

Dynamic mean field programming

George Stamatescu

School of Computer Science

University of Adelaide

Adelaide, SA 5001

george.stamatescu@adelaide.edu.au

Abstract

A dynamic mean field theory is developed for model based Bayesian reinforcement learning in the large state space limit. In an analogy with the statistical physics of disordered systems, the transition probabilities are interpreted as couplings, and value functions as deterministic spins, and thus the sampled transition probabilities are considered to be quenched random variables. The results reveal that, under standard assumptions, the posterior over Q-values is asymptotically independent and Gaussian across state-action pairs, for infinite horizon problems. The finite horizon case exhibits the same behaviour for all state-actions pairs at each time but has an additional correlation across time, for each state-action pair. The results also hold for policy evaluation. The Gaussian statistics can be computed from a set of coupled mean field equations derived from the Bellman equation, which we call dynamic mean field programming (DMFP). For Q-value iteration, approximate equations are obtained by appealing to extreme value theory, and closed form expressions are found in the independent and identically distributed case. The Lyapunov stability of these closed form equations is studied.

1 Introduction

An agent interacting with a Markov decision process (MDP) with unknown parameters faces the problem of both estimating these parameters and determining a control strategy. The question is how to use samples efficiently to balance the two goals. Here, we assume both the rewards and transition probabilities are unknown to the agent. Two popular approaches to sample efficient learning in unknown MDP environments are based on Bayesian and frequentist approaches to estimation in so-called bandit problems: Thompson or posterior sampling and “optimism in the face of uncertainty” Osband and Van Roy [2017], Lattimore and Szepesvári [2020]. Both approaches continually update the estimates or beliefs for the MDP parameters, typically at the start of episodes of interaction.

In this paper we restrict our attention to the Bayesian case and consider in particular the discounted infinite horizon problem, though we argue that our results hold for all horizons. Under posterior sampling for reinforcement learning (PSRL) Osband and Van Roy [2017], an agent updates the posterior over parameters at the end of each interaction or episode, and a sample is drawn from this distribution. From such samples, the contraction property of Bellman’s optimality equation allows the estimation of a fixed point for the Q-value via iteration of this equation. A policy can then be derived by acting greedily with respect to the Q-values, and thus the agent acts as if the sampled MDP is reality. Remarkably, this approach balances exploration and exploitation, attaining sub-linear Bayesian regret Osband and Van Roy [2017].

From the Bayesian perspective the optimal Q-values are random variables, by virtue of the rewards and transition probabilities being random variables. It is often written that since the optimal Q-values depend on these parameters and each other in a complex non-linear manner via the Bellman equation, this then makes exact calculation of the posterior over Q-values impossible. The results in this paper

reveal that the situation is not so dire, provided we study systems with large state spaces. Under this setting we obtain, via methods from statistical physics, results akin to the central limit theorem.

1.1 Posterior sampling for RL as a disordered dynamical system

In the language of statistical physics, we interpret value iteration for a sampled MDP as a deterministic dynamical system subject to *quenched disorder* Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018]. The disorder in this context arises from the sampled transition probabilities and rewards, \tilde{P} and \tilde{r} , which in physicists’ language are termed quenched random variables. This interpretation can be understood from an analogy with the spin glass literature of statistical physics Castellani and Cavagna [2005], or equivalently random recurrent neural networks Advani et al. [2013]. In the spin glass language, the transition probabilities represent couplings and the Q-value functions represent the local fields for deterministic spins. In neural networks these are weights and activation inputs for neurons, respectively.

Inspired by this analogy we study Q-value iteration under Bayesian model uncertainty, in the large state space limit, using a dynamic mean field theory. The fundamental theoretical result of the paper is that asymptotically the posterior distribution over optimal Q-values is factorises over state-action pairs and, under some standard assumptions, is Gaussian. More specifically, in the infinite horizon setting we study the posterior over the iterates of Q-value iteration and derive dynamic mean field equations which describe a Gaussian process over iterates where the Q-values are independent across state-action pairs but each have a correlation across iterates. The fixed point of the equations produce the statistics for the posterior over the optimal Q-values. The finite horizon case is identical to the theory for Q-value iterates over a finite number of iterations. We refer to the computation of these statistics as dynamic mean field programming (DMFP).

We are able to systematically derive this result by developing a dynamic mean field theory in the spirit of Sompolinsky et al. [1988], originally derived for random recurrent neural networks, despite several differences in the reinforcement learning case. The basis of the theory is the generating functional or path integral formalism for disordered systems. A key assumption is that a moment generating function defined for Q-value iterates is a “self-averaging” quantity, meaning that it concentrates in measure on its average. Under this assumption, from the disorder averaged generating function one can calculate statistics for a typical realisation of the system. Leveraging a central limit theorem for linear combinations of Dirichlet random vectors Matsunawa [1985], we are able to average a generating functional for the Q-value iterates. We then derive a saddle point approximation and thus establish the asymptotic independence and Gaussian behaviour of the Q-values.

In order to compute the DMFP solution we derive the approximate equations using extreme value theory, whose accuracy improves with increasing action space size. In the i.i.d case, which corresponds to having identical priors at the start of learning, we find closed form expressions for the mean field equations. We study the stability of the closed form approximations in the infinite horizon setting. We find the maximum Lyapunov exponent is the logarithm of the discount factor, implying the system is stable, which one might expect from the contraction property of the underlying Bellman equations. In the general case, during learning, we resort to numerical approximations based on extreme value theory. We provide simulation evidence in support of the results, confirming the Gaussian process behaviour and the accuracy of the approximate mean field equations. We note that our results also hold for policy evaluation in the Bayesian setting.

1.2 Significance and related work

We anticipate that the approach and theoretical results presented here will stimulate new research into reinforcement learning with large state spaces. To the best of our knowledge, this asymptotic limit and its implications for the posterior over Q-value functions has not been studied. Arguably, it is problems with large state spaces which pose the greatest challenge.

A recent line of work from O’Donoghue has applied an epistemic risk-seeking approach to develop Bayesian reinforcement learning with regret guarantees in finite horizon problems O’Donoghue [2018] O’Donoghue et al. [2020]. This approach is motivated by the intractability for both computing posteriors for value functions and in sampling posteriors over MDP model parameters. The work essentially bounds an object related to the cumulant generating function of the posterior over Q-values. The bounds are restricted to the finite horizon case, or the case where the MDP is a directed acyclic

graph. In contrast, the mean field result is exact in the large system limit and applies to general infinite horizon problems, where cycles may be present. Indeed, it is cycles which produce statistical dependencies between Q-values which we show vanish in the large system limit. Our theory may also be relevant to risk sensitive approaches since it reveals that the cumulant generating function for Q-values is that of a Gaussian, and we also provide methods for calculating its moments. Earlier work has attempted to approximate the posterior variance for Q-values using bounds O’Donoghue et al. [2018]. Similarly, Osband and Van Roy [2017] use a bound on the posterior variance to heuristically propose a Gaussian approximation for posterior sampling. In all cases the bounds may be loose.

