]. We conduct a concise critical point analysis of the MSBE including its Hessian and also derive a proper approximation for it. We obtain insights into the learning process and can prevent the existence of saddle points or undesired local minima by requiring over-parametrisation of the NN-VFA and by ensuring certain properties of the optimisation objective. Furthermore, our analysis leads naturally to an efficient and effective Approximate Newton’s (AN) algorithm. We investigate for a continuous state space setting whether or not ignoring the dependency of derivatives on the network parameters in the TD-target has a significant impact, especially in the context of second-order optimisation. We outline how to overcome the convergence speed issues of Residual Gradients and show that gradients and higher order derivatives of the TD-target provide critical information about the optimisation problem. They are essential for implementing efficient optimisation algorithms and result in solutions with higher quality. Finally, we conduct several experiments to confirm the results of our critical point analysis numerically and also investigate generalisation capabilities of NN-VFA methods empirically.

The rest of our paper is arranged as follows. In the next section, we address the existing work regarding the construction and analysis of algorithms. In Section 3, we give a brief introduction to RL with VFA and provide the necessary notational conventions around NNs since a concise notation is required for our analysis in later sections. We conduct a critical point analysis of the MSBE when using NN-VFA in Section 4 and present our results separately for discrete and continuous state spaces in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. Section 5 is dedicated to our proposed Approximate Newton’s Residual Gradient algorithm and addresses details relevant for implementation. In Section 6, we evaluate performance and generalisation capabilities of the proposed method in several experiments. Finally, a conclusion is given in Section 7.

2 Related Work

Recent attempts towards developing efficient NN-VFA methods follow the approach of extending the well-studied LVFA algorithms. These are a general family of gradient-based temporal difference algorithms, which have been proposed to optimise either the Mean Squared Bellman Error [Baird III, 1995, Baird III and Moore, 1999] or the Mean Squared Projected Bellman Error [Sutton et al., 2008, 2009]. The work in [Maei et al., 2009] adapts the results of developing the so-called Gradient Temporal Difference (GTD) algorithms to a non-linear smooth VFA manifold setting. The proposed approach requires projections onto the smooth manifold, which is practically infeasible because the geometry of VFA manifolds is in general not available. Similarly, the approach developed in [Silver, 2013] projects estimates of the value function directly onto the vector subspace spanned by the parameter matrices of the NNs. Unfortunately, no further analysis or numerical development exists besides the original work.

Such a difficulty in studying and developing NN-VFA methods is partially due to incomplete theoretical understanding of the optimisation of NNs. The main challenge of the underlying optimisation problem is the strong non-convexity. Although there are several efforts towards characterising the optimality of NN-training, e.g. [Kawaguchi, 2016, Nguyen and Hein, 2017, Haefele and Vidal, 2017, Yun et al., 2018], a complete answer to the question is still quite demanding.
The work in [Shen, 2018b,a, Shen and Gottwald, 2019] addresses training of NNs using theory of differential topology and smooth optimisation. It has highlighted the importance of over-parametrisation to ensure proper convergence to a solution. We aim at introducing those techniques to the RL domain.

Lately, there has been more interest in Residual Gradient algorithms. As described in [Baird III, 1995], Residual Gradient algorithms possess convergence guarantees since they use a complete gradient of a well-defined performance objective. Thus, they are eligible for a critical point analysis. Unfortunately, these guarantees are coupled to solving the Double Sampling issue, i.e., the requirement of having for any state several possible successors to capture stochastic transitions. In a recent work [Saleh and Jiang, 2019], the authors explore the application of deterministic Residual Gradient algorithms to bypass the Double Sampling issue when using the Optimal Bellman Operator. Furthermore, they characterise empirically the impact of stepwise increased noise in environments and can motivate reviving Residual Gradient algorithms. In our work, we investigate Residual Gradient algorithms in deterministic problems for Policy Evaluation instead of aiming directly at the optimal value function. This allows us to use a Policy Iteration scheme.

We consider the work [Cai et al., 2019] also as strongly related to ours, as the authors pursue a similar idea, namely the importance of over-parametrisation. However, they address Semi-Gradient algorithms and thus work in a different setting. The authors show that the usage of NNs for NL-VFA with a redundant amount of adjustable parameters is mandatory for achieving good performance. They establish an implicit local linearisation and enable reliable convergence to a global optimum of the Mean Squared Projected Bellman Error. In [Brandfonbrener and Bruna, 2020], reliable convergence under over-parametrisation is also confirmed when treating Semi-Gradient TD-Learning as ordinary differential equation and investigating stationary points of the vector field. The Jacobian of over-parametrisated networks when evaluated for all discrete states can have full rank, which is required for their theoretical investigation. Using an empirical approach in [Fu et al., 2019], the authors arrive at the conclusion that larger NL-VFA architectures result in smaller errors and boost convergence. In [Liu et al., 2019], the role of over-parametrisation is classified as an important ingredient for a variant of Proximal Policy Optimisation [Schulman et al., 2017] to converge to an optimum. In our work, we can confirm the role of over-parametrisation when using Residual Gradient algorithms and provide further insights from the global analysis perspective.

3 Notation and Technical Preliminaries

This section contains various definitions and provides a concise foundation for Section 4. First, we outline the Reinforcement Learning setting in general. Second, we introduce the usage of function approximation architectures and formulate the optimisation problem we want to investigate. Lastly, we define the function class and its components used for the NL-VFA method we are going to analyse.

3.1 Reinforcement Learning

As common approach, we model the decision making as a Markov Decision Process (MDP) by defining the tuple \((S, A, P, r, \gamma)\). We consider as state space \(S\) both finite countable sets of \(K\) discrete elements \(S = \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}\) as well as bounded subsets of finite dimensional Euclidean vector spaces \(S \subset \mathbb{R}^K\). Depending on the state space we denote with slight abuse of notation by \(K := |S|\) either the cardinality of the finite set or by \(K := \dim(S)\) the dimension of the subspace. The action space \(A\) is always a finite set of discrete actions an agent can choose from. The conditional transition probabilities \(P: S \times A \times S \to [0, 1]\), which are either available directly in the form of analytic models or can be collected by using simulators and performing roll-outs, define for discrete spaces the probability \(P(s'|s, a)\) for transiting from state \(s\) to \(s'\) when executing the action \(a\). In continuous state spaces, \(P\) takes the role of a probability density function which must be integrated over. A scalar reward function \(r: S \times A \times S \to [-M, M]\) with \(M \in \mathbb{R}\) assigns an immediate and finite one-step-reward to the transition triplet \(s, a\) and \(s'\). Finally, \(\gamma \in (0, 1)\) represents a discount factor, which is required to ensure convergence of the overall expected discounted reward.

The goal of an agent is to learn a policy \(\pi\), which maximises the expected discounted reward. It is sufficient to consider deterministic policies of the form \(\pi: S \to A\), as the space of history independent Markov policies can be proven \(^3\) to contain an optimal policy.

The expected discounted reward starting in some state \(s \in S\) and following the policy \(\pi\) afterwards is called value function and is defined as

\[
V_\pi: S \to \mathbb{R}, \quad s \mapsto \lim_{T \to \infty} \mathbb{E}_{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_T} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{T} \gamma^t r(s_t, \pi(s_t), s_{t+1}) | s_0 = s \right]. \tag{1}
\]

\(^3\)e.g. chapter one and two in [Bertsekas, 2012], applies also to other statements here
The computation of expectations depends on the type of the state space. For discrete sets it takes the form of a weighted sum. In continuous spaces, we have to compute an integral over the successor states. It is well known that for a given policy \( \pi \) the value function \( V_\pi \) satisfies the *Bellman equation*, i.e., we can write for all states \( s \in S \)

\[
V_\pi (s) = \mathbb{E}_{s'} \left[ r(s, \pi (s), s') + \gamma \cdot V_\pi (s') \right] = \sum_{s'} P(s, \pi (s), s') \left( r(s, \pi (s), s') + \gamma V_\pi (s') \right),
\]

(2)

where \( s' \) is the successor state of \( s \) obtained by executing action \( a = \pi (s) \). The second equality in Equation (2) is only available if transition probabilities are known and exist due to discrete state and action spaces. Treating \( V_\pi \) as a variable, the right hand side of Equation (2) is referred to as the *Bellman Operator* and the corresponding \( \xi \) the aforementioned objective. The combination of a *greedily induced policy* \( s, a \mapsto \arg\max_{a \in A} Q_\pi (s, a) \) of a natural discrete formulation, exact representations are out of reach. An accurate value function approximation is considered. If we further restrict the decision making problem to be *ergodic*, there exists a *steady state distribution* \( \xi \in (0, 1) \) for each state, \(^4\) which allows us to create a quality assessment for the approximation when combined with the aforementioned objective. The combination of a \( \xi \)-weighted norm and the TD-error of Equation (4) yields the *Mean Squared Bellman Error*

\[
\text{MSBE}(F) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| F - (T_\pi F) \right\|_\xi^2,
\]

(8)

\(^4\)for continuous spaces \( \xi \) is also a probability density function and must be used with integrals
which accepts a value function approximation \( F \in \mathcal{V} \) and returns a scalar value. The factor \( 1/2 \) is included for convenience. As the MSBE contains a norm over a function space, the realization of \( \| \cdot \|_\xi \) comes in two different ways depending on the type of state space. In discrete spaces we can enumerate all states and write down directly

\[
\text{MSBE}(F) = \frac{1}{2} \| F - (T_{\pi} F) \|_{\xi}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \xi(s) (F(s) - (T_{\pi} F)(s))^2. \tag{9}
\]

Because the steady state distribution is a probability, we can treat the summation also as expectation and use samples to approximate it by the law of large numbers. We have

\[
\text{MSBE}(F) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \left[ (F(s) - (T_{\pi} F)(s))^2 \right] \approx \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( F(s_i) - (T_{\pi} F)(s_i) \right)^2, \tag{10}
\]

where samples \( s_i \) are drawn according to the environment. Note that changing the \( \xi \)-weighted norm to an equivalent one, e.g. a uniform weighting, can only change the steepest descent direction. Types and locations of critical points remain the same. In continuous spaces, the \( \xi \)-norm is typically based on integrals

\[
\text{MSBE}(F) = \frac{1}{2} \| F - (T_{\pi} F) \|_{\xi}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \xi(s) (F(s) - (T_{\pi} F)(s))^2 \, ds. \tag{11}
\]

