This chapter introduces a model known as a Markov decision process (MDP) to represent sequential decision problems where the effects of our actions are uncertain.\(^1\) We begin with a description of the model, which specifies both the stochastic dynamics of the system as well as the utility associated with its evolution. Different algorithms can be used to compute the utility associated with a decision strategy and to search for an optimal strategy. Under certain assumptions, we can find exact solutions to Markov decision processes. Later chapters will discuss approximation methods that tend to scale better to larger problems.

### 7.1 Markov Decision Processes

In an MDP (algorithm 7.1), we choose action \(a_t\) at time \(t\) based on observing state \(s_t\). We then receive a reward \(r_t\). The action space \(A\) is the set of possible actions, and the state space \(S\) is the set of possible states. Some of the algorithms assume these sets are finite, but this is not required in general. The state evolves probabilistically based on the current state and action we take. The assumption that the next state depends only on the current state and action and not on any prior state or action is known as the Markov assumption.

An MDP can be represented using a decision network as shown in figure 7.1. There are informational edges (not shown in the figure) from \(A_{1:t-1}\) and \(S_{1:t}\) to \(A_t\). The utility function is decomposed into rewards \(R_{1:t}\). We focus on stationary MDPs in which \(P(S_{t+1} \mid S_t, A_t)\) and \(P(R_t \mid S_t, A_t)\) do not vary with time. Stationary MDPs can be compactly represented by a dynamic decision diagram as shown in figure 7.2. The state transition model \(T(s' \mid s, a)\) represents the probability of transitioning from state \(s\) to \(s'\) after executing action \(a\). The reward function \(R(s, a)\) represents the expected reward received when executing action \(a\) from state \(s\).

The reward function is a deterministic function of $s$ and $a$ because it represents an expectation, but rewards may be generated stochastically in the environment or even depend on the resulting next state. Example 7.1 shows how to frame a collision avoidance problem as an MDP.

The problem of aircraft collision avoidance can be formulated as an MDP. The states represent the positions and velocities of our aircraft and the intruder aircraft, and the actions represent whether we climb, descend, or stay level. We receive a large negative reward for colliding with the other aircraft and a small negative reward for climbing or descending.

Given knowledge of the current state, we must decide whether an avoidance maneuver is required. The problem is challenging because the positions of the aircraft evolve probabilistically and we want to make sure that we start our maneuver early enough to avoid collision but late enough so that we avoid unnecessary maneuvering.

Example 7.1. Aircraft collision avoidance framed as an MDP.


Given knowledge of the current state, we must decide whether an avoidance maneuver is required. The problem is challenging because the positions of the aircraft evolve probabilistically and we want to make sure that we start our maneuver early enough to avoid collision but late enough so that we avoid unnecessary maneuvering.

Algorithm 7.1. Data structure for an MDP. We will use the TR field later to sample the next state and reward given the current state and action: $s', r = TR(s, a)$. In mathematical writing, MDPs are sometimes defined in terms of a tuple consisting of the various components of the MDP, written $(S, A, T, R, \gamma)$.
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a discount factor $\gamma$ between 0 and 1. The utility is then given by

$$
\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t
$$

(7.2)

This value is sometimes called the discounted return. So long as $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ and the rewards are finite, the utility will be finite. The discount factor makes it so that rewards in the present are worth more than rewards in the future, a concept that also appears in economics.

Another way to define utility in infinite horizon problems is to use the average reward given by

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} r_t
$$

(7.3)

This average return formulation can be attractive because we do not have to choose a discount factor, but there is often not a practical difference between this formulation and discounted return with a discount factor close to 1. Because the discounted return is often computationally simpler to work with, we will focus on the discounted formulation.

A policy tells us what action to select given the past history of states and actions. The action to select at time $t$, given the history $h_t = (s_1:t, a_1:t-1)$, is written $\pi_t(h_t)$. Because the future states and rewards depend only on the current state and action (as made apparent in the conditional independence assumptions in figure 7.1), we can restrict our attention to policies that depend only on the current state. In addition, we will primarily focus on deterministic policies because, in MDPs, there is guaranteed to exist an optimal policy that is deterministic. Later chapters discuss stochastic policies, where $\pi_t(a_t \mid s_t)$ denotes the probability the policy assigns to taking action $a_t$ in state $s_t$ at time $t$.