More generally, we hope the current paper stimulates new interactions between statistical physics and reinforcement learning. To date, there has been little contact. This hope is founded on successful interaction between statistical physics and other research fields. Previously, dynamic mean field theory Sompolinsky et al. [1988] has been applied to theoretical neuroscience, and more recently was used to develop initialisation theory for deep neural networks Poole et al. [2016], Schoenholz et al..

1.3 Outline

The paper proceeds as follows. We introduce our notation for Bayesian reinforcement learning in section 2. In section 3 we present the basic analogy between random neural networks and Bayesian reinforcement learning. We also provide a brief overview of mean field theory as encountered in machine learning, placing dynamic mean field theory in the broader gamut. In section 4 we present the dynamic mean field programming (DMFP) equations. We describe a naive but intuitive derivation for the dynamic mean field equations, and then derive approximate computations based on extreme value theory. We present chiefly the discounted infinite horizon case, since the finite horizon and other settings follow the same form. In the i.i.d case we establish the Lyapunov stability of the approximate DMFP equations. Finally, in section 5 we develop the dynamic mean field theory for RL, which provides a systematic derivation of the DMFP equations. We discuss the results in section 7.

2 Bayesian reinforcement learning

We introduce our notation here for Markov decision processes (MDPs) and Bayesian reinforcement learning in the discounted infinite horizon setting. The finite horizon theory will be detailed in the appendix. We consider an infinite horizon, discounted MDP $M = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, r, \beta)$, to be specified by a state space \mathcal{S} , an action space \mathcal{A} , and we denote the size of $|\mathcal{S}| = N$; a transition function $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$, where $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$ the probability simplex and we say $P_{s'|sa}$ is the probability of transitioning into state s' upon taking action a in state s ; a reward function $r : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, denoted r_{sa} and assumed to be bounded and random with mean ρ_{sa} and finite variance, and a discount factor $\beta \in [0, 1)$, which defines an effective horizon for the problem.

A policy specifies a decision-making strategy. We restrict attention to the set of stationary policies $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. For a fixed policy and fixed starting state $s_0 = s$, we define the Q-value function $Q^\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the discounted sum of future rewards

$$Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta^t r_{s_t a_t} \mid \pi, s_0 = s, a_0 = a\right] \quad (2.1)$$

where expectation is with respect to the randomness of the trajectory, that is, the randomness in state transitions and π . Since r_{sa} is bounded, so are the Q-values. The solutions to the Bellman optimality equation are known to give the optimal Q-value function. In the case the parameters are known, we may use dynamic or linear programming methods to compute solutions. In the case that the MDP parameters are unknown an agent must balance exploration and exploitation. In the Bayesian approach it is common to model the transition probabilities as Dirichlet random vectors which are independent across state-action pairs, often referred to as the flat Dirichlet prior assumption, $P_{sa} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_{sa})$. with α_{sa} a vector of strictly positive real numbers, which here encapsulates the posterior statistics for the transition probabilities. This assumption, as we will discuss, is key for the mean field theory hold. We consider here that the mean rewards ρ_{sa} are either known or, if unknown, have Gaussian posteriors with mean and variance denoted $\mu_{\rho_{sa}}$ and $\sigma_{\rho_{sa}}^2$ respectively, as in Osband and Van Roy [2017]. This corresponds, for example, to having Gaussian “noise” on otherwise deterministic rewards. A common objective in Bayesian reinforcement learning is to design algorithms with low (ie. sub-linear) Bayesian regret.

3 An analogy between reinforcement learning and random neural networks

The analogy we work from is most clear when presenting side by side the equations for Q-value iteration for the discounted infinite horizon problem and random recurrent neural networks. Denote $x_i(t)$ as neurons at time t , θ_i as thresholds, weights (or couplings) J_{ij} are here assumed to be Gaussian and i.i.d and we denote $\phi(\cdot)$ as a non-linearity, for example $\tanh(\cdot)$. The equations are,

$$\text{Q-Value Iteration: } Q_{sa}^{n+1} = \rho_{sa} + \beta \sum_{s'} P_{s'|s,a} \max_{a'} Q_{s'a'}^n \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{Random Recurrent Neural Network: } x_i(t+1) = \theta_i + \sum_j J_{ij} \phi(x_j(t)) \quad (3.2)$$

By inspection, state-action pairs (sa) correspond to the site indices i in the neural network case. Thus each transition probability ‘‘couples’’ a Q-value to a set of other Q-values. The non-linearity $\phi(\cdot)$ is typically a smooth function or at least piece-wise linear, whereas the maximum function is neither. Couplings for neural networks are often taken as i.i.d and Gaussian, whereas the transition probabilities are drawn from Dirichlet distribution, and exhibit negative dependence. In order to obtain interesting limits, the mean and variance of the J_{ij} are set to scale as \bar{J}/N and σ_J^2/N respectively. In the MDP case, the couplings scale naturally as they sum to one. Remarkably, despite these differences, we are able to develop a dynamic mean field theory for Bayesian reinforcement learning.

3.1 Static and dynamic mean field theory

Mean field theory and statistical physics have been commonly encountered in machine learning within the context of variational Bayesian inference Wainwright et al. [2008]. The idea is that one attempts to approximate an intractable posterior distribution using a simpler one whose parameters may be computed using optimisation algorithms. This approach is borrowed from statistical physics, which can be recognised when interpreting the posterior of interest as a Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution for a system with a given Hamiltonian, an energy function which defines the true interactions between the variables of interest. The Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution describes a physical system in *thermal equilibrium*. This is often referred to as a ‘‘static’’ theory, which is not to say that such systems have no dynamics, but that equilibrium is the long-time limit to which appropriately defined dynamics relax towards. Dynamic theories study systems out of equilibrium, which in general may never relax towards a steady state.

Large deviations theory underlies any mean field theory Touchette [2009]. The principles essentially state that whilst the variables of interest may be dependent on each other, they are weakly dependent enough that as the system gets large we can ignore most interactions. In the static case, we say that there exists an *effective* Hamiltonian, with a simplified interaction ‘‘field’’ between the variables, such as each variable only depending on the mean of other variables. Disordered systems, such as spin glasses, are complex varieties of systems where the interactions between the spins are via random or quenched couplings.

A new point of contact between machine learning and a *dynamic* mean field theory of disordered systems recently occurred in a series of papers which has helped establish initialisation theory for deep learning Poole et al. [2016] Schoenholz et al.. Originally developed in a series of papers from Sompolinsky and collaborators Sompolinsky and Zippelius [1982] Sompolinsky et al. [1988], this theory applied to systems where the couplings between fluctuating or deterministic spins are random and asymmetric (or generally independent). The asymmetry implies that equilibrium is not guaranteed since Markov dynamics for the system do not satisfy detailed balance. Like static mean field theory, the idea in the dynamic case is to replace the local field for variables in the dynamical system with an effective field with simplified interactions. The results show that neurons are effectively subject to a Gaussian field, whose statistics are given by a self-consistent, time-dependent mean field equations. We propose the same approach in the Bayesian reinforcement learning setting.

4 Dynamic mean field programming

In this section we present the dynamic mean field equations for Q-value iteration, which we call dynamic mean field programming (DMFP). In order to provide some intuition about the results, we

present the naive derivation based on independence assumptions that are derived via a generating functional approach in section 5. We develop approximations using extreme value theory to compute the solutions. Finally, we establish the Lyapunov stability of the equations in the i.i.d case, where extreme value theory provides closed form approximations.