Here, \( \xi \) takes the role of a normalised probability density function such that we can make use of Monte Carlo Integration. It allows us to write integrals as summations over many samples

\[
\text{MSBE}(F) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \xi(s) (F(s) - (T_{\pi} F)(s))^2 \, ds \approx \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( F(s_i) - (T_{\pi} F)(s_i) \right)^2. \tag{12}
\]

From Equations (10) and (12) it becomes clear that a realisation of an optimisation procedure for both types of state spaces results in the same instructions for a computer. However, as far as we are aware, the existence of the integral when working with continuous state spaces or the concise definition of a norm in that case were not part of the research focus in the past. The integrand \( (F(s) - (T_{\pi} F)(s)) \) in Equation (11) must be square integrable, i.e., be an element of \( L^2 \). This is not a problem for the definition of \( V_\pi \) as the infinite discounted sum in Equation (1). Already necessary assumptions such as bounded rewards \( |r(\cdot)| < M \) for some \( M > 0 \) and bounded state spaces guarantee square integrability. The system dynamics must be chosen to fit implicitly into these conditions. However, care must be taken for the selected function space \( \mathcal{V} \). If using e.g. neural networks with arbitrary non-linearities as function class, square integrability might not be ensured. Furthermore, to define a norm, the integral should cover the whole Euclidean space, not only a bounded subset, to be in line with linearity requirements of any norm. However, this stands in conflict with the assumptions required for RL and also can affect in turn the square integrability of \( V_\pi \). We leave these theoretical considerations as a topic for future research.

The extension of the Mean Squared Bellman Error to Q-factors is in both settings straightforward. One has to add another sum or integral over all actions to the definition of the MSBE and include the action as second input to \( F \).

Reinforcement Learning with Function Approximation now manifests itself in the optimisation problem

\[
F_\pi \in \arg \min_{F \in \mathcal{V}} \text{MSBE}(F), \tag{13}
\]

where \( F_\pi \) is the closest function to \( V_\pi \) in the approximation space \( \mathcal{V} \). In general we have \( F_\pi \neq V_\pi \) for at least some states \( s \in \mathcal{S} \) and only aim to be close enough to \( V_\pi \). By the choice of \( \xi \) as weighting for the norm, we also maintain for linear function approximation architectures the contraction properties of \( T_\pi \) when combining it with a linear projection onto that function space. The accuracy of the solution \( F_\pi \) as defined in Equation (13) is known to be bounded by

\[
\| F_\pi - V_\pi \|_{\xi} \leq \frac{1 + \gamma}{1 - \gamma} \inf_{F \in \mathcal{V}} \| F - V_\pi \|_{\xi}. \tag{14}
\]

Obviously, the challenge is to find a function space \( \mathcal{V} \) which we can optimise over and which still contains a good approximation for the desired function \( V_\pi \). Thus, we investigate in Section 4 critical points of the MSBE and derive conditions, under which training results in finite exact approximations.

### 3.3 Multi Layer Perceptrons

To approximate value functions, we deploy in this paper the classic feed forward fully connected neural network, a.k.a. Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). We summarise in the following the well-known definition of an MLP such that for the remaining document a concise notation exists with the goal to avoid any possible source of confusion.
Let us denote by $L$ the number of layers in the MLP structure, and by $n_l$ the number of processing units in the $l$-th layer with $l = 1, \ldots, L$. By $l = 0$ we refer to the input layer with $n_0$ units. The value of $n_0$ depends on the state space and its type. For discrete spaces we have $n_0 = 1$ such that a single state can be processed as natural number directly by the network. In a continuous setting we use $n_0 = K$ units matching the $K$-dimensional state vectors. We always restrict the number of nodes in the output layer $l = L$ to $n_L = 1$.

Let $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a unit activation function and denote by $\sigma' : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ its first derivative with respect to the input. The unit activation function $\sigma$ and its derivatives act element-wise on non-scalar values. Depending on the concrete choice for $\sigma$ the domain and image might have to be changed. Traditionally, the activation function $\sigma$ is chosen to be non-constant, bounded, continuous and monotonically increasing (e.g. the Sigmoid function). More recent popular choices consider unbounded functions like (Leaky-) ReLU, SoftPlus or the Bent-Identity$^5$. In this work, we further restrict the choice for the activation function to smooth, unbounded and strictly monotonically increasing functions such as SoftPlus, Bent-Identity or also the Identity function itself as used in the last layer. The latter two are used in this work.

For the $(l, k)$-th unit in an MLP architecture, i.e., the $k$-th unit in the $l$-th layer, we define the corresponding unit mapping $\Lambda_{l,k} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1}} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$
\Lambda_{l,k}(w_l, b_l, \phi_{l-1}) := \sigma \left( w_{l,k}^T \phi_{l-1} - b_l \right),
$$

where $\phi_{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1}}$ denotes the output from layer $(l-1)$. The terms $w_{l,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1}}$ and $b_l \in \mathbb{R}$ are a weight vector and a scalar bias associated with the $(l, k)$-th unit, respectively. Next, we can define the $l$-th layer mapping by stacking all unit mappings of layer $l$ as

$$
\Lambda_l(W_l, b_l, \phi_{l-1}) := \left[ \Lambda_{l,1}(w_{l,1}, b_{l,1}, \phi_{l-1}) \ldots \Lambda_{l,n_l}(w_{l,n_l}, b_{l,n_l}, \phi_{l-1}) \right]^T = \sigma \left( W_l^T \phi_{l-1} + b_l \right),
$$

with $W_l := [w_{l,1}, \ldots, w_{l,n_l}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{l-1} \times n_l}$ being the $l$-th parameter matrix and $b_l := [b_{l,1}, \ldots, b_{l,n_l}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$ the $l$-th bias vector. It is convenient to store the bias vector as an additional row of the matrix and extend the layer input with a constant value of 1. Thus, we can write Equation (16) equivalently as

$$
\Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1}) := \sigma \left( W_l^T \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{l-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right).
$$

by using a larger parameter matrix $W_l \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_{l-1}+1) \times n_l}$. Next, let us define the overall function represented by the MLP. First, denote by $\phi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^K$ the network input. Then, the output at the $l$-th layer is defined recursively as $\phi_l := \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})$. Note that the last layer in an MLP employs the identity map as activation function and is thus only a linear mapping. Finally, by denoting the set of all parameter matrices in the MLP by $\mathcal{W} := \mathbb{R}^{(n_0+1) \times n_1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{R}^{(n_{L-1}+1) \times 1}$, we can compose all layer-wise mappings to define for a set of parameters $W \in \mathcal{W}$ the overall network mapping as

$$
f : \mathcal{W} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad (W, \phi_0) \mapsto \Lambda_L(W_L, \cdot) \circ \ldots \circ \Lambda_1(W_1, \phi_0),
$$

which contains in total $N_{net}$ parameters with $N_{net}$ being

$$
N_{net} = \sum_{l=1}^L (n_{l-1} + 1) \cdot n_l.
$$

With this construction we can define the set of parametrised value functions belonging to a MLP by writing

$$
\mathcal{F} := \{ f(W, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \to \mathbb{R} \mid W \in \mathcal{W} \}.
$$

With slight abuse of notation, we refer by $\mathcal{F}(n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_{L-1}, 1)$ to a concrete function class by specifying the architecture of the MLP, i.e., the number of processing units in each layer as well as the input and output dimensions. Sometimes it is more convenient to describe an MLP by its depth $d$ and the identical width $w$ of all hidden layers. In this case we write $\mathcal{F}(n_0, w \times d, 1)$. The type of non-linearity is typically fixed and mentioned separately.

### 3.4 Optimisation Approaches

For solving the optimisation problem in Equation (13), i.e., obtaining the approximated value function with smallest MSBE, two fundamental approaches using steepest descent directions exist:

- **Direct Algorithms** [Baird III, 1995], alternatively called Semi-Gradient as proposed in [Sutton and Barto, 2020]
• Residual Gradient algorithms [Baird III, 1995]

Both methods accept a parametrised function class such as MLPs with an initial set of parameters. Then, they move those parameters iteratively closer to an optimum by following repetitively a descent direction of the MSBE. Descent steps invoke derivatives of Equation (8) and the differential map of the MLP with respect to all parameters.

The difference between both approaches resides in the construction of derivatives. For Semi-Gradient algorithms, one ignores the dependence on the parameters through the value function inside the Bellman Operator. For Residual Gradient algorithms the complete gradient is calculated. We refer to [Zhang et al., 2020] and references therein for a comparison of Semi-Gradient and Residual Gradient algorithms. In the following, we proceed with the analysis of critical points of Equation (8) for discrete and continuous spaces. We only investigate Residual Gradient algorithms as there is no insight to be gained from a critical point analysis, when we use a direction for descending, which is not always pointing in the same half space as a gradient.

4 A Critical Point Analysis of the MSBE

In the following, we present our theoretical investigation of Residual Gradient algorithms by analysing the critical points of the Mean Squared Bellman Error. Thereby, we follow the work in [Shen, 2018b] and translate those insights to the RL domain. First, we investigate discrete state spaces and derive conditions under which learning the exact value function works reliably. Second, we extend our analysis to continuous spaces by changing to a sampling based approximation of the MSBE and adapt our conditions accordingly. We characterise the importance of over-parametrisation, give design principles for MLPs and unveil a connection to other state of the art algorithms.

4.1 For Discrete State Spaces

In discrete problems, we have two choices to approach a critical point analysis. Either we want to have an approximation architecture that is exact for each of the \( K \) states or we are interested in an architecture, which is exact for only \( N \ll K \) sampled but unique states. While the second case simplifies the analysis and relaxes restrictions as shown later for continuous spaces, this also means that we have to address generalisation to states outside of the sampled ones. As the sampling case with discrete states would match almost completely our approach for continuous state spaces, we present here only the exact learning assumption. This means, we are interested in conditions for an MLP that would allow for a perfect solution to any state.