In infinite horizon problems with stationary transitions and rewards, we can further restrict our attention to stationary policies, which do not depend on time. We will write the action associated with stationary policy $\pi$ in state $s$ as $\pi(s)$, without the temporal subscript. In finite horizon problems, however, it may be beneficial to select a different action depending on how many time steps are remaining. For example, when playing basketball, it is generally not a good strategy to attempt a half-court shot unless there are only a couple seconds remaining in the game. We can make stationary policies account for time by incorporating time as a state variable.
The expected utility of executing \( \pi \) from state \( s \) is denoted \( U^\pi(s) \). In the context of MDPs, \( U^\pi \) is often referred to as the value function. An optimal policy \( \pi^* \) is a policy that maximizes expected utility:

\[
\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_\pi U^\pi(s)
\]

for all states \( s \). Depending on the model, there may be multiple policies that are optimal. The value function associated with an optimal policy \( \pi^* \) is called the optimal value function and is denoted \( U^* \).

An optimal policy can be found by using a computational technique called dynamic programming,\(^5\) which involves simplifying a complicated problem by breaking it down into simpler sub-problems in a recursive manner. Although we will focus on dynamic programming algorithms for MDPs, dynamic programming is a general technique that can be applied to a wide variety of other problems. For example, dynamic programming can be used in computing a Fibonacci sequence and finding the longest common subsequence between two strings.\(^6\) In general, algorithms that use dynamic programming for solving MDPs are much more efficient than brute force methods.

### 7.2 Policy Evaluation

Before we discuss how to go about computing an optimal policy, we will first discuss policy evaluation, where we compute the value function \( U^\pi \). Policy evaluation can be done iteratively. If the policy is executed for a single time step, the utility is \( U_1^\pi(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) \). Further steps can be obtained by applying the lookahead equation:

\[
U_{k+1}^\pi(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, \pi(s)) U_k^\pi(s')
\]

This equation is implemented in algorithm 7.2. Iterative policy evaluation is implemented in algorithm 7.3. Several iterations are shown in figure 7.3.

The value function \( U^\pi \) can be computed to arbitrary precision given sufficient iterations. For an infinite horizon, we have

\[
U^\pi(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, \pi(s)) U^\pi(s')
\]

\(^4\) Doing so is consistent with the maximum expected utility principle introduced in section 6.4.

\(^5\) The term dynamic programming was coined by the American mathematician Richard Ernest Bellman (1920–1984). Dynamic refers to the fact that the problem is time-varying and programming refers to a methodology to find an optimal program or decision strategy. R. Bellman, *Eye of the Hurricane: an Autobiography*. World Scientific, 1984.

# 7.2. Policy Evaluation

Algorithm 7.2. Functions for computing the lookahead state-action value from a state $s$ given an action $a$ using an estimate of the value function $U$ for the MDP $\mathcal{P}$. The second version handles the case when $U$ is a vector.

```python
function lookahead(\mathcal{P}::MDP, U, s, a)
    S, T, R, \gamma = \mathcal{P}.S, \mathcal{P}.T, \mathcal{P}.R, \mathcal{P}.\gamma
    return R(s, a) + \gamma*\sum(T(s, a, s')*U(s')) for s' in S
end

function lookahead(\mathcal{P}::MDP, U::Vector, s, a)
    S, T, R, \gamma = \mathcal{P}.S, \mathcal{P}.T, \mathcal{P}.R, \mathcal{P}.\gamma
    return R(s, a) + \gamma*\sum(T(s, a, s')*U[i] for (i, s') in enumerate(S))
end
```

Algorithm 7.3. Iterative policy evaluation, which iteratively computes the value function for a policy $\pi$ for MDP $\mathcal{P}$ with discrete state and action spaces using $k_{\text{max}}$ iterations.

```python
function iterative_policy_evaluation(\mathcal{P}::MDP, \pi, k_{\text{max}})
    S, T, R, \gamma = \mathcal{P}.S, \mathcal{P}.T, \mathcal{P}.R, \mathcal{P}.\gamma
    U = [0.0 for s in S]
    for k in 1:k_{\text{max}}
        U = [lookahead(\mathcal{P}, U, s, \pi(s)) for s in S]
    end
    return U
end
```

Figure 7.3. Iterative policy evaluation used to evaluate an east-moving policy on the hex world problem (appendix F.1). The arrows indicate the direction recommended by the policy (i.e., always move east), and the colors indicate the values associated with the states. The values change with each iteration.
at convergence. Convergence can be proven using the fact that the update in equation (7.5) is a contraction mapping (reviewed in appendix A.15).7

Policy evaluation can be done without iteration by solving a system of equations in matrix form:

\[ U^\pi = R^\pi + \gamma T^\pi U^\pi \]  

(7.7)

where \( U^\pi \) and \( R^\pi \) are the utility and reward functions represented in vector form with \( |S| \) components. The \(|S| \times |S|\) matrix \( T^\pi \) contains state transition probabilities where \( T^\pi_{ij} \) is the probability of transitioning from the \( i \)th state to the \( j \)th state.