4.1 A naive derivation

The naive approach to deriving dynamic mean field equations is based first on an assumption of independence across all variables within Q-value iteration, originally developed in the neural network context Amari [1972]. More specifically, with \perp denoting statistical independence, the assumptions are,

$$Q_{sa}^n \perp \rho_{s'a'}, \quad Q_{sa}^n \perp P_{s',a'}, \quad Q_{sa}^n \perp Q_{s'a'}^n \quad \forall (s, a), (s', a')$$

We can combine this assumption with a central limit theorem for linear combinations of Dirichlet random vectors Matsunawa [1985] to deduce the asymptotic Gaussian result for the iterates of Q-value iteration. From this result we can write down equations which propagate the moments at each iteration. For the mean, this is straightforward

$$\mu_{sa}^{n+1} = \mathbb{E}_{r, P_{s,a}, Q^n(s,a)} Q^{n+1}(s, a) = \mu_{\rho_{sa}} + \beta \sum_{s'} \mathbb{E}_{P_{s,a}} P_{s'|s,a} \mathbb{E}_{Q^n(s',a')} \max_{a'} Q^n(s', a') \quad (4.1)$$

We denote the variance of $Q^{n+1}(s, a)$ as ν_{sa}^{n+1} and obtain,

$$\nu_{sa}^{n+1} = \sigma_{\rho_{sa}}^2 + \beta^2 \sum_{s', s''} C_{s', s'' | sa} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{a'} Q^n(s', a') \max_{a''} Q^n(s'', a'') \right] \quad (4.2)$$

where we used that the variance of dependent terms is the sum of the covariances, and denoted the Dirichlet covariance as $C_{s', s'' | sa} = \text{Cov}[P_{s'|s,a}, P_{s''|s,a}]$. Note we use the CLT Matsunawa [1985] differently in section 5, as part of a more systematic derivation of the result.

Note that, if the rewards are stochastic and unknown, but do not have Gaussian posteriors, then the Q-values will not be Gaussian but a mixture. However, the DMFP theory still holds. In particular, the term $\sum_{s'} P_{s'|s,a} \max_{a'} Q^n(s', a')$ will still have Gaussian distribution, and hence only the first two moments will be propagated across iterations in the finite horizon setting, or time in the finite.

4.2 Extreme value theory for approximate statistics

In order to compute the solutions to DMFP one needs to calculate the first and second moments of the maxima over $|\mathcal{A}|$ non-identical Gaussian Q_{sa}^n . Here we appeal to extreme value theory, which describes the distribution of the maximum over asymptotically many variables (appropriately re-scaled). This theory was originally developed for i.i.d variables, but there exist generalisations to non-independent cases Falk et al. [2010], Hüsler [1994]. This work establishes that the distribution approaches a Poisson limit, from which we may calculate moments. See the appendix for details.

In the case that all the parameters of the system are identically distributed for all state-action pairs, the system is described by one set of coupled scalar equations for the mean and variance of the value function. In this case we are able to obtain *closed form* approximate mean field equations Fisher and Tippett [1928]. We assume here that the Dirichlet parameters are uniform and set to $\alpha_{sa}(s') = \frac{1}{N}$. This produces simplifications in the DMFP equations, as we detail in appendix A. Denoting the mean $\mu(k) = \mathbb{E}[Q_{sa}(k)]$ and variance $\nu(k) = \text{Var}[Q_{sa}(k)]$ for all (s, a) since they are identical, if we use a Type-I extreme value or Gumbel distribution as an approximation, we have

$$\mu^{n+1} = \mu_{\rho} + \beta (\mu^n + \sqrt{\nu^n} (b_{|\mathcal{A}|} + a_{|\mathcal{A}|} \gamma_{\text{EM}})) \quad (4.3)$$

$$\nu^{n+1} = \sigma_{\rho}^2 + \beta^2 \frac{\pi^2}{12} \nu^n a_{|\mathcal{A}|} \quad (4.4)$$

where γ_{EM} is the Euler-Mascheroni constant, and $a_{|\mathcal{A}|}$ and $b_{|\mathcal{A}|}$ are constants dependent on the action space size $|\mathcal{A}|$, given in Fisher and Tippett [1928]. See the appendix for the complete derivation. The solution can be found in closed form by solving first eq. (4.4) then eq. (4.3). The approximation can be improved by using a Type-III or Weibull distribution Fisher and Tippett [1928] or other approximations Cohen [1982].

4.3 Stability and fixed points of DMFP in the i.i.d case

The Bellman optimality equation is a contraction mapping for any instance or realisation of the MDPs we consider. This is in contrast to the spin glass and random neural network cases, where we observe chaos or limit cycles, outside of a stable regime. The contractive properties of the Bellman equation do not appear to extend in a straightforward manner to the dynamic mean field equations, which can be viewed as an operator propagating moments. Furthermore, due to the maximum function, the Lyapunov stability results for the mean field equations developed in Sompolinsky et al. [1988] also do not directly translate here. However, in the i.i.d case we find from the closed form approximate equations that the Jacobian explicitly. We find the maximum eigenvalue of the Jacobian of the system is the discount factor β . This means that the system is Lyapunov stable about its unique fixed point, since $\beta \in (0, 1)$. We expect these results to hold in the ergodic and stochastic shortest path problems, where the Bellman equation still has a modulus of contraction.

5 Dynamic mean field theory for Bayesian RL

In this section we work through the generating functional approach, systematically deriving the dynamic mean field theory. We emphasise the key steps, and leaving a detailed account to the appendix. We follow Helias and Dahmen [2019] and Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018]. In order to write down a moment generating function (MGF), we define a probability distribution over Q-value iterates by artificially injecting i.i.d Gaussian noise at each state-action site and iteration. This noise can be later removed. Second, we represent the empirical distribution over iterates with a Dirac delta function, from which we then write down the moment generating function for a realisation of the disorder. By first switching to a Fourier representation of the Dirac delta we are then able to take an average over the disorder in the system by appealing to the central limit theorem for linear combinations of Dirichlet random vectors. Finally, we seek to apply a saddle-point approximation. For this to be applied, we reveal a dependence on N (the state space size) in the exponent of the generating function by carefully choosing auxiliary fields to decouple various interaction terms. The saddle-point equations may be solved, which yield the standard Gaussian theory.