We consider MLPs of the form \( F(1, \ldots, 1) \), i.e., fully connected feed forward networks with a one dimensional input and output and arbitrary depth or width. With discrete and finite spaces we can evaluate an MLP \( f \in \mathcal{F} \) for every available state \( s \in \mathcal{S} \) and collect the evaluations of \( f \) as vector in \( \mathbb{R}^K \), where \( K \) is the number of states. As the simplest approach, we encode the discrete states with natural numbers for the single input unit and, thus, can treat \( F(W) := [f(W, 1), \ldots, f(W, K)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^K \) as the approximated value function for all states. Next, we define the Bellman Residual vector for a policy \( \pi \) in matrix form as

\[
\Delta_\pi(W) = F(W) - T_\pi F(W) = F(W) - P_\pi \left( R_\pi + \gamma F(W) \right),
\]

where the term \( R_\pi \) contains the collection of all one-step-rewards suitable for the matrix form of the Bellman Operator and \( P_\pi \) is the transition probability matrix under \( \pi \). We use a capital \( \Delta \) instead of \( \delta \) to emphasize that we consider all transitions in here instead of just a single one as in Equation (4). Using a diagonal matrix \( \Xi := \text{diag}(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_K) \) consisting of the steady state distributions \( \xi_i \) for all states, we can rewrite the norm in Equation (9) as the Neural Mean Squared Bellman Error (NMSBE) function

\[
\mathcal{J}(W) := \frac{1}{2} \Delta_\pi(W)^T \Xi \Delta_\pi(W).
\]

It is important to notice that the NMSBE function is generally non-convex in \( W \) and, even worse, it is also non-coercive [Güler, 2010]; for \( W \to \infty \) we do not necessarily have \( \mathcal{J}(W) \to \infty \). Thus, the existence and attainability of global minima of \( \mathcal{J}(W) \) are not guaranteed in general. Nevertheless, when appropriate non-linear activation functions are employed in hidden layers, exact learning of finite samples can be achieved with sufficiently large architectures [Shah and Poon, 1999]. Thus, for our analysis, it is safe to assume that there exists an MLP able to approximate the value function \( V_\pi \).

Assumption 1 (Existence of exact approximator). Let \( V_\pi : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R} \) be the exact value function under policy \( \pi \). There exists at least one MLP architecture \( \mathcal{F} \) as defined in Equation (20) together with a set of parameters \( W^* \in \mathcal{W} \) such that the output of \( F \) and \( V_\pi \) coincide, i.e., we have

\[
f(W^*, s) = V_\pi(s) \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.
\]
To conduct a critical point analysis of the NMSBE function we first compute the derivatives. By the linearity of the Bellman Operator $T_\pi$, we obtain the directional derivative of $J$ at the point $W \in \mathcal{W}$ in direction $H \in \mathcal{W}$ as

$$D J(W)[H] = \Delta_\pi(W)^T \Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi) D F(W)[H],$$

(23)

with $D F(W)[H]$ being the differential map of the MLP and $I_K$ the $K \times K$ identity matrix. As the function $F(W)$ is simply a superposed function evaluated at each state, we just need to compute the directional derivative of the MLP evaluated at a specific state $s$, i.e., $D f(W, s)[H]$. Furthermore, the directional derivative of $f(W, s)$ is a linear operator, hence the evaluation of the directional derivative of $f$ for all states can be expressed as a matrix vector multiplication and results in

$$D F(W)[H] = \left[ \text{vec}(\nabla_W f(W, 1)), \ldots, \text{vec}(\nabla_W f(W, K)) \right]^T \text{vec}(H),$$

(24)

where $\text{vec}(\nabla_W f(W, s)) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{out} \times 1}$ is the gradient of $f$ with respect to the parameters evaluated at $W$ for state $s$ under the Euclidean norm. The operation $\text{vec}()$ transforms a matrix into a vector by stacking its columns. It acts on collections of matrices by concatenating the results of each individual vectorisation. The matrix $G(W)$ takes the role of the Jacobian for the evaluation of all states $F(W)$. Now, we can characterise critical points of the NMSBE function $J$ from Equation (22) by setting its gradient to zero, i.e., $\nabla_W J(W) = 0$. Combining the results from Equations (23) and (24) together with Riesz’ Representation Theorem yields the critical point condition

$$\nabla_W J(W) := \Delta_\pi(W)^T \Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi) G(W)^T \frac{1}{W} = 0,$$

(25)

which is the counterpart to Equation (19) in [Shen, 2018b] for the Reinforcement Learning setting with exact learning. Now, we derive the following proposition.

**Proposition 1** (Suboptimal local minima free condition). Let an MLP architecture $F$ satisfy Assumption 1.

If the rank of the matrix $G(W)$ as constructed in Equation (24) is equal to $K$ for all $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then any extremum $W^* \in \mathcal{W}$ realises the true value function $V_\pi$, i.e., $f(W^*, s) = V_\pi(s) \forall s \in S$. Furthermore, the NMSBE function $J$ is free of suboptimal local minima.

**Proof.** Because the underlying state transition matrix $P_\pi$ of the MDP is required to be Markovian and ergodic, both terms $\Xi$ and $(I_K - \gamma P_\pi)$ have full rank. Consequently, the expression $\Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi) G(W)^T$ also has rank $K$, if we claim that $G(W^*)$ has full rank. Hence, there is only the trivial solution left for the linear system in Equation (25), meaning that the Bellman Residual $\Delta_\pi(W^*)$ must be exactly zero for all states. Due to Assumption 1 and because the Bellman Residual is only zero for the unique fixed point $V_\pi$ of the operator $T_\pi$, we see that $W^*$ corresponds to the true value function. Furthermore, the Bellman Residual appears as factor in the NMSBE. Hence, at any critical point the error vanishes and there are no suboptimal local minima.

To make use of Proposition 1, one needs to investigate, under what conditions the matrix $G(W)$ has full column rank. The immediate risk of being exactly zero can be eliminated by choosing proper activation functions without zero derivatives for finite inputs. To see this we have to look at the structure of $G(W)$, which takes the form

$$G(W) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_0^{(1)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} \right)^T \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_0^{(N)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} \right)^T
\end{bmatrix},$$

(26)

where the matrices $\Psi_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_{out}}$ and Kronecker products result from the layer wise definition of an MLP. The $\Psi_l$ are products of diagonal matrices containing the derivative of $\sigma$ and the parameter matrices of various layers, hence a proper choice for $\sigma$ prevents $G(W)$ from becoming zero. A detailed construction is available in the appendix.

Maintaining the rank of $G(W)$ means, one has to choose MLPs in such a way to minimise the risk that rows of the matrix lie in a shared subspace. As in the original multidimensional regression setting, the overall block structure of $G(W)$ remains for RL applications. However, we have in the RL setting the advantage that each block in $G(W)$ reduces to a single row, because the output layers are always scalar, i.e., $n_L = 1$. For the same amount of sampled

---

6In this paper we used $G$ in place of $P$ to avoid confusion with the transition probability matrix
inputs, there are less possibilities to have linear dependent rows. While there are no theoretical guarantees, most matrices have full rank in practical applications, where noise or sampling are present.

Unfortunately, the requirement of using over-parametrised MLPs

$$N_{\text{net}} \geq K$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

negates any useful insight. If we need as many adjustable parameters in an MLP as there are unique states, we could use a tabular representation in the first place and avoid dealing with non-linear function approximation. Note that the strong condition in Equation (27) stems from the assumption of being exact for all states. If the NMSBE is changed to be an approximation based on sampling, as done for continuous spaces in Section 4.2, we can reduce the number of MLP parameters from $K$ down to $N \ll K$ samples. As immediate consequence, generalisation becomes an issue, because the MLP is only accurate by design for finite many points in the state space. Investigating the predictive capabilities for the remaining states of a discrete space, which not necessarily has a proper definition for a metric, is beyond the analysis presented in this work.

A closer look reveals that the differential map as shown in Equation (23) is a candidate for the Gauss Newton (GN) approximation as in the non-linear regression setting. Indeed, we have for the second directional derivative of $\mathcal{J}$ at $W$ with two directions $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{W}$

$$D^2 \mathcal{J}(W)[H_1, H_2] = \Delta_\pi(W)^T \Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi) D^2 F(W)[H_1, H_2]$$

$$+ \left( \left( D F(W)[H_1] \right)^T \Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi)^T D F(W)[H_2] \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

where we see that the first summand from the right hand side vanishes at any critical point $W^* \in \mathcal{W}$ according to Proposition 1. Thus, a good approximated evaluation of the Hessian of the NMSBE function at $W^*$ is given by

$$D^2 \mathcal{J}(W^*)[H_1, H_2] = \text{vec}(H_1)^T G(W^*)(I_K - \gamma P_\pi)^T \Xi(I_K - \gamma P_\pi) G(W^*)^T \text{vec}(H_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

This corresponds to the Gauss Newton approximation for non-linear least squares regression, i.e., defining the Hessian as the product of the Jacobian and its transpose. Our characterisation of critical points reveals this possibility for approximation as a side benefit. Using naively the outer product of the model’s Jacobians $G(W^*)$ as approximation would ignore the additional structure coming from the Bellman Operator.

To ensure proper behaviour for a second-order Approximated Newton’s (AN) algorithm, we need to characterise the Hessian $H_W \mathcal{J}(W^*)$ of the NMSBE at critical points. Its quadratic form leads to the following result for MLPs.

**Proposition 2** (Properties of the approximated Hessian). The Hessian of the NMSBE function $\mathcal{J}$ at any critical point $W^*$ is always positive semi-definite. Furthermore, its rank is bounded from above by

$$\text{rank}(H_W \mathcal{J}(W^*)) \leq K,$$

if the MLP satisfies Equation (27).

**Proof.** Positive semi-definiteness of $H_W \mathcal{J}(W^*)$ follows from its symmetric definition. As before $\Xi$ and $(I_K - \gamma P_\pi)$ have full rank. The rank of $G(W^*)$ is at most $K$. For $H_W \mathcal{J}(W^*)$ being the product of these matrices we get the upper bound on its rank. \qed

It is interesting to see that the rank condition from Equation (27) also allows the Hessian to become positive definite if the matrix $G(W)$ has full column rank. This has significant consequences for the optimisation problem. A positive definite Hessian at all critical points means that they are all true minima, thereby confirming Proposition 1. There are no saddle points or local maxima and, thus, a gradient based optimisation strategy cannot get stuck. Over-parametrisation of MLPs is not only important for Proposition 1 but also necessary from the algorithmic perspective.

We confirm the proposed approximation for the Hessian in discrete state spaces with exact learning numerically in Section 5.3.