The value function is obtained as follows:

\[ U^\pi - \gamma T^\pi U^\pi = R^\pi \]  

(7.8)

\[ (I - \gamma T^\pi) U^\pi = R^\pi \]  

(7.9)

\[ U^\pi = (I - \gamma T^\pi)^{-1} R^\pi \]  

(7.10)

This method is implemented in algorithm 7.4. Solving for \( U^\pi \) in this way requires \( O(|S|^3) \) time. The method is used to evaluate a policy in figure 7.4.

Algorithm 7.4. Exact policy evaluation, which computes the value function for a policy \( \pi \) for an MDP \( \mathcal{P} \) with discrete state and action spaces.

Figure 7.4. Exact policy evaluation used to evaluate an east-moving policy for the hex world problem. The exact solution contains lower values than what was contained in the first few steps of iterative policy evaluation in figure 7.3. If we ran iterative policy evaluation for more iterations, it would converge to the same value function.

7 See exercise 7.13.

7.3 Value Function Policies

The previous section showed how to compute a value function associated with a policy. This section shows how to extract a policy from a value function, which we later use when generating optimal policies. Given a value function \( U \), which
may or may not correspond to the optimal value function, we can construct a policy $\pi$ that maximizes the lookahead equation introduced in equation (7.5):

$$
\pi(s) = \arg\max_a \left( R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) U(s') \right)
$$

We refer to this policy as a *greedy policy* with respect to $U$. If $U$ is the optimal value function, then the extracted policy is optimal. Algorithm 7.5 implements this idea.

An alternative way to represent a policy is to use the *action value function*, sometimes called the $Q$-function. The action value function represents the expected return when starting in state $s$, taking action $a$, and then continuing with the greedy policy with respect to $Q$:

$$
Q(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) U(s')
$$

From this action value function, we can obtain the value function,

$$
U(s) = \max_a Q(s, a)
$$

as well as the policy,

$$
\pi(s) = \arg\max_a Q(s, a)
$$

Storing $Q$ explicitly for discrete problems requires $O(|S| \times |A|)$ storage instead of $O(|S|)$ storage for $U$, but we do not have to use $R$ and $T$ to extract the policy.

Policies can also be represented using the *advantage function*, which quantifies the advantage of taking an action in comparison to the greedy action. It is defined in terms of the difference between $Q$ and $U$:

$$
A(s, a) = Q(s, a) - U(s)
$$

Greedy actions have zero advantage, and non-greedy actions have negative advantage. Some algorithms that we will discuss later in the book use $U$ representations, but others will use $Q$ or $A$. 
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7.4 Policy Iteration

Policy iteration (algorithm 7.6) is one way to compute an optimal policy. It involves iterating between policy evaluation (section 7.2) and policy improvement through a greedy policy (algorithm 7.5). Policy iteration is guaranteed to converge given any initial policy. It converges in a finite number of iterations because there are finitely many policies and every iteration improves the policy if it is possible to be improved. Although the number of possible policies is exponential in the number of states, policy iteration often converges quickly. Figure 7.5 demonstrates policy iteration on the hex world problem.
Policy iteration tends to be expensive because we must evaluate the policy in each iteration. A variation of policy iteration called modified policy iteration\(^8\) approximates the value function using iterative policy evaluation instead of exact policy evaluation. We can choose the number of policy evaluation iterations between steps of policy improvement. If we use only one iteration between steps, then this approach is identical to value iteration.

7.5 Value Iteration

Value iteration is an alternative to policy iteration that is often used because of its simplicity. Unlike policy improvement, value iteration updates the value function directly. It begins with any bounded value function $U$, meaning that $|U(s)| < \infty$ for all $s$. One common initialization is $U(s) = 0$ for all $s$.

The value function can be improved by applying the Bellman equation:

$$U_{k+1}(s) = \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) U_k(s') \right) \quad (7.16)$$

This backup procedure is implemented in algorithm 7.7.

```
function backup(\mathcal{P}::MDP, U, s)
    return maximum(lookahead(\mathcal{P}, U, s, a) for a in \mathcal{P}.A)
end
```

Repeated application of this update is guaranteed to converge on an optimal policy. Like iterative policy evaluation, we can use the fact that the update is a contraction mapping to prove convergence. This optimal policy is guaranteed to satisfy:

$$U^*(s) = \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) U^*(s') \right) \quad (7.17)$$

Further applications of the Bellman equation once this equality holds do not change the policy. An optimal policy can be extracted from $U^*$ using equation (7.11). Value iteration is implemented in algorithm 7.8 and is applied to the hex world problem in figure 7.6.