5.1 Probability distribution over Q-value iterates

Dynamic mean field theory considers as a starting point the moment generating function (MGF) of the distribution over trajectories of a system. Given that the system we study is deterministic, albeit subject to “disorder” due to uncertain parameters, we consider a noise-perturbed system. We consider the perturbation to be independent Gaussian noise W_{sa}^n at each state action pair (s, a) and at each iteration n . The noise term W_{sa}^n is technically needed for a large deviations analysis (even with arbitrarily small noise) Moynot and Samuelides [2002], but can be safely removed in the generating functional approach later, and thus only serves to first define a moment generating function Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018]. Thus we study the following system

$$Q_{sa}^{n+1} = \rho_{sa} + \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) + W_{sa}^n \quad (5.1)$$

For shorthand we write the maximum as $\phi(Q_{s':.}^n) = \max_{a'} Q_{s'a'}^n$. The distribution over a trajectory from iteration $n = 1$ to $n = M$ can be written as

$$p(Q^{1:M}) = \int \prod_{n=1}^{M-1} dW^n \rho_{\mathcal{N}}(W^n) \delta(Q_{sa}^{n+1} - \rho_{sa} - \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{sa}^n) - W_{sa}^n) \quad (5.2)$$

where we have denoted the density over Gaussian noise terms W_{sa}^n as $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}(W^n) = \prod_{sa} \rho_{\mathcal{N}}(W_{sa}^n)$. One could go on to write the probability distribution as a product over Gaussian densities, but in order to average over the disorder, we introduce a so-called response field \tilde{x} . This field enters by eq. (5.2) by representing the Dirac delta by its Fourier integral $\delta(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} d\tilde{x} e^{\tilde{x}x}$. We obtain the discrete time analogue of the Martin-Siggia-Rose-De Dominicis-Janssen (MSRDJ) path integral

formalism Castellani and Cavagna [2005], by replacing the Dirac delta with its Fourier form,

$$\begin{aligned} p(Q^{1:M}) &= \int \prod_{n=1}^{M-1} dW^n \rho_{\mathcal{N}}(W^n) \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}^n}{2\pi i} \exp \left[\tilde{Q}_{sa}^n (Q_{sa}^{n+1} - \rho_{sa} - \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{sa}^n) - W_{sa}^n) \right] \\ &= \prod_{n=1}^{M-1} \prod_{sa} \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}^n}{2\pi i} \exp \left[\tilde{Q}_{sa}^n (Q_{sa}^{n+1} - \rho_{sa} - \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{sa}^n) - W_{sa}^n) \right] Z_W(-\tilde{Q}_{sa}^n) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where $Z_W(-\tilde{Q}^n)$ is the moment generating function for the noise.

5.2 Moment generating function and the disorder average

We now consider the MGF for Q-value iterates by taking the expectation of terms $\exp(\sum_{n=1}^M j_n Q^n)$,

$$Z[\mathbf{j}] = \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ^n \exp(j_n Q^n) \right\} p(Q^{1:M}) \quad (5.4)$$

where we write $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_M)$. From the MGF we can of course study moments of the process as functional derivatives $\frac{\delta}{\delta j^n} Z[\mathbf{j}]|_{j=0} = \langle Q^n \rangle$. Higher moments can be obtained from higher derivatives.

By including a small perturbation localised at an iteration $-\tilde{j}_{sa}^n$, we can probe dependencies across iterations, if we wish, by calculating the so called response function, see Helias and Dahmen [2019] for details. So, using the notation $(j^n)^T Q^n = \sum_{sa} j_{sa}^n Q_{sa}^n$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} Z[\mathbf{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{j}}] &= \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ^n \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}^n}{2\pi i} Z_W(-\tilde{Q}^n) \right\} \\ &\times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n (Q_{sa}^n - \rho_{sa} - \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{sa}^n)) + (j^{n+1})^T Q^{n+1} + (\tilde{j}^n)^T \tilde{Q}^n \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Assuming the MGF is self-averaging Helias and Dahmen [2019], Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018], then from its average we can calculate the statistics of typical realisations of the system. So, we now look to take the average over the disorder. The term involving ρ_{sa} in eq. (5.5) presents no difficulty compared to the neural network case. However, the term involving the uncertain transition probabilities demands consideration. Extracting the term in the moment generating function depending on $P_{s'|sa}$, we see that the calculation of interest is

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \prod_{(sa), (s')} dP_{\cdot|sa} \text{Dir}(P_{\cdot|sa}; \alpha_{sa}) \exp \left(- \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{sa}^n) \right) \\ &= \prod_{(sa)} \int dS_{sa} \mathcal{N}(\bar{S}_{sa}, \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) \exp(-S_{sa}) = \prod_{(sa)} \exp(\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where we have defined $S_{sa} = \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{sa}^n)$. Crucially, we have used that $P(\cdot | sa)$ is independent across pairs (sa) , and applied a CLT for linear combinations of Dirichlet vectors Matsunawa [1985]. This is possible since Q and \tilde{Q} terms are not random in eq. (5.5). The mean and variance of S_{sa} are given by,

$$\bar{S}_{sa} = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \bar{P}_{s'|sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{sa}^n), \quad \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 = \sum_{s', s''} C_{s', s'' | sa} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{sa}^n) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^m \phi(Q_{sa}^m) \right)$$

From here we can write the disorder averaged generating function for Q-value Iteration as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}[\mathbf{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{j}}] &= \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ^n \right\} \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}^m}{2\pi i} Z_W(-\tilde{x}^m) \right\} \times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n Q_{sa}^n - \mu_{\rho_{sa}} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \right] \\ &+ \frac{\sigma_{\rho_{sa}}^2}{2} (\tilde{Q}_{sa}^n)^2 - (\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) + j_{n+1}^T Q^{n+1} + \tilde{j}_n^T \tilde{Q}^n \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Finally we note that, for the next section, we make analytic progress if we have, in the i.i.d case, uniform scaling $\alpha_{s'|sa} = \alpha$ for each $P_{s'|sa}$, and in the case $\alpha \sim \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{N})$, we have

$$\bar{S}_{sa} = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \frac{1}{N} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) \quad (5.8)$$

$$\sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 = \sum_{s'} \frac{1}{2N} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) \right)^2 - \sum_{s' \neq s''} \frac{1}{2N^2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^n \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}^m \phi(Q_{s'':.}^m) \right) \quad (5.9)$$

The non-identical case can be written as a perturbation about the identical one, and provided these are of smaller order in N , can be ignored asymptotically. We detail this argument in the appendix.

5.3 Saddle point approximation

We now seek a saddle-point approximation for the disorder averaged generating function, analogously to the neural network case. Such an approximation is appropriate when the exponential term in eq. (5.7) can be written in the form $\int dQ \exp(Nf(Q))$. Similar to the neural network case, it is the variance term for the couplings which requires ‘‘decoupling’’ to reveal the large N dependence. However, in contrast to the Gaussian weight case, we require three real auxiliary fields rather than one to decouple the interacting Q fields Sompolinsky et al. [1988], Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018]. The first $\Theta_1(n, m)$ is very similar to the neural network case, however we require two more real fields in order to decouple the interactions,

$$\Theta_1(n, m) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) \phi(Q_{s':.}^m) - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':.}^n) \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s'':.}^m) \quad (5.10)$$

$$\Theta_3(n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':.}^n), \quad \Theta_5(m) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s'':.}^m) \quad (5.11)$$

The fields are inserted by use of a Dirac delta in each case, which produce corresponding complex fields. Please see the appendix for the full derivation, where the saddle-point equations are solved, which correspond to stationary point of the action (the term within the exponential). The solution takes the same Gaussian form as in Sompolinsky et al. [1988], Crisanti and Sompolinsky [2018].