### 4.2 For Continuous State Spaces

In high dimensional continuous state spaces, say $K > 6$, an exact representation of the value function based on a fine grained partitioning of $S$ is typically impossible. This is due to the *Curse of Dimensionality* and we are forced to work directly with the continuous space, which causes MLPs to be of the form $\mathcal{F}(K, \ldots, 1)$ to accept $K$ dimensional state vectors as input.
Since there cannot exist a transition probability matrix in continuous spaces and its corresponding discrete steady state distribution $\Xi$, the NMSBE as shown in Equation (22) is not available here. We must work with a finite number of samples $N \in \mathbb{N}$ to approximate the loss as done in Equation (12).

Another important limitation for Residual Gradient algorithms is the so-called \textit{Doubling Sampling Issue}. Due to the expectation inside the Bellman Operator for every single sample state $s_i \in S$ many possible successors $s'_i$ are necessary to approximate this expectation empirically. The \textit{Doubling Sampling Issue} can be bypassed if an accurate model containing a description of stochastic transitions is available or if one has access to a simulator, where the state can be set freely to collect its successors. However, if one wishes to learn in a model free manner or with rather limited and less powerful simulations, collecting successor samples becomes problematic. In a recent work [Saleh and Jiang, 2019], the authors rediscovered the application of Residual Gradient algorithms in deterministic environments. They are motivated by their observation that many environments and RL test beds are deterministic or posses only a small amount of noise. Thus, for our analysis, we follow the same strategy and restrict ourself to deterministic MDPs and analyse the algorithm in its purest form. The one step TD-error from Equation (4) now simplifies for the amount of noise. Thus, for our analysis, we follow the same strategy and restrict ourself to deterministic MDPs.

Next, we change the loss of Equation (12) accordingly and obtain the sampled NMSBE for continuous state spaces as

$$J(W) := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (F(W, s_i) - r(s_i, \pi(s_i), s'_i) - \gamma F(W, s'_i))^2$$

where $\pi(s'_i)$ is the successor of $s_i$ when executing $\pi(s_i)$. As before, we collect the evaluation of the MLP for all $N$ sampled states $s_i$ as vector and denote it by $F(W) := [f(W, s_1), \ldots, f(W, s_N)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The definition of $G(W) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N_{\text{act}}}$ applies as in the discrete setting. Detailed steps for its derivation are provided in the appendix.

Next, we change the loss of Equation (12) accordingly and obtain the sampled NMSBE for continuous state spaces as

$$\tilde{J}(W) := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \underbrace{F(W, s_i) - r(s_i, \pi(s_i), s'_i) - \gamma F(W, s'_i)}_{\delta(s_i, s'_i)} \right)^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2N} \begin{bmatrix} \delta(s_1, s'_1) & \ldots & \delta(s_N, s'_N) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \delta(s_1, s'_1) \\ \vdots \\ \delta(s_N, s'_N) \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2N} \Delta_{\pi}(W)^T \Delta_{\pi}(W),$$

where $\Delta_{\pi}(W)$ now takes the form

$$\Delta_{\pi}(W) = F(W) - R - \gamma F'(W)$$

when we denote by $F'$ the evaluation of $f$ for all successor states. For this loss similar lines of thought apply as in the discrete setting. Yet we move at the same time closer to the learning setting and optimisation task described in [Shen, 2018b]: We consider a finite set of sample states at which the corresponding value function is approximated exactly. We formulate this situation for Residual Gradient algorithms precisely in the next definition.

**Definition 1** (Finite exact approximator). Let $V_\pi : S \to \mathbb{R}$ be the value function under policy $\pi$. Given $N$ sample states $s_i \in S$ we call an MLP $f \in \mathcal{F}$, which satisfies

$$f(W, s_i) = V_\pi(s_i) \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N$$

for some parameters $W \in \mathcal{W}$, a finite exact approximator of $V_\pi$ based on the $N$ sample states.

As in the discrete setting, we can choose sufficiently rich MLP architectures $\mathcal{F}$ and, thus, assume also in the continuous setting the existence of such an approximator.

**Assumption 2** (Existence of finite exact approximator). Let $V_\pi : S \to \mathbb{R}$ be the value function of policy $\pi$. Given $N$ unique samples $s_i \in S$, there exists at least one MLP architecture $\mathcal{F}$ as defined in Equation (20) together with a set of parameters $W^* \in \mathcal{W}$ such that the MLP $f(W^*, \cdot) \in \mathcal{F}$ is a finite exact approximator of $V_\pi$ according to Definition 1.

A key challenge of Definition 1 and Assumption 2 resides in the number of MLPs, which can satisfy these criteria because they are universal approximators, but still do not resemble a good approximation. Due to the sampling based formulation of the MSBE with only finite many samples there is room left for an error, which cannot be specified in more detail. For MLPs, $\tilde{J}$ can be close to zero because Equation (32) vanishes perfectly for all sample states, but at the same time, the approximation can be arbitrarily bad in between. Thus, generalisation capabilities are crucial and we investigate them empirically as part of the experiments.

Our critical point analysis follows the same steps as in Section 4.1. First, we need the differential map of Equation (31). It takes the form

$$D J(W)[H] = \frac{1}{N} \Delta_{\pi}(W)^T \left( D F(W)[H] - \gamma D F'(W)[H] \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \Delta_{\pi}(W)^T \left( G(W) - \gamma G'(W) \right)^T \text{vec}(H),$$

(33)
where $G'$ is the Jacobian when using $s'_l$ as input. Using this map, critical points can be characterised by setting the gradient to zero
\[
\nabla_{W} \tilde{J}(W) := \frac{1}{N} \Delta_{\pi}(W)^{T} \left( G(W) - \gamma G'(W) \right)^{T} = 0.
\]  

\(34\)

Apparently, the critical point condition for the continuous setting based on $N$ unique samples in Equation (34) takes a similar form as that of the discrete setting in Equation (25). But since we no longer investigate the exact learning scenario, we have to re-formulate Proposition 1 and obtain a slightly different version.

**Proposition 3** (Suboptimal local minima free condition). Let an MLP architecture $f \in F$ satisfy Assumption 2.

If the rank of the matrix $\tilde{G}(W)$ as defined in Equation (34) is equal to $N$ for all $W \in \mathcal{W}$, then any extremum $W^* \in \mathcal{W}$ realises a finite exact approximator of $V_{\pi}$. Furthermore, the NMSBE function $\tilde{J}$ of Equation (31) is free of suboptimal local minima.

**Proof.** As before, Equation (34) defines a linear equation system in the sampled Bellman Residual vector $\Delta_{\pi}$. If we claim that $\tilde{G}(W)$ has full rank, there is only the trivial solution left. By Assumption 2 we know that such an MLP exists. It must be a finite exact approximator according to Definition 1 as this is the only way to make $\Delta_{\pi}$ zero. Furthermore, the Bellman Residual appears as factor in the sampled NMSBE. Hence, at any critical point the error vanishes and there are no suboptimal local minima.

We now address the requirements for $\tilde{G}(W)$ since this matrix forms the backbone of Proposition 3. As the first requirement, $\tilde{G}(W)$ has to be non-zero to define a proper equation system and enforce a trivial solution in terms of $\Delta_{\pi}(W)$ in Equation (34). For both differential maps $G(W)$ and $G'(W)$ the design principles apply individually. Hence it is unlikely in practice that for unique sample states simultaneously both matrices vanish elementwise on their own. More troublesome is the distance between a state $s$ and its successor $s'$. If $||s - s'|| \rightarrow 0$, which happens for example whenever $s$ is getting close to a fixed point of the system dynamics, then the discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ prevents a perfect cancellation of $G(W)$ with $G'(W)$. Aside from those fixed points in the state space it is again unlikely to observe in practice perfect cancellation of these two matrices. As the second requirement, the rank of $\tilde{G}(W)$ is important. Obviously, it is more difficult to make concise statements compared to discrete and exact learning setting. For the rank of the sum of two matrices the only known inequality is

\[
\text{rank} (A + B) < \text{rank} (A) + \text{rank} (B),
\]

which implies that we still have to increase the rank of $G(W)$ and $G'(W)$ individually to push the upper bound for the rank of $\tilde{G}(W)$ high enough to allow for full rankness. This leads us to similar design principles for the MLP as in the discrete setting. When taking a closer look at $\tilde{G}(W)$ itself, we find that the overall structure stays rather close to $G(W)$ from Equation (26). We have

\[
\tilde{G}(W) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Psi_{1}^{T} \left( I_{n_{1}} \otimes \left( \phi_{0}^{(1)} - \gamma \phi'_{0}^{(1)} \right)^{T} \right) & \ldots & \Psi_{L}^{T} \left( I_{n_{L}} \otimes \left( \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} - \gamma \phi'_{L-1}^{(1)} \right)^{T} \right) \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\Psi_{1}^{T} \left( I_{n_{1}} \otimes \left( \phi_{0}^{(N)} - \gamma \phi'_{0}^{(N)} \right)^{T} \right) & \ldots & \Psi_{L}^{T} \left( I_{n_{L}} \otimes \left( \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} - \gamma \phi'_{L-1}^{(N)} \right)^{T} \right)
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\(35\)

where the vectors $\phi_{l} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{l}}$ result from the evaluation of all layers for state $s$ and $\phi'_{l}$ from using $s'$. Again, we provide more detailed construction steps in the appendix.

We see in Equation (35) that only the layer outputs $\phi$ get changed. Hence, the more complex $\tilde{G}(W)$ still complies to considerations of the discrete setting regarding linear dependent rows. Of course these properties and requirements come without any guarantees, i.e., we expect that carefully constructed examples (yet almost pathological) exist where a drop of the rank of $\tilde{G}(W)$ happens. But in practice, where numerical errors and sampled quantities are present, we do not consider this to become a problem.