The implementation in algorithm 7.8 stops after a fixed number of iterations, but it is also common to terminate the iterations early based on the maximum change in value $\|U_{k+1} - U_k\|_\infty$, called the Bellman residual. If the Bellman residual drops below some threshold $\delta$, then the iterations terminate. A Bellman residual of $\delta$ guarantees that the optimal value function obtained by value iteration is within $\epsilon = \delta \gamma / (1 - \gamma)$ of $U^*$. Discount factors closer to 1 significantly inflate this error, leading to slower convergence. If we heavily discount future reward ($\gamma$ closer to 0), then we do not need to iterate as much into the future. This effect is demonstrated in example 7.2.

9 Named for one of the pioneers of the field of dynamic programming, R.E. Bellman, Dynamic Programming. Princeton University Press, 1957.


11 See exercise 7.8.
Knowing the maximum deviation of the estimated value function from the optimal value function, $\|U_k - U^*\|_\infty < \epsilon$, allows us to bound the maximum deviation of reward obtained under the extracted policy $\pi$ from an optimal policy $\pi^*$. This policy loss $\|U^\pi - U^*\|_\infty$ is bounded by $2\epsilon^\frac{1}{13}$ 

Algorithm 7.8. Value iteration, which iteratively improves a value function $U$ to obtain an optimal policy for an MDP $\mathcal{P}$ with discrete state and action spaces. The method terminates after $k_{\text{max}}$ iterations.

```plaintext
struct ValueIteration
    k_max # maximum number of iterations
end

function solve(M::ValueIteration, P::MDP)
    U = [0.0 for s in P.S]
    for k = 1:M.k_max
        U = [backup(P, U, s) for s in P.S]
    end
    return ValueFunctionPolicy(P, U)
end
```

7.6 Asynchronous Value Iteration

Value iteration tends to be computationally intensive, as every entry in the value function $U_k$ is updated in each iteration to obtain $U_{k+1}$. In asynchronous value iteration, only a subset of the states are updated in each iteration. Asynchronous value iteration is still guaranteed to converge on the optimal value function provided that each state is updated infinitely often.

One common asynchronous value iteration method, Gauss-Seidel value iteration (algorithm 7.9), sweeps through an ordering of the states and applies the Bellman update in place:

$$U(s) \leftarrow \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) U(s') \right) \tag{7.18}$$

The computational savings lies in not having to construct a second value function in memory in each iteration. Gauss-Seidel value iteration can converge more quickly than standard value iteration depending on the ordering chosen. A poor ordering in Gauss-Seidel value iteration cannot cause the algorithm to be slower than standard value iteration.

In some problems, the state contains a time index that increments deterministically forward in time. If we apply Gauss-Seidel value iteration starting at the last time index and work our way backwards, this process is sometimes called backwards induction value iteration. An example of the impact of the state ordering is given in example 7.3.

13 A poor ordering in Gauss-Seidel value iteration cannot cause the algorithm to be slower than standard value iteration.
Figure 7.6. Value iteration on the hex world problem to obtain an optimal policy. Each hex is colored according to the value function and arrows indicate the policy that is greedy with respect to that value function.
Consider a simple variation of the hex world problem consisting of a straight line of tiles with a single consuming tile at the end producing 10 reward. The discount factor directly affects the rate at which reward from the consuming tile propagates down the line to the other tiles, and thus how quickly value iteration converges.

\[
\gamma = 0.9 \quad \gamma = 0.5
\]

Example 7.2. An example showing the effect of the discount factor on convergence of value iteration. In each case value iteration was run until the Bellman residual was less than 1.
Algorithm 7.9. Asynchronous value iteration, which updates states in a different manner to value iteration, often saving computation time. The method terminates after \( k_{\text{max}} \) iterations.

7.7 Linear Program Formulation

The problem of finding an optimal policy can be formulated as a linear program, which is an optimization problem with a linear objective function and a set of linear equality or inequality constraints. Once a problem is represented as a linear program, we can use one of many different linear programming solvers.\(^\text{14}\)

To show how we can convert the Bellman equation into a linear program, we begin by replacing the equality in the Bellman equation with a set of inequality constraints while minimizing \( U(s) \) at each state \( s \):\(^\text{15}\)

\[
\text{minimize } \sum_s U(s) \\
\text{subject to } U(s) \geq \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) U(s') \right) \text{ for all } s
\]

(7.19)

The variables in the optimization are the utilities at each state. Once we know those utilities, we can extract an optimal policy using equation (7.11).