6 Simulations

We can test the predictions of the Gaussian theory and accuracy of the DMFP approximations empirically as follows. We draw from given Dirichlet and mean reward distributions, as in Thomson sampling, and run Q-value iteration until convergence. The simulations presented in Figure 6 are for a small system with only $|\mathcal{S}| = 50$ and $|\mathcal{A}| = 30$, with a uniform $\alpha_{sa} = \frac{1}{N}$ and rewards with identical uniform priors. The figure on the left shows the empirical mean and variance of a particular Q-value, and overlaid are the theoretical mean and variance, as given by eq. (4.3) and eq. (4.4). The figure on the right is a Q-Q plot for the Q-value. As shown in the supplementary material, the state space increases, we see the convergence to Gaussianity. We detail experiments in the non-i.i.d cases as well. Note that there are two approximations in effect, the first due to finite size effects in the state space, the second due to the extreme value theory approximations of the DMFP equations.

7 Discussion

The work presented raises several interesting questions. Perhaps most pressing would be to ask what the rate of convergence is to the Gaussian result. We expect this of course to be dependent on several factors in the model. First, the state space size. Second, the discount factor, which controls the ‘‘memory’’ between iterations. Third, the overall uncertainty within the system. If for instance the Dirichlet vectors are known with partial certainty (ie. some Dirichlet parameters are large) then there may be an effective state space size which is smaller.

Relatedly, an interesting property of the system in the mean field limit is the behaviour of the variance. The linear combination of Dirichlet random vectors has vanishing variance in the large state space limit as long as the Dirichlet parameters scale at least as great as $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$. Investigating this behaviour




Figure 6.1: DMFP simulations. Left: Mean and variance for a Q-value $Q(s, a)$ of an MDP of size $|\mathcal{S}| = 50$, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$ with identical uniform Dirichlet priors for the transitions for each state action pair, Gaussian priors for the rewards. Empirical mean and variance given by dots, theory by dashed lines. Discount factor $\beta = 0.9$. Right: Q-Q plots for a Q-value, against normal quantiles.

during the learning process, where the Dirichlet parameters increase in integer quantities, and where parts of the system are relatively unexplored is of great interest.

There are many other theoretical and algorithmic developments that should be explored. The asymptotic independence and Gaussian result may be surprising to many in the field. A rigorous proof, based on large deviations analysis such as Ben Arous and Guionnet [1995] and Samuelides and Cessac [2007] is of course needed. This would allow us to consider the case where the flat Dirichlet assumption does not hold, and the subsequent breakdown in self-averaging and thus the mean field theory.

In terms of the direct application of DMFP, the extreme value theory based approximations must be improved, for instance to not require numerical computation based on the Poisson approximation, or the restrictive i.i.d assumption. Furthermore, approximations for the case where rewards are unknown but non-Gaussian are needed, for which the mean-field posterior over Q-values is a mixture of a Gaussian and the reward posterior.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support, insight and assistance offered by Federica Gerace and Carlo Lucibello, Giel van Bergen, Kelli Francis-Staite, Blake O'Donnely, Sean McGowan and Ian Fuss, as well as the ongoing material and technical guidance of Hung Nguyen and Langford White.

References

- M. Advani, S. Lahiri, and S. Ganguli. Statistical mechanics of complex neural systems and high dimensional data. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2013(03):P03014, 2013.
- S.-I. Amari. Characteristics of random nets of analog neuron-like elements. *IEEE Transactions on systems, man, and cybernetics*, (5):643–657, 1972.
- G. Ben Arous and A. Guionnet. Large deviations for langevin spin glass dynamics. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 102(4):455–509, 1995.
- T. Castellani and A. Cavagna. Spin-glass theory for pedestrians. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2005(05):P05012, may 2005. doi: 10.1088/1742-5468/2005/05/p05012. URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2005/05/p05012>.
- J. P. Cohen. The penultimate form of approximation to normal extremes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 14(2):324–339, 1982. ISSN 00018678. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1426524>.

- A. Crisanti and H. Sompolinsky. Path integral approach to random neural networks. *Physical Review E*, 98(6):062120, 2018.
- M. Falk, J. Hüsler, and R.-D. Reiss. *Laws of small numbers: extremes and rare events*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- R. A. Fisher and L. H. C. Tippett. Limiting forms of the frequency distribution of the largest or smallest member of a sample. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 24(2):180–190, 1928. doi: 10.1017/S0305004100015681.
- M. Helias and D. Dahmen. Statistical field theory for neural networks, 2019.
- J. Hüsler. Extremes: Limit results for univariate and multivariate nonstationary sequences. In *Extreme Value Theory and Applications*, pages 283–304. Springer, 1994.
- T. Lattimore and C. Szepesvári. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- T. Matsunawa. The exact and approximate distributions of linear combinations of selected order statistics from a uniform distribution. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 37(1): 1–16, 1985.
- O. Moynot and M. Samuelides. Large deviations and mean-field theory for asymmetric random recurrent neural networks. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 123(1):41–75, 2002.
- B. O’Donoghue. Variational bayesian reinforcement learning with regret bounds. *CoRR*, abs/1807.09647, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1807.09647>.
- B. O’Donoghue, I. Osband, R. Munos, and V. Mnih. The uncertainty Bellman equation and exploration. In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3839–3848. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/odonoghue18a.html>.
- B. O’Donoghue, I. Osband, and C. Ionescu. Making sense of reinforcement learning and probabilistic inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1xitgHtvS>.
- I. Osband and B. Van Roy. Why is posterior sampling better than optimism for reinforcement learning? In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML’17*, page 2701–2710. JMLR.org, 2017.
- B. Poole, S. Lahiri, M. Raghu, J. Sohl-Dickstein, and S. Ganguli. Exponential expressivity in deep neural networks through transient chaos. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29: 3360–3368, 2016.
- M. Samuelides and B. Cessac. Random recurrent neural networks dynamics. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 142(1):89–122, 2007.
- S. S. Schoenholz, J. Gilmer, S. Ganguli, and J. Sohl-Dickstein. Deep information propagation. 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf>.
- H. Sompolinsky and A. Zippelius. Relaxational dynamics of the edwards-anderson model and the mean-field theory of spin-glasses. *Physical Review B*, 25(11):6860, 1982.
- H. Sompolinsky, A. Crisanti, and H.-J. Sommers. Chaos in random neural networks. *Physical review letters*, 61(3):259, 1988.
- H. Touchette. The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics. *Physics Reports*, 478(1-3):1–69, Jul 2009. ISSN 0370-1573. doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.2009.05.002. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2009.05.002>.
- M. J. Wainwright, M. I. Jordan, et al. Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 1(1–2):1–305, 2008.

A Derivations of DMFP equations and extreme value theory approximations

A.1 DMFP derivation in the identical case

To review, here we derive the mean field equations based on assumptions on the scale of parameters within the transition function, a local chaos hypothesis, and a central limit argument for our transition function. The result of the assumptions is that a central limit type argument can be applied to certain terms in the Q-value iteration equations. This allows analytical expressions for the mean and variance of the Q-values to be found for the large system limit.