Various authors report a slow convergence of RG algorithms due to the similarity of $G(W)$ and $G'(W)$, e.g., [Zhang et al., 2020, Baird III, 1995]. We can identify two remedies here. The first is already visible in Equation (34) or Equation (35), where the contribution of the successor $G'(W)$ comes with the prefactor $\gamma$. If using multi-step lookahead the discount factor would come with higher powers, thus, more efficiently taking away the cancelling effect of $G'(W)$ onto $G(W)$ if the successor stays after several steps still close to its original state. For large enough lookahead, $\gamma^{k}$
would become small enough to allow for ignoring $G'(W)$ altogether, which also helps with the desired full rankness of $G(W)$. It is interesting to see that this multi-step lookahead in the objective resembles the construction of advantage estimators in \textit{Proximal Policy Optimisation} [Schulman et al., 2017] or \textit{Generalized Advantage Estimation} [Schulman et al., 2016]. Thus, Semi-Gradient issues such as the limited applicability of classic optimisation methods seem to be avoidable, because for long enough lookahead the omitted dependence of derivatives with respect to MLP parameters in the TD target vanishes naturally. The second remedy is related to vanishing gradients of $\tilde{f}$ if $s$ and $s'$ are close by. The natural solution here is to use second-order gradient descent, again in the form of an Approximated Newton’s algorithm, which takes the curvature into account to define a descent direction. Hence, we propose to employ a \textit{Gauss Newton Residual Gradient Algorithm}. Other approaches to overcome curvature issues such as momentum based descent algorithms are too reliant on the dynamical runtime behaviour as well as on initialisation. They are prone to excessive hyper parameter tuning and frequent restarts. In the worst case, they complicate reproducibility, which is also a reason, why we decided to use second-order optimisation.

As before, to see the possibility for a Gauss Newton approximation of the Hessian, we first write down the second-order differential map of $\tilde{f}$ at point $W \in \mathcal{W}$ for two directions $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{W}$

\[
D^2 \tilde{f}(W)[H_1, H_2] = \frac{1}{N} \Delta_\pi(W)^T \left( D^2 F(W)[H_1, H_2] - \gamma \cdot D^2 F'(W)[H_1, H_2] \right) \\
+ \frac{1}{N} \left( D \Delta_\pi(W)[H_1] \right)^T \left( D F(W)[H_2] - \gamma D F'(W)[H_2] \right).
\]  

Since the first summand contains the Bellman Residual as factor it vanishes at any critical point $W^*$ of $\tilde{f}$ due to the assumption of exact learning at sample states. This removes the contribution of second-order derivatives of the MLP and allows us to simplify the Hessian to

\[
D^2 \tilde{f}(W^*)[H_1, H_2] = \frac{1}{N} \text{vec}(H_1)^T \left( (G(W^*) - \gamma G'(W^*)) \cdot (G(W^*) - \gamma G'(W^*))^\top \right) \text{vec}(H_2). \tag{37}
\]

It becomes clear that Proposition 2 applies almost unchanged.

**Proposition 4** (Properties of the approximated Hessian). \textit{The Hessian of the NMSBE function $\tilde{f}$ from Equation (31) is at any critical point $W^*$ always positive semi-definite. Furthermore, its rank is bounded from above by}

\[
\text{rank}(H_{W, \tilde{f}}(W^*)) \leq N.
\]

**Proof.** Positive semi-definiteness follows from the symmetric definition. The rank of the matrix $(G(W^*) - \gamma G'(W^*))$ is at most $N$. For $H_{W, \tilde{f}}(W^*)$ being the product of these we get the upper bound on its rank. \hfill \square

The question, whether $H_{W, \tilde{f}}(W^*)$ is positive definite or only semi-definite, is the same as in the discrete setting. We just have to use $\tilde{G}(W^*)$ in place of $G(W^*)$ alone and still arrive at

\[
N_{\text{net}} \geq N \tag{38}
\]

to allow the rank to become full. We want to emphasize that this requirement for the Hessian is far less restricting than in the discrete setting with exact learning. Also, computational concerns regarding a second-order optimisation method are no longer that severe with nowadays hardware capabilities. MLPs can become large enough for RL applications while still allowing for working with Hessians in a reasonable time. We further address practical concerns in Section 5 and as part of the experiments.

In summary, we have two kind of approaches, namely exact learning and sampling based approximation. For discrete state spaces we have a sound and exact algorithm with verifiable quadratic convergence as shown later. Furthermore, this algorithm can be converted to sampling based loss definition at any time without extra effort. For continuous state spaces only a sampling based algorithm is realisable. As we have shown, it possesses a matching behaviour with only slightly altered propositions. Thus, the only major difference is the formulation of the loss. By using sampling we allow for broader applications without sacrificing theoretical properties. The last uncertainty left is how many sample states are required, i.e., how to select the size of $N$ for a certain MDP. As this enters the realm of sampling complexity an answer to this question is no longer in the focus of our current work.
5 A Gauss Newton Residual Gradient Algorithm

In this section, we provide details regarding our concrete algorithm and make use of the results from our analysis. The focus lies on aspects that are relevant on their own, i.e., decoupled from any experiment, but fit no longer into the previous section as they are only due to the implementation in a computer system. We give pseudo code as it is used in the experiments and demonstrate numerically the properties of our approximated Hessian using the discrete exact learning setting.

5.1 Second-Order Algorithms

A frequent concern regarding second-order algorithms is the computational effort involved in models with many parameters. Typical architectures of MLPs used in RL applications contain around two hidden layers with approximately 50 units in each layer. For such MLPs, \( N_{net} \) falls in the range of 2000 parameters, for which second-order optimisation is manageable with reasonable time and storage as we demonstrate with our experiments. More severe is the root seeking behaviour of a Newton’s method. By using second-order information in a gradient descent optimisation procedure, we aim directly at any root in the gradient vector field of the NMSBE. Thus, the optimiser is also attracted by (local) maxima or even saddle points. Fortunately, as we have already elaborated after Propositions 2 and 4, these types of extrema do not exist if our assumptions are satisfied. On top of that, only at critical points of \( J(W) \) our approximated Hessian is exact. This makes it necessary to define the Approximated Newton’s step \( \eta \in W \) for an arbitrary point in the parameter space as the solution to a regularised linear equation system. Using the gradient from Equation (33) directly and the Hessian from Equation (37) combined with an identity matrix times a small factor we solve

\[
(H_W J(W) + c \cdot I_{N_{net}}) \cdot \eta = \nabla_W J(W)
\]

for \( \eta \), where \( c = 10^{-5} \) controls the strength of regularisation. All experiments use this value if not otherwise stated. The regularisation is important, because the approximated Hessian is only valid in a restricted neighbourhood around critical points. Outside of critical points, the regularisation ensures that the gradient direction is always part of the Newton’s step. Thus, this disturbance would also help with avoiding saddle points, as the descent direction is not coinciding completely with a correct Newton’s direction and because for first-order only information saddles and maxima are numerically unstable.

In our implementation, we do not make use of automatic differentiation frameworks due to the following reasons. First, they are not able to introduce approximations to symbolic expressions on their own. As we already have the required differential maps available due to our theoretical investigation, we could realise the optimisation procedure by hand without too much overhead. Second, to the best of our knowledge, the operations involved in the Hessian are not suited for general purpose graphics processing units, hence the performance gain of automatic differentiation frameworks is minimal. Third, as we have to solve linear equation systems, we cannot avoid to use other libraries as well. This would add additional overhead in the data transfer and further neglect benefits of these frameworks. In conclusion, by implementing the algorithm manually we achieved the full control over all the components and also could make use of sophisticated parallelisation. Of course, recent developments and contributions to automatic differentiation frameworks can render these considerations obsolete.

5.2 Pseudocode

For our experiments we need two kinds of procedures. The first is Policy Evaluation as shown in Algorithm 1. It makes uses of a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm to approximate \( V_\pi \) with a given MLP. The required inputs are initial parameters for the MLP as well as a policy to evaluate. As output one obtains the optimal parameters.

The second algorithm is normal Policy Iteration, which makes use of the first and extends it with a Policy Improvement step. After every sweep consisting of evaluation and improvement a better performing policy should be available. It is depicted in Algorithm 2.

A common practice in Policy Iteration is to reuse the most recent evaluation outcome for the next iteration. In [Sigaud and Stulp, 2019] this practice is called persistent while running the evaluation from scratch in every sweep is referred to as transient. We employ this naming convention here as well.

5.3 Demonstration of Quadratic Convergence

To evaluate empirically our derived theoretical results in the discrete state space setting together with the assumption of exact learning we demonstrate quadratic convergence on Baird’s Seven State Star Problem [Baird III, 1995]. Only if all components work as intended, quadratic convergence of a second-order gradient descent algorithm can be visible. As
Algorithm 1 Policy Evaluation with Gauss Newton Residual Gradient Formulation

**Hyper parameters:** $\gamma \in (0, 1), \alpha > 0, c = 10^{-5}, \epsilon \leq 10^{-5}, N \sim N_{\text{net}}$

**Input:**
- $\text{MLP } f \in F(n_0, \ldots, 1)$ with initialised parameters $W \in \mathcal{W}$
- policy $\pi$
- unique sample states $s_i \in \mathcal{S}$ with $i = 1, \ldots, N$

**Output:** $W$ such that $f(W, s_i) \approx V_\pi(s_i) \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N$

1: Construct transition tuples $s_i, r_i, s'_i$ using $\pi$ for all $i$

2: do

3: Evaluate $F(W) := [f(W, s_1), \ldots, f(W, s_N)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and its differential map $G(W)$.

4: Evaluate $F'$ and $G'$ using $s'_i$.

5: NMSBE: $\tilde{J}(W) = \frac{1}{2N} \Delta_\pi(W)^T \Delta_\pi(W)$

6: Gradient: $\nabla_W \tilde{J}(W) = \frac{1}{N} \Delta_\pi(W)^T \left(G(W) - \gamma G'(W)\right)$

7: Hessian: $H_W \tilde{J}(W) = \frac{1}{N} \left(G(W) - \gamma G'(W)\right) \cdot \left(G(W) - \gamma G'(W)\right)^T$

8: Solve for $\eta$: $H_W \tilde{J}(W)^T + c \cdot I_{N_{\text{net}}} \cdot \eta = \nabla_W \tilde{J}(W)$ (e.g. with Householder QR-Decomposition)

9: Descent step: $W \leftarrow W - \alpha \eta$

10: while $\tilde{J}(W) > \epsilon$

Algorithm 2 Policy Iteration

**Hyper parameters:** $\gamma \in (0, 1), \alpha > 0, c = 10^{-5}, \epsilon \leq 10^{-5}, N \sim N_{\text{net}}, \text{sweeps} > 0$

**Input:** MLP $f \in F(n_0, \ldots, 1)$ with parameters $W \in \mathcal{W}$, policy $\pi$

**Output:** policy $\pi'$

1: $W \leftarrow \text{UniformInitialisation}(-1, 1)$

2: $\pi(s) \leftarrow \text{GIP}(f, W, s)$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$

3: $s_i \leftarrow \text{UniformStateSpaceSample}()$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$

4: for sweep in sweeps do

5: if not persistent then

6: $W \leftarrow \text{UniformInitialisation}(-1, 1)$

7: end if

8: $W \leftarrow \text{PolicyEvaluation}(f, W, \pi, s_1, \ldots, s_N)$

9: $\pi'(s) \leftarrow \text{GIP}(f_{\pi}, W, s)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$

10: Evaluate $\pi'$ empirically using several roll-outs

11: $\pi \leftarrow \pi'$

12: end for
Figure 1: Adapted version of Baird’s *Seven State Star Problem* [Baird III, 1995]. We have added transitions with low probabilities from the centre back to the six outer states to obtain an infinite horizon problem such that the NMSBE is well-defined.

Figure 2: Local quadratic convergence on adapted version of Baird’s *Seven State Star Problem*. a): Distance of iterates $W^{(k)}$ to the accumulation point $W^*$. b): The NMSBE corresponding to each iterate.

we require a problem, where all states occur infinite many times for the NMSBE to be well-defined, we extend the *Star Problem* with transitions from the central node to all others. In Figure 1 all transitions and their probabilities are shown. A policy for evaluation is defined implicitly by setting the transition probabilities to fixed values. The reward is present in state 1 and takes the value 1. As discount factor we use $\gamma = 0.99$.

We deploy an MLP architecture $\mathcal{F}(2,7,1)$ consisting of $N_{net} = 29$ parameters with step size $\alpha = 1$ and use *Bent-Id* as activation function in hidden layers. Every state receives a unique two-dimensional random feature to embed the discrete states in a vector space for the input layer. Features are drawn from a normal distribution with zero mean and unit covariance.

In Figure 2 we visualise convergence with the distance of the accumulation point $W^*$ to all iterates $W^{(k)}$ as well as by the corresponding NMSBE. We use the last iterate as $W^*$ and measure the distance by extending the Frobenius norm of matrices to collections of matrices as $\|W^{(k)} - W^*\|_F^2 := \sum_{l=1}^L \|W_{l}^{(k)} - W_{l}^*\|_F^2$.

It is clear from Figure 2a that the AN algorithm converges locally quadratically fast to a minimiser. From Figure 2b we conclude that the MLP is close to the ground truth value function as the NMSBE becomes negligibly small. Both graphs together imply that the approximated Hessian is exact close to $W^*$ and additionally that its rank is full. Due to over-parametrisation, convergence to suboptimal local minima does not happen.
6 Experiments in Continuous State Spaces

For our empirical investigation of the algorithm we first outline the experimental setup. Second, we test the convergence behaviour in continuous state spaces. We compare Residual Gradients with Semi-Gradients and quantify the influence of second-order optimisation. Next, we explore the generalisation capabilities of an MLP when trained with a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm by evaluating the NMSBE on unseen states outside of the training set. Finally, we address the application of a second-order Residual Gradient algorithm in full Policy Iteration and test it in a continuous control problem.

6.1 Experimental Setup

We investigate the application of a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm for Policy Evaluation in finite dimensional and bounded Euclidean state spaces. We provide empirical results for the performance of the Approximated Newton’s algorithm by minimising the objective of Equation (31) in several different scenarios:

1. Convergence of Policy Evaluation by evaluating the value function of a fixed policy
2. Generalisation Capabilities by characterising the influence of different MLP architectures on the generalisation performance
3. Full Policy Iteration by combining Policy Evaluation and Q-factors to improve iteratively an initial policy

Investigating the performance of the algorithm with generalisation in mind is both interesting and important due to still-unexplainable capabilities of neural networks [Lawrence et al., 1997, Zhang et al., 2017, Neyshabur et al., 2017]. Testing in a full Policy Iteration setting is important for the general applicability of a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm.

In our Policy Evaluation experiments, except for generalisation, we compare the cases of whether or not considering derivatives of the TD-target. This means we compare Semi-Gradient and Residual Gradient formulations for both first and second order optimisation methods.

For the experiments, we use the Mountain Car [Moore, 1990] and the Cart Pole control problems [Barto et al., 1983] as environments. These two are classic deterministic Reinforcement Learning benchmarks with a typical continuous state space and a manageable complexity that allows for an extensive investigation and visualisation. More specifically, we employ the MountainCar-v0 of the OpenAI Gym package [Brockman et al., 2016], and include important changes to the environment to obtain infinite horizon problems. First, we replace the built-in constant reward function, which assigns independently of the state, action and successor state to any transition the punishment $-1$, with a function that rewards being in a goal region by not giving punishments in that area. We define the goal region as $x > 0.5$, where $x$ denotes the position of the car. Second, once the car enters the goal region we teleport it back to a starting state. These two adjustments allow us to use the environment in a non-episodic fashion and, thereby, establish the required formulation of the MDP to work with uniformly sampled state transitions. Without these adjustments ergodicity cannot be present and the objective would not be well-defined. Similarly, the CartPole-v1 environment of OpenAI Gym receives a new non-constant reward and a new transition. Instead of rewarding every step with $+1$, including those states which are considered to be a failure because the pole fell over or the cart left the allowed range, we only punish with $-1$ reward the transition into those failure states. Otherwise, the reward is zero. By adding connections from terminal region to the start state, we convert the episodic formulation of the balancing task and restore also here an infinite horizon MDP. We set the discount factor for all environments to $\gamma = 0.99$ if not otherwise stated.

6.2 Empirical Convergence Analysis

Setting We first make use of the Mountain Car problem, which has a continuous state space and discrete actions, and investigate the performance when evaluating a predefined policy. The complexity and dimensionality of the problem is manageable, which enables us to estimate the ground truth value function with Monte Carlo methods based on a fine grained two-dimensional grid. Thus, we can evaluate accurately the performance of tested algorithms against the ground truth. The policy, whose value function is being evaluated, is fixed to accelerate the car in the direction of the current velocity.

We investigate the performance of the algorithm under the influence of three variants: ignoring TD targets in derivatives, using Hessian based optimisation and varying learning rates. We use four different learning rates $\alpha \in \{10^0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}\}$ and study all 16 combinations.

For all tests, we adopt the batch learning scenario. Specifically, we use as the training set 100 transition tuples $(s, r, s')$ collected in prior with the fixed policy. States $s$ are sampled uniformly from $S$. Executing the action provided by the
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Figure 3: The NMSBE as defined in Equation (31) plotted over time for all tested optimisation approaches. Figure a) to d) represent considered learning rates $\alpha \in \{10^0, 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}\}$. A Residual Gradient formulation combined with Hessian based optimisation outperforms Semi-Gradient algorithms for all learning rates and stays convergent, even for large values of $\alpha$. First-order only Residual Gradient algorithms demonstrate the reported slow convergence.

Results We observe that a Semi-Gradient algorithm always diverges for extremely large step sizes as shown in Figure 3a with $\alpha = 1$. For smaller step sizes $\alpha \in \{10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}\}$ as shown in Figures 3b, 3c and 3d a Semi-Gradient algorithm can converge if using first-order optimisation. Extending it to second-order gradient descent causes it to diverge sooner or later for all step sizes. For small enough learning rates, e.g. $\alpha = 10^{-3}$, second-order Semi-Gradient additionally achieves only the same final NMSBE as first-order Residual Gradient methods, indicating
that the computation for the approximated Semi-Hessian is obsolete. However, we want to point out that the resulting solution of Policy Evaluation is not good compared to other possible outcomes.

Figures 3b and 3c show that first-order gradient descent algorithms with and without ignoring the dependency of the gradient on the TD target perform consistently and achieve almost identical final errors. Looking at the descent behaviour, we can confirm the slow convergence issue of a Residual Gradient formulation. From Figure 3d it becomes clear that first-order Semi-Gradient descent combined with carefully selected learning rates $\alpha \in \{10^{-2}, 10^{-3}\}$ can achieve an equal or even lower final error, further explaining its popularity over Residual Gradients.

In contrast stands the Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm, i.e., a Gauss Newton algorithm combined with complete derivatives of the NMSBE. This algorithm works well with all learning rates, in particular this algorithm works with large learning rates as it can be seen in Figures 3a and 3b. Even for extremely large learning rates $\alpha = 1$ convergence is not a problem. Despite strong initial numerical problems, all repetitions arrive at a sufficiently small NMSBE over time. For all learning rates, the final value for the NMSBE is orders of magnitude smaller than that of other approaches. In other words, building the derivatives of the TD target w.r.t. to the parameters and using (approximate) second-order information of the NMSBE function are important ingredients for designing and implementing efficient NN-VFA algorithms. Modifying the descent direction based on the curvature is crucial to achieve good performance. This insight matches also the empirical evidence that when combining Semi-Gradient algorithms with annealing schemes for learning rates even better performance can be obtained [Gronauer and Gottwald, 2021].

**Computational concerns** A severe burden of Newton-like algorithms is the computational complexity involved in the Hessian, especially since the Gauss Newton approximation involves a full sized and dense matrix. In this experiment, first-order only methods require roughly 8.4 and 7.6 seconds on average for $10^4$ iterations of Semi- and Residual Gradients, respectively. Calculating the Hessian and Newton’s direction $^7$ increases the run time to 22.4 and 48.5 seconds, respectively. These execution times are not supposed to be accurate and reproducible measurements, but should reveal only the overall trend. The numbers imply that within $10^3$ steps of a first-order Residual Gradient method only around 1500 iterations of a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm can be performed on our computers. However, the performance gain in terms of convergence speed and overall lower error, as seen in Figure 3b or Figure 3c, still justifies the additional computational effort. A second-order algorithm is in total faster than first-order only methods, because far less iterations are required to reach an already significantly smaller error. The performance could be further enhanced if we would make use of concepts such as the Levenberg-Marquardt heuristic or put additional effort in hyper parameter tuning.

### 6.3 Generalisation Capabilities of MLPs

As mentioned earlier in the critical point analysis, working with finite exact approximators based on $N$ samples from a continuous state space renders generalisation an important topic. Since the value function approximator can only be trained to fit a finite set of samples exactly, the generalisation capabilities of an MLP for states in between the collected training samples are essential to RL and worth further investigation. Thus, we evaluate an approximated value function, trained to fit a finite set of samples exactly, the generalisation capabilities of an MLP for states in between the collected continuous state space renders generalisation an important topic. Since the value function approximator can only be enhanced if we would make use of concepts such as the Levenberg-Marquardt heuristic or put additional effort in hyper parameter tuning.