Recall the transition probabilities given by P in the MDP are considered to be Dirichlet random variables which are negatively dependent. The Dirichlet distribution is a multivariate generalisation of the beta distribution and is characterised by parameters $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{|S|} > 0$. The formulae for the mean, variance and covariance for Dirichlet random variables are,

$$\mathbb{E}[p_i] = \frac{\alpha_i}{\sum_t \alpha_t} \quad \text{Var}[p_i] = \frac{\alpha_i}{\sum_t \alpha_t} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_i}{\sum_t \alpha_t}\right) \quad \text{Cov}[p_i, p_j] = -\frac{\alpha_i}{\sum_t \alpha_t} \frac{\alpha_j}{\sum_t \alpha_t}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Assumption 1: Identical Dirichlet distribution parameters

Let us now consider how the parameters α_i scale with the size of the state space N . It is convenient to assume then that the α_i are all identical and in this case the distribution is known as the symmetric Dirichlet distribution. Thus let $\alpha_i = \alpha, \forall i$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[p_i] = \frac{1}{N} \quad \text{Var}[p_i] = \frac{N-1}{N^2(N\alpha+1)} \quad \text{Cov}[p_i, p_j] = -\frac{1}{N^2(N\alpha+1)}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Therefore, assuming that the transition functions are independent across pairs (s, a) , and assuming we have uniform scaling $\alpha_{s'|s,a} = \alpha$ for each $P_{s'|s,a}$ and that $\alpha \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$ we can derive closed form approximate mean field equations.

Assumption 2: Local chaos hypothesis

To derive our mean field equations we will also assume the independences,

$$Q^k(s, a) \perp r(s', a') \quad \forall (s, a), (s', a') \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$r(s, a) \perp P_{s',a'} \quad \forall (s, a), (s', a') \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$Q^k(s, a) \perp P_{s',a'} \quad \forall (s, a), (s', a') \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$Q^k(s, a) \perp Q^k(s', a') \quad \forall (s, a), (s', a'). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This assumption states that, when our state space is large, the system behaves as if the variables Q were independent of each other, the reward values, and transition values.

Expressions for the mean and variance of Q^{k+1} can then be found.

We denote the mean of $Q^{k+1}(s, a)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P(r), P_{P_{s,a}}, P(Q^k(s,a))} Q^{k+1}(s, a) \\ &= \mu_\rho + \beta \sum_{s'} \mathbb{E}_{P_{s,a}} \left[P_{s'|s,a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{Q^k(s',a')} \left[\max_{a'} Q^k(s', a') \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $P_{s,a}$ is a Dirichlet distribution with parameter $\alpha_{s,a}$. We denote the variance of $Q^{k+1}(s, a)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_{P(r), P_{P_{s,a}}, P(Q^k(s,a))} [Q^{k+1}(s, a)] \\ &= \sigma_\rho^2 + \beta^2 \text{Var}_{Dir(P_{s,a}), Q^k(s,a)} \left[\sum_{s'} P_{s'|s,a} \max_{a'} Q^k(s', a') \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Considering the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_{Dir(P_{s,a}), Q^k(s,a)} \left[\sum_{s'} P_{s'|s,a} \max_{a'} Q^k(s', a') \right] \\ &= \sum_{s'=1}^N \sum_{s''=1}^N \text{Cov} \left[P_{s'|s,a} \max_{a'} Q^k(s', a'), P_{s''|s,a} \max_{a''} Q^k(s'', a'') \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$= \sum_{s'=1}^N \sum_{s''=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{a'} Q^k(s', a') \max_{a''} Q^k(s'', a'') \right] \text{Cov} \left[P_{s'|s,a}, P_{s''|s,a} \right]. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Assumption 3: Central limit type argument of Dirichlet variables

To derive closed form expressions from the moments of Q^{k+1} , we must assume a central limit type argument for the transition probabilities given by P . We assume that as the size of the state space $|S|$ increases, we apply a central limit theorem (CLT) for *linear combinations* of Dirichlet random variables Matsunawa [1985], which establishes the linear combination approaches a normal distribution. This extends in a straightforward manner to the case where the weights in the linear combination are themselves random variables. These weights correspond to the value functions in the Bellman optimality equation.

Due to the discontinuous and nonlinear function $\max(\cdot)$ in the value iteration schemes, the distributions of maxima of Q-values must be studied through extreme value statistics Fisher and Tippett [1928], Cohen [1982]. This allows analytical expressions for the mean and variance of the Q-values to be derived. Using a type I extreme value distribution for Gaussian random variables allows the moments of the maxima to be calculated Fisher and Tippett [1928], Cohen [1982].

Defining the mean as $\mu(k) = \mathbb{E} [Q^k(s, a)]$ and variance as $\nu(k) = \text{Var}(Q^k(s, a))$, the mean field iteration functions can be found through substituting in the Dirichlet moments and extreme value expressions into equations A.7 and A.8 and taking the limit as the state space size goes to infinity. The mean field iteration functions are

$$\mu(k+1) = \bar{r} + \beta \left(\mu(k) + (b_{|\mathcal{A}|} + a_{|\mathcal{A}|} \gamma_{\text{EM}}) \sqrt{\nu(k)} \right) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$\nu(k+1) = \sigma_r^2 + \beta^2 \frac{\pi^2}{12} a_{|\mathcal{A}|} \nu(k) \quad , \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where γ_{EM} is the Euler-Mascheroni constant, and $a_{|\mathcal{A}|}$ and $b_{|\mathcal{A}|}$ are positive constants dependent on the action space size $|\mathcal{A}|$ given by solving the expressions

$$b_{|\mathcal{A}|} \sqrt{2\pi} \exp(0.5(b_{|\mathcal{A}|})^2) = |\mathcal{A}| \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$a_{|\mathcal{A}|} = \frac{b_{|\mathcal{A}|}}{(b_{|\mathcal{A}|})^2 + 1} \quad . \quad (\text{A.14})$$

These constants increase as the size of the action space increases. The accuracy of the extreme value distribution can be improved through using a type III Weibull distribution Fisher and Tippett [1928].

A.2 Extreme value theory for non-identical case

In the case that we consider non-identically distributed Dirichlet transition probabilities P_{sa} and non-identical mean rewards ρ_{sa} , we thus have that the Q-values will be independent but non-identical Gaussian variables. This poses a challenge for calculating the statistics of the maximum $\max_a Q_{sa}$.

An asymptotic approximation would appeal to extreme value theory, however this theory was derived in the case where one takes n samples of from a population Fisher and Tippett [1928]. While closed form approximations exist in the case of non-identical means and identical variances, we would of course like to consider both non-identical means and variances. For this, we must resort to numerical approximations. Consider a sequence of Gaussian random variables

$$\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$$




Figure A.1: The CDF of the maximum of n non-identical independent Gaussians $P(M_n \leq u)$ can be approximated for large n by the function $\exp(-\tau)$, where τ depends on u and all the means and variances of the Gaussian variables.

with non-constant mean values $\mathbb{E}(X_i) = \mu_i$ and variances $\text{Var}(X_i) = \sigma_i^2$. Now suppose that we have another sequence of Gaussian random variables: $\{Y_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, which is stationary. We can then define from this a non-stationary Gaussian sequence as:

$$\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1} = \{\mu_i + \sigma_i Y_i\}_{i \geq 1},$$

from which the maximum, $M_n = \sup X_i \mid i \leq n$ gives us the relationship

$$\{M_n \leq u\} = \left\{ Y_i \leq \frac{u - \mu_i}{\sigma_i} \mid i \leq n \right\}$$

where u is a bound for a stationary Gaussian sequence. The CDF is given by:

$$P(M_n \leq u) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i \leq u) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(Y_i \leq u_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \Phi(u_i)$$

due to the independence. From the lemma below we know that there exists a real value τ , depending on $\{(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)\}_i$ such that this product tends to the function $e^{-\tau}$. that there exists a real value τ , such that this product tends to the function $e^{-\tau}$.