#### 6.3.1 Single Architecture

**Setting** We start with a single architecture and vary the amount of training samples. More specifically, we consider again the MLP $F(2, 10, 10, 1)$ with learning rate $\alpha = 10^{-2}$ and Bend-Id activation function. For the initialisation we use a uniform distribution in the interval $[-1, 1]$. For this experiment, we vary the number of training samples $N$ non-uniformly between 25 and 2000 and compute the NMSBE for a separated test set comprised of $25 \cdot 10^4$ states arranged on a grid. Again, we repeat for each $N$ the training of MLPs 25 times and visualise the NMSBE as box-plots in Figure 4a for the training data and in Figure 4b for the held-out test set.

**Results** It is clear that at $N = 2000$ the training process is always successful with almost ignorable variance. While decreasing the number of randomly placed training samples down to $N = 300$, the mean error becomes slightly larger with more pronounced variances. Furthermore, only poor results are observed at $N = 25$. Here, the MLP is able to fit the training data exactly, but the test error indicates that this is no longer a valid solution.

We observe for the test error that the variance when using $N = 150$ samples is smaller than that of its direct neighbours. Simultaneously, there is a sharp reduction in the variance for training errors starting at $N = 125$. Since these numbers of samples are almost identical or at least close to the number of parameters in the network ($N_{net} = 151$) this could be a

---

$^7$using Eigen’s Householder QR-decomposition when linked against OpenBlas and OpenLapack
Numerical confirmation of the theoretical condition as derived earlier. However, we admit that an empirical verification is rather involved. In particular, we require $N$ unique samples in the training set, but there is no practical way to determine, whether those $N$ collected samples are “sufficiently unique”.

When evaluating the approximated value function with smallest test error for $N = 25$ samples visually, i.e., see Figure 5b, one can spot a plateau located at around $-100$ expected discounted reward. This is exactly the solution to Bellman’s equation or, more precisely, to the loss as defined in Equation (31) if every transition would yield $-1$ reward. We conclude that those scarce samples do not allow the reward information to flow and hence we have solved implicitly a different MDP. By comparing the ground truth value function as shown in Figure 5a, which we obtain by running rollouts from every grid state in the test set, to other value functions learned with different sample sizes as shown in Figures 5c to 5f, we see that training with even only 50 samples starts to fit the shape of the ground truth value function in the correct range. Hence, this experiment suggests that for problems with a continuous state space, NN-VFA methods can still perform well with a relatively small number of sampled interactions.

6.3.2 Various Architectures

Setting It is widely believed that the architecture of an MLP has an important influence on its generalisation performance, but the exact impact is still unclear. Therefore, we train several MLPs with different architectures and a varying number of samples in the same scenario as before. We refer to the axis labels in Figure 6 for concrete choices of architectures and the values of $N$. Due to the huge amount of computation involved in deeper networks with large sample sizes, we reduce the number of repetitions from 25 to ten. We provide the mean test and training error as
Results

In the following, we look separately at training and testing errors and start with the training errors, i.e., the contour plots in Figure 6 with logarithmic scale \( Z = \log_{10}(E) \) where \( E \) is the actual error and \( Z \) its plotted value. This additional processing step is required to reveal the detailed structure of the surface.

Next, we address the testing error as shown in the right column of Figure 6. For larger MLPs, where the condition \( N_{\text{net}} \approx N \) is available for large values of \( N \), we observe that the region with smallest test error extends always to the condition line. This happens e.g. for the MLP \( F(2, 15 \times 3, 1) \) at \( N = 500 \) or for \( F(2, 20 \times 3, 1) \) at \( N = 900 \). We see that larger MLPs work more predictable where smaller MLPs can achieve the smallest test error for several training set sizes \( N \) with higher errors in between. In other words, large MLPs do not necessarily increase the threshold of required samples for good performance in our experiment. Small MLPs need samples in a similar scale as the largest MLPs to achieve the smallest test error. Even those MLPs, which one would consider as tiny such as \( F(2, 6 \times 3, 1) \), also achieve the smallest test error with the same amount of samples. Thus, if for small MLPs the condition \( N_{\text{net}} > N \) is far from being realistic, the well-known statement “the more data the better” applies. We need a factor of ten more training data than adjustable parameters. In summary, large MLPs concentrate the region with extreme values for the test errors and amplify the effect of the sample size. For \( N \to 50 \) the largest architectures produces out of all runs the highest test
Figure 6: The training and test error of different MLP architectures (ordinate) for various sample sizes $N$ (abscissa). We use a logarithmic scale $Z = \log_{10}(E)$, where $E$ is the original error and $Z$ its plotted value. Red indicates higher errors. In all plots the solid line represents the condition $N_{\text{net}} = N$. Left column: Training error. Right column: Test error. For training errors one can see that shape and position of isolines follow roughly the condition $N_{\text{net}} = N$. Lower training error as well as the case of exact fitting happens to the upper left of the black solid line, confirming our considerations from Section 4. The testing errors reveal that, at least for MLPs with a large number of parameters, the region with smallest test error reaches close to the condition $N_{\text{net}} = N$. However, for all networks the well-known rule “the more data the better” applies, presumably because not all sample states are far apart.
We test different sample sizes $N$ and plot the expected reward obtained by performing roll-outs from 5 repetitions. From left to right we vary the number of sampled states. In each Figure the number of Policy Evaluation iterations is changed. In the top row Policy Evaluation starts with a new MLP in every sweep. For the bottom row we reuse the last evaluation of the previous sweep as initialisation for the current one. Sequentially improving policies are visible, especially when reusing the MLP, however, there is no clear trend for the required number of samples or the optimal amount of Policy Evaluation iterations. Without second-order optimisation or when using Semi-Gradients Policy Iteration did not work at all.

error. Hence, by shrinking the amount of parameters in an MLP such that $N_{net} \approx N$ applies again one can reduce the test error without changing the amount of data. If $N \rightarrow 1000$ one has to employ MLPs with a comparable amount of parameters such that the area with smallest test error is present. These MLPs then possess highest generalisation performance out of all architectures.

### 6.4 Policy Iteration

**Setting** For the final experiment we change the environment to *Cart Pole* and test our approach in a Policy Iteration setting. For that purpose we use Q-factors instead of $V_\pi(s)$ and use a greedily induced policy as defined in Equation (7). To represent Q-factors the network input consists of the continuous state and the discrete action index, hence MLPs must have $K + 1$ units in the input layer. More specifically, we use the MLP $\mathcal{F}(5, 10, 10, 1)$ with $N_{net} = 181$ parameters to approximate the Q-function.

We test different sample sizes $N \in \{100, 181, 300, 500\}$, i.e., the number of states sampled before every Policy Evaluation, and investigate different amounts of policy evaluation steps $i \in \{500, 1500, 2500, 3500, 4500\}$, i.e., the number of descent steps. Finally, we also compare the effect of reusing the last parameters of the previous Policy Evaluation step as initialisation for the current one and refer to this by transient and persistent as in [Siguad and Stulp, 2019].

We measure the performance of a policy by performing ten rollouts with each 500 steps after every improvement step and combine the rollouts as mean, minimal and maximal value. Furthermore, we repeat every experiment five times such that we can provide averages of expected returns at each sweep as a summarising impression of the Policy Iteration processes. Shaded areas represent the mean of all individual spreads of discounted returns. Our results are available in Figure 7.

**Results** Since experiments with Semi-Gradients diverged for both first and second order descent algorithms and a first-order Residual Gradient formulation did not show improving policies over time we can only provide results for the Gauss Newton Residual Gradient formulation. Thus, this experiment already implies that second-order information is essential to enable and stabilise Policy Iteration in continuous problems. It also shows that in order to get the benefits of second-order approaches, the TD target cannot be ignored during the computation of differential maps.
Sequentially improving policies are visible in most plots. Starting with a fresh MLP for each evaluation increases the number of sample states to see a more pronounced improvement over time. When using persistent evaluations, i.e., reusing the MLP parameters corresponding to the last policy, clear improvements are visible also for small sample sizes. Furthermore, the maximum achieved performance is higher than for transient sweeps.

In all graphs of Figure 7, it is hard to find a clear trend for the required number of samples or the optimal amount of Policy Evaluation iterations. As an example, in Figure 7d both $i = 1500$ and $i = 4500$ have a similar high performance around sweep 175. In Figure 7e, using only $N = 100$ samples result for $i = 3500$ reliably in significant better performing policies than when increasing the amount of Policy Evaluation steps to $i = 4500$.

The fact that for $N = 181 = N_{net}$ samples and when using persistent evaluations of policies all repetitions of the experiment come up with good performing policies for the largest amount of Policy Evaluation steps is worth further investigation. But based on our currently available experimental results we cannot make reliable statements at this point. We can only hypothesise why this chaotic behaviour is present. As we are using an approximate Policy Iteration algorithm due to the function approximation, there are two sources of errors: inaccurate Policy Evaluation and erroneous Policy Improvement. First, different than typical settings where samples come from an exploration mechanism, we select samples uniformly distributed in the whole state space. Thus, our optimisation problem does not have a high resolution focused around at the visited parts of the state space but tries to find a global solution, which is obviously a more challenging problem. Second, we make us of discrete actions. This means, we ask a smooth function approximation architecture to model jumps in the value function, which must occur for example around the balancing point of the pole. Thus, our next step for future work is to include continuous action spaces in our analysis.

7 Conclusion

RL with NN-VFA has become one of the most powerful RL paradigms in both research and application in the recent years. Despite the superior performance, its training and convergence analysis remains challenging due to an incomplete theoretical understanding how MLPs affect the common RL setting. In particular, most previous theoretical analysis of this problem approaches the challenge from the perspective of minimising Mean Squared Projected Bellman Error which is incompatible with recent successful applications.