Lemma A.1. *Falk et al. [2010] Let $\{u_{ni}, 1 \leq i \leq n, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be constants such that $\lambda_n = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_{ni} \rightarrow \infty$. Then for $0 \leq \tau \leq \infty$,*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \Phi(u_{ni}) \rightarrow e^{-\tau(u, \mu_i, \sigma_i)}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{A.15})$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \Phi(u_i)) \rightarrow \tau(u, \{\mu\}_i, \{\sigma\}_i) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

We have the CDF of the maximum of non-identical Gaussians, which are independent (or possibly weakly dependent). From the CDF, we can calculate the mean and variance of the maximum. This can be done by standard methods (ie. Tonelli's theorem).

B Dynamic mean field theory derivations

B.1 Derivation in the i.i.d case

Consider Q-value iteration. Recall the analogy with spin glasses and neural networks is as follows. Time corresponds to iterations, which we denote n . The local fields $x_i(t)$ are the Q-values $Q_{sa}(n)$, so each site corresponds to a state and action pair. The couplings are transition probabilities $P_{s'|sa} \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_{sa})$, and we have a reward term $r_{sa} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_r, \sigma_r^2)$.

The random Bellman optimality equation, perturbed by Gaussian noise $W_{sa}(n)$, is

$$Q_{sa}(n+1) = r_{sa} + \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) + W_{sa}(n) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The noise term $W_{sa}(n)$ is technically needed for a large deviations analysis, but can be removed in the generating functional approach later.

The non-linearity $\phi(\cdot)$ is

$$\phi(Q_{s':}(n)) = \max_{a'} Q_{s'a'}(n) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

So we see each Q_{sa} ‘‘couples’’ to a set of $\{Q_{s'a'}\}_{a' \in \mathcal{A}(s')}$, where $\mathcal{A}(s')$ is the action set corresponding to s' .

Following the steps in the previous section, the **random Q-value Iteration Generating Function** is

$$\begin{aligned} Z[\mathbf{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{j}}] &= \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ(n) \right\} \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \left\{ \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}(m)}{2\pi i} Z_W(-\tilde{x}(m)) \right\} \\ &\times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) (Q_{sa}(n+1) - r_{sa} - \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) + j_{n+1}^T Q(n+1) + \tilde{j}_n^T \tilde{Q}(n)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We now turn to performing the average over the disorder. The term involving r_{sa} presents no difficulty compared to the neural network case. However, the term involving the uncertain transition probabilities demands special consideration.

Extracting the term in the moment generating function equation B.3 depending on $P_{s'|sa}$, the calculation of interest is

$$\int \prod_{(sa), (s')} \text{Dir}(P(:, |sa); \alpha_{sa}) \exp \left(- \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) \right) \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$= \prod_{(sa)} \int \prod_{(s')} \text{Dir}(P(:, |sa); \alpha_{sa}) \exp \left(- \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) \right) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Here we have used that we assume each random vector $P(:, |sa)$ is independent, across pairs (sa) .

We propose to use a central limit theorem for weighted Dirichlet random vectors, as proven in Matsunawa [1985]. This is possible because we have shifted the expectation over the disorder within the integrals in equation B.3, and thus the Q and \tilde{Q} terms are not random. Denote the sum as $S = \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n))$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \prod_{(s')} \text{Dir}(P(:, |sa); \alpha_{sa}) \exp \left(- \sum_{s'} P_{s'|sa} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) \right) \\ &= \int \mathcal{N}(\bar{S}_{sa}, \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) dS \exp \left(-S \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$= \exp(\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where

$$\bar{S}_{sa} = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \bar{P}_{s'|sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 = \sum_{s', s''} C_{s', s''|sa} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \right) \quad (\text{B.9})$$

In the case we have uniform scaling $\alpha_{s'|sa} = \alpha$ for each $P_{s'|sa}$, and in the case $\alpha \sim \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{N})$, we have

$$\bar{S}_{sa} = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \frac{1}{N} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 &= \sum_{s'} \frac{1}{2N} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{s' \neq s''} \frac{1}{2N^2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

From here we can write the **disorder averaged generating function for Q-value Iteration** is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}[\mathbf{j}, \tilde{\mathbf{j}}] &= \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ(n) \right\} \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \left\{ \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}(m)}{2\pi i} Z_W(-\tilde{x}(m)) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) Q_{sa}(n+1) - \mu_{r_{sa}} \tilde{Q}_{sa} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{r_{sa}}^2 \tilde{Q}_{sa}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2) + j_{n+1}^T Q(n+1) + \tilde{j}_n^T \tilde{Q}(n) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

In order to reveal the dependence on N of the ‘‘action’’ (the terms within the exponential), we will introduce auxilliary fields for the variance term, which we write explicitly as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{sa} \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{s'} \sum_{sa} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \right)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{sa} \sum_{s', s''} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s':(m)}) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa} \sum_{s', s''} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \left(\sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \phi(Q_{s':(m)}) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{s' \neq s''} \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Six Auxilliary Fields:

We will progressively introduce six auxiliary fields. We use a convention that odd powers correspond to real fields and even their associated imaginary fields, arising from the Dirac delta representations.

$$\Theta_1(n, m) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \phi(Q_{s':(m)}) - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s':(n)}) \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s'':(m)}) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

thus with a Fourier representation

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta \left[-2N\Theta_1(n, m) + \left(\sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s'}(m)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right) \right] \\
& = \int d\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \left(-2N\Theta_1(n, m) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \left(\sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s'}(m)) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s' \neq s''} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We consider a particular (n, m) term from equation B.13

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \int d\Theta_1(n, m) d\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \exp \left[\left(\sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n)\tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \right) \Theta_1(n, m) \right] \\
& \times \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \left(-N\Theta_1(n, m) + \left(\sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s'}(m)) \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s' \neq s''} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right) \right) \right] \tag{B.15}
\end{aligned}$$

We now introduce two more real fields

$$\Theta_3(n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)), \quad \Theta_5(m) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \tag{B.16}$$

The Fourier representation of the Diracs of each field (for different times m, n) are,

$$\delta \left[-N\tilde{\Theta}_3(m) + \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right] = \int d\tilde{\Theta}_4(n) \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_4(n) \left(-N\Theta_3(n) + \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \right) \right]$$

Returning to the (n, m) term from equation B.15, and ignoring the diagonal term $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s'}(m))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int d\Theta_1(n, m) d\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) d\Theta_3(m) d\tilde{\Theta}_4(m) \exp \left[\left(\sum_{sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n)\tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \right) \Theta_1(n, m) \right] \\
& \times \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \left(-2N\Theta_1(n, m) + \left(\sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n))\phi(Q_{s'}(m)) - N\Theta_3(n)\Theta_5(m) \right) \right) \right] \\
& \times \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_4(n) \left(-N\Theta_3(n) + \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \right) \right] \exp \left[\tilde{\Theta}_6(m) \left(-N\Theta_5(m) + \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