Our work bridges this gap with a concise critical point analysis of the NMSBE when using MLPs. We address both the discrete and continuous state space setting for a Residual Gradient formulation, i.e., using the complete gradient of the NMSBE. We derive conditions on MLPs to ensure a proper behaviour of the optimisation procedure. Over-parametrisation of the MLP is required next to some design principles for MLPs to eliminate suboptimal local minima. Furthermore, full rankness of the differential maps of the MLP enable pleasing convergence properties of gradient descent algorithms. Our analysis unveils the possibility to utilise approximated second-order information of the cost function, resulting in an efficient Approximate Newton’s method. As part of our work, we also see, why Multi-step Lookahead can help Semi-Gradient algorithms. As the MLP in the TD target gets multiplied with the discount factor with larger powers the effect of ignoring the dependency vanishes naturally.

In several experiments, we investigate empirically the minimisation of the NMSBE using a Gauss Newton Residual Gradient algorithm. First, we ensure the correctness of the approximated Hessian close to critical points by demonstrating quadratic convergence on an adapted version of Baird’s Seven State Star Problem.

Next, in continuous state space problems, we provide consistent and stable convergence properties of Residual Gradient algorithms combined with second-order information for a wide range of learning rates. Semi-Gradient algorithms are observed to diverge except for some learning rates. Carefully selecting the learning rate is thus important. First-order only Residual Gradients are shown to converge slowly, confirming the known behaviour which explains their unpopularity. Using an approximated Hessian can solve these issues and is essential to develop stable and efficient RL algorithms, which also achieve better final errors. Our experiments also serve as proof of concept that with modern computer systems second-order optimisation is a possible approach in Reinforcement Learning applications.

Furthermore, we investigate the generalisation capabilities of MLPs when training with approximated second-order Residual Gradient algorithms. Training and test errors follow our theoretical insights, meaning that the number of parameters should be synchronised with the number of training samples. We find that deeper architectures do not necessarily increase the number of samples required for good performance, they rather amplify the extreme cases for errors.

Finally, we demonstrate that the application of Residual Gradient methods can work in a full Policy Iteration setting. A well performing policy can be learned by alternating between Policy Evaluation and Policy Improvement, starting from a random one. However, our empirical findings did not reveal trends on the number of samples or Policy Evaluation steps needed. Our hypothesis is that the discrete action space stands in conflict with the capabilities of a smooth function approximation architecture to model jumps in the value function.
approximators such as MLPs. Solving the RL task involves representing jumps in the value function, which might not be possible. Hence, including a continuous action space in our analysis is an important next step for our future work.

In conclusion, considering derivatives of the TD target as done in Residual Gradient algorithms allows us to perform a sophisticated analysis and also provides the foundation for reliable RL algorithms.
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A Step by Step Calculations

Differential map of error function  For the error function \( E : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) and some \( F \in \mathbb{R}^K \) we have
\[
E(F) = \frac{1}{2} \left( F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F) \right)^T \Xi \left( F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F) \right)
\]
\[
DE(F)[h] = \left[ \frac{d}{dt} \right]_{t=0} \left[ \left( (F + th) - P_\pi (R + \gamma (F + th)) \right)^T \Xi \left( (F + th) - P_\pi (R + \gamma (F + th)) \right) \right]
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( h - P_\pi \gamma h \right)^T \Xi \left( (F + th) - P_\pi (R + \gamma (F + th)) \right) \right.
\]
\[
\left. + \left( (F + th) - P_\pi (R + \gamma (F + th)) \right)^T \Xi \left( h - P_\pi \gamma h \right) \right]_{t=0}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( h - P_\pi \gamma h \right)^T \Xi \left( F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F) \right) + \left( F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F) \right)^T \Xi \left( h - P_\pi \gamma h \right) \right]
\]
\[
= \left( F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F) \right)^T \Xi \left( I_K - \gamma P_\pi \right) h.
\]
Thus, according to Riesz, the gradient is
\[
\nabla_F E(F) = \left( (F - P_\pi (R + \gamma F))^T \Xi (I_K - \gamma P_\pi) \right)^T,
\]

Differential map of MLP  Consider an MLP \( f \in \mathcal{F}(n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_{L-1}, n_L) \) and an input \( s \in S \). To calculate the differential map of \( f \) for \( s \) at the point \( \mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{W} \) and a direction \( \mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{W} \) first start with a single layer \( l \) of the MLP. We have
\[
D_{W_l} f(\mathbf{W}, s)[H_l] = D_2 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1}) \circ \cdots \circ D_2 \Lambda_{l+1}(W_{l+1}, \phi_l) \circ D_1 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})[H_l],
\]
where \( D_1 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})[H_l] \) and \( D_2 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})[h_{l-1}] \) refer to the derivative of layer mapping \( \Lambda_l \) with respect to the first and second argument, respectively. For the layer definition in Equation (17) we obtain
\[
D_1 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})[H_l] = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \left[ \sigma \left( (W_{l,k} + t \cdot H_{l,k})^T \frac{\phi_{l-1}}{1} \right) \right] = \left. \delta(\cdots) H_{l,k}^T \frac{\phi_{l-1}}{1} \right|_{t=0}
\]
\[
= \text{diag} \left( \frac{\phi_l}{1} \right) H_l^T \frac{\phi_{l-1}}{1} =: \Sigma_l \cdot H_l^T \cdot \phi_{l-1}
\]
\[
D_2 \Lambda_l(W_l, \phi_{l-1})[h_{l-1}] = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \left[ \sigma \left( W_l^T \frac{\phi_{l-1}}{1} + t \cdot [h_{l-1} 0] \right) \right] = \left. \delta(\cdots) W_l^T \frac{h_{l-1}}{0} \right|_{t=0}
\]
\[
= \text{diag} \left( \frac{\phi_l}{1} \right) W_l^T \frac{h_{l-1}}{0} =: \Sigma_l \cdot \bar{W}_l^T \cdot h_{l-1}
\]
where \( \Sigma_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l \times n_l} \) is a diagonal matrix with its entries being the derivatives of the activation function with respect to the input, i.e., \( \phi_l \) containing \( \delta(\cdots) \) for all units in layer \( l \). The input to \( \phi_l \) is the unmodified output \( \phi_{l-1} \) of the truncated MLP. By writing \( \bar{W} \) we indicate that the last row is cut off due to the multiplication by zero and \( \bar{\phi} \) shows that the layer output is extended with an additional 1. This resembles homogenous coordinates as they are used with the special Euclidean group SE(3) for computer vision applications. Inserting these parts yields for the differential map
\[
D_{W_l} f(\mathbf{W}, s)[H_l] = \Sigma_L \bar{W}_L^T \cdot \Sigma_{L-1} \bar{W}_{L-1}^T \cdots \Sigma_{l+1} \bar{W}_{l+1}^T \cdot \Sigma_l H_l^T \cdot \phi_{l-1}.
\]
To shorten this expression let us construct a sequence of matrices for all \( l = L - 1, \ldots, 1 \) as
\[
\Psi_l := \Sigma_l W_{l+1} \psi_{l+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l \times n_L},
\]
with \( \psi_L \equiv 1 \) due to the activation function in the last layer being the identity function. Now we can write compactly
\[
D_{W_l} f(\mathbf{W}, s)[H_l] = \Psi_l^T H_l^T \phi_{l-1}.
\]
To arrive at the expression shown in the paper consider a matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) and a compatible column vector \( b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1} \). When denoting by \( A_1, \ldots, A_m \) the \( m \) columns of \( A \) one can show by straightforward computation the identity

\[
A^T \cdot b = \begin{bmatrix} A_1^T b \\ \vdots \\ A_m^T b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b^T A_1 \\ \vdots \\ b^T A_m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{bmatrix} = (I_{m \times m} \otimes b^T) \cdot \text{vec}(A).
\]

Setting \( A = H_i \) and \( b = \phi_{l-1} \), we get

\[
D_{W_i} f(W, s)[H_i] = \Psi_i^T (I_{n_l} \otimes \phi_{l-1}) \text{vec}(H_i).
\]

Finally, we can combine the expressions for all layers and produce the full differential map with respect to all parameters

\[
D_W f(W, s)[H] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Psi_1^T (I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_0) \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_L^T (I_{n_l} \otimes \phi_L^{-1}) \end{array} \right] \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{vec}(H_1) \\ \vdots \\ \text{vec}(H_L) \end{array} \right],
\]

where the MLP input \( \phi_0 \) is just the input \( s \). For the application in our work we always have \( n_L = 1 \) because the value function maps to a scalar value. Using all \( N \) inputs at once we arrive at the expression \( G(W) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n_l \times N_{\text{net}}} \) as shown in Equation (24)

\[
D_W F(W)[H] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_{0}^{(1)} \right)^T \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_l} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} \right)^T \end{array} \right] \cdot \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{vec}(H_1) \\ \vdots \\ \text{vec}(H_L) \end{array} \right],
\]

where \( \Psi_i \) indicates that the \( i \)-th layer outputs \( \phi_i \) arise from the \( i \)-th state in the input layer.

**Definition of \( \tilde{G}(W) \)**  
Equation (35) originates directly from the difference of \( G(W) \) and \( G'(W) \). We have

\[
\tilde{G}(W) = G(W) - \gamma G'(W)
\]

\[
= \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_{0}^{(1)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} \right)^T \\ \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_{0}^{(N)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} \right)^T \end{array} \right] - \gamma \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_{0}^{(1)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} \right)^T \\ \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \phi_{0}^{(N)} \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} \right)^T \end{array} \right]
\]

\[
= \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \left( \phi_{0}^{(1)} - \gamma \phi_{0}^{(1)} \right) \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \left( \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} - \gamma \phi_{L-1}^{(1)} \right) \right)^T \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Psi_1^T \left( I_{n_1} \otimes \left( \phi_{0}^{(N)} - \gamma \phi_{0}^{(N)} \right) \right)^T & \cdots & \Psi_L^T \left( I_{n_L} \otimes \left( \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} - \gamma \phi_{L-1}^{(N)} \right) \right)^T \end{array} \right],
\]

because the Kronecker product is bilinear with respect to matrix addition.

**B Raw Data**

To emphasize the difficulty in visualising the results of our Policy Iteration experiment we provide here the raw output of all five individual repetitions for \( N = 100 \) samples with \( i = 3500 \) Policy Evaluations steps when using the persistent setting.
All repetitions of the roll-outs per run produce reliably similar discounted returns, but running again the whole experiment produces varying performance curves. Unfortunately, these curves can be rather dissimilar. Thus, by averaging these curves, we can highlight the trend for the performance over time in the overall experiment and produce the plots shown in Figure 7.