We see we have successfully decoupled the interaction terms, and thus revealed the dependence of the action in terms of N .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{Z}[\mathbf{k}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_4, \mathbf{k}_5, \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_6] = \int d\Theta_1(n, m) d\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) d\Theta_3(m) d\tilde{\Theta}_4(m) \\
& \times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} -2N\Theta_1(n, m)\tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) - N\Theta_2(n, m)\Theta_3(n)\Theta_5(m) - N\Theta_3(n)\tilde{\Theta}_4(n) \right. \\
& \left. - N\Theta_5(m)\tilde{\Theta}_6(m) + N \ln Z[\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, \Theta_4] + \mathbf{k}_1^T \Theta_1 + \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_2^T \tilde{\Theta}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3^T \Theta_3 + \tilde{\mathbf{k}}_4^T \tilde{\Theta}_4 \right] \tag{B.17}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define

$$\begin{aligned}
Z^N[\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, \Theta_4, \Theta_5, \Theta_6] &= \prod_{n=1}^M \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dQ(n) \right\} \prod_{m=1}^{M-1} \left\{ \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\tilde{Q}(m)}{2\pi i} Z_W(-\tilde{x}(m)) \right\} \\
&\times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa}^N \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) Q_{sa}(n+1) - \mu_{r_{sa}} \tilde{Q}_{sa} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{r_{sa}}^2 \tilde{Q}_{sa}^2 - \bar{S}_{sa} \right] \\
&\times \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{sa}^N \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \Theta_1(m, n) \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) + \tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \phi(Q_{s'}(m)) \right. \\
&\left. + \tilde{\Theta}_4(n) \sum_{s'} \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) + \tilde{\Theta}_6(m) \sum_{s''} \phi(Q_{s''}(m)) \right] \tag{B.18}
\end{aligned}$$

The form of equation B.17 suggests a saddle point approximation, as in the recurrent network literature,

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta \Theta_{\{1,2,3,4\}}} \left[-N \Theta_1(n, m) \tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) - N \Theta_3(m) \tilde{\Theta}_4(m) + N \ln Z[\Theta_1, \Theta_2, \Theta_3, \Theta_4] \right] = 0 \tag{B.19}$$

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Theta_1} = 0 \implies \tilde{\Theta}_2(n, m) = \langle \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \rangle_{\Theta^*} = 0 \tag{B.20}$$

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Theta_2} = 0 \implies \Theta_1(n, m) = \langle \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \phi(Q_{s'}(m)) \rangle_{\Theta^*} - \langle \Theta_3(n) \Theta_5(m) \rangle_{\Theta^*} \tag{B.21}$$

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Theta_3} = 0 \implies -N \sum_m \Theta_2(n, m) \Theta_5(m) - N \Theta_4(n) = 0 \implies \Theta_4(n) = 0 \quad \text{since } \Theta_2 \text{ is zero.} \tag{B.22}$$

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Theta_4} = 0 \implies \Theta_3(n, m) = \langle \phi(Q_{s'}(n)) \rangle_{\Theta^*} \tag{B.23}$$

with identical results for Θ_5 and Θ_6

B.2 The non-i.i.d case

We argue here that in the first instance, the non-i.i.d case can be considered via perturbations about the identical case. These perturbations essentially do not contribute to the ‘‘action’’, the term within the exponential of the moment generating function, and thus they can be ignored. The more general case of a mixture of terms of different orders in the action, arising from Dirichlet parameters of different orders, is slightly more tedious to deal with. Stepping through the algebra essentially reveals that above the order $1/N$ case the variance will ultimately vanish. However, the *rate* at which this will vanish in practice will depend on the mixture. We aim to explore this in future work.

B.2.1 Perturbations about the mean for the disorder averaged MGF

Recall that the key term in the disorder averaged generating function equation B.12 is $\exp(\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2)$, where

$$\bar{S}_{sa} = \sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \sum_{s'} \bar{P}_{s'|sa} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) \quad (\text{B.24})$$

$$\sigma_{S_{sa}}^2 = \sum_{s', s''} C_{s', s''|sa} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(n) \phi(Q_{s':}(n)) \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \tilde{Q}_{sa}(m) \phi(Q_{s'':}(m)) \right) \quad (\text{B.25})$$

where for the Dirichlet random variables recall that

$$\bar{P}_{s'|sa} = \frac{\alpha_{s'|sa}}{\sum_t \alpha_{t|sa}} \quad C_{s', s''|sa} = \frac{\delta_{s' s''} - \frac{\alpha_{s'|sa} \alpha_{s''|sa}}{\sum_t \alpha_{t|sa}}}{1 + \sum_t \alpha_{t|sa}}. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Recall also that in the case that $\alpha_{s'|sa} = \alpha$, we always have

$$\bar{P}_{s'|sa} = \frac{1}{N} \quad (\text{B.27})$$

and that if $\alpha_{s'|sa} = \alpha = 1/N$ then

$$C_{s', s''|sa} = \frac{N \delta_{s' s''} - 1}{N^2 (N\alpha + 1)} \quad (\text{B.28})$$

Now if we simply consider the non-identical case as a small perturbation about the identical, such as $\alpha_{s'|sa} = \alpha + \Delta_{s'|sa}$ with $\Delta_{s'|sa}$ a lower order in N , then this term will not contribute to the exponent $\exp(\bar{S}_{sa} + \sigma_{S_{sa}}^2)$ and the analysis follows the same steps as above. For example if α is of order $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ and Δ is of order $\mathcal{O}(1/N^2)$.

Finally, consider that if α is of order greater than $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$ the covariance vanishes, meaning the auxiliary fields and saddle point approximation are not required. This implies the Gaussian process that the mean field theory predicts will have vanishing variance, and thus a typical realisation will be well described by the mean equation of the DMFP equations.

Intermediate cases are of course possible, and will arise in practice, since the Dirichlet parameters will increase in integer quantities. We anticipate the Gaussian theory to hold, however what we may observe in practice are finite size effects, not only due to the finite nature of the system but also the mixture of highly uncertain random variables and those more certain. We aim to pursue this question in future work.

C Simulations

C.1 Q-Q plots of Q-values.




Figure C.1: $|\mathcal{S}| = 5$




Figure C.2: $|\mathcal{S}| = 50$




Figure C.3: $|\mathcal{S}| = 500$

Figure C.4: Q-Q plots of standardised optimal Q-values at initialisation, against quantiles of standard normal distribution for varying state space size. discount factor $\beta = 0.95$

C.2 Dynamic mean field programming: empirical data versus theoretical predictions.




Figure C.5: $\beta = 0.5, N = 5$




Figure C.6: $\beta = 0.8, N = 50$




Figure C.7: $\beta = 0.9, N = 500$

Figure C.8: Comparison between empirical and DMFP theoretical mean and variances against iterations k for varying discount factor β and varying values of N .