The maximization in the inequality constraints can be replaced by a set of linear constraints, making it a linear program:

\[
\text{minimize } \sum_s U(s) \\
\text{subject to } U(s) \geq R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) U(s') \text{ for all } s \text{ and } a
\]

(7.20)

In the linear program above, the number of variables is equal to the number of states and the number of constraints is equal to the number of states times...
Consider the linear variation of the hex world problem from example 7.2. We can solve the same problem using asynchronous value iteration. The ordering of the states directly affects the rate at which reward from the consuming tile propagates down the line to the other tiles, and thus how quickly the method converges.

Example 7.3. An example showing the effect of the state ordering on convergence of asynchronous value iteration. In this case, evaluating right to left allows for convergence in far fewer iterations.
the number of actions. Because linear programs can be solved in polynomial time,\textsuperscript{16} MDPs can be solved in polynomial time. Although a linear programming approach provides this asymptotic complexity guarantee, it is often more efficient in practice to simply use value iteration. Algorithm 7.10 provides an implementation.

\begin{verbatim}
struct LinearProgramFormulation

function tensorform(\$::MDP)
    \$', \$', \$', \$ = \$.
    \$' = \$([\$])
    \$' = \$([\$])
    \$' = \$([\$])
    \$' = \$([\$,:])
    return \$', \$', \$', \$'
end

function solve(\$::MDP) = solve(LinearProgramFormulation(), \$)
end

end

Algorithm 7.10. A method for solving a discrete MDP using a linear program formulation. For convenience in specifying the linear program, we define a function for converting an MDP into its tensor form, where the states and actions consist of integer indices, the reward function is a matrix, and the transition function is a three-dimensional tensor. It uses the JuMP.jl package for mathematical programming. The optimizer is set to use GLPK.jl, but others can be used instead. We also define the default solve behavior for MDPs to use this formulation.

7.8 Linear Systems with Quadratic Reward

So far, we have assumed discrete state and action spaces. This section relaxes this assumption, allowing for continuous, vector-valued states and actions. The Bellman equation for discrete problems can be modified as follows:\textsuperscript{17}

\[
U_{h+1}(s) = \max_a \left( R(s, a) + \int T(s' \mid s, a) U_h(s') \, ds' \right)
\]

where \( s \) and \( a \) in equation (7.16) are replaced with their vector equivalents, the summation is replaced with an integral, and \( T \) provides a probability density rather than a probability mass. Computing equation (7.21) is not straightforward for an arbitrary continuous transition distribution and reward function.

\textsuperscript{16} This was proven by L.G. Khachiyan, “Polynomial Algorithms in Linear Programming,” USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 53–72, 1980. Modern algorithms tend to be more efficient in practice.

\textsuperscript{17} This section assumes the problem is undiscounted and finite horizon, but these equations can be easily generalized.
In some cases, exact solution methods do exist for MDPs with continuous state and action spaces. In particular, if a problem has linear dynamics and has quadratic reward, then the optimal policy can be efficiently found in closed form. Such a system is known in control theory as a linear quadratic regulator (LQR) and has been well studied.

A problem has linear dynamics if the transition function has the form:

\[ T(s' | s, a) = T_s s + T_a a + w \]  

where \( T_s \) and \( T_a \) are matrices that determine the mean of the next state \( s' \) given \( s \) and \( a \), and \( w \) is a random disturbance drawn from a zero mean, finite variance distribution that does not depend on \( s \) and \( a \). One common choice is the multivariate Gaussian.

A reward function is quadratic if it can be written in the form:

\[ R(s, a) = s^\top R_s s + a^\top R_a a \]  

where \( R_s \) and \( R_a \) are matrices that determine how state and action component combinations contribute reward. We additionally require that \( R_s \) be negative semidefinite and \( R_a \) be negative definite. Such a reward function penalizes states and actions that deviate from 0.

Problems with linear dynamics and quadratic reward are common in control theory where one often seeks to regulate a process such that it does not deviate far from a desired value. The quadratic cost assigns much higher cost to states far from the origin than those near it. The optimal policy for a problem with linear dynamics and quadratic reward has an analytic, closed-form solution. Many MDPs can be approximated with linear quadratic MDPs and solved, often yielding reasonable policies for the original problem.

Substituting the transition and reward functions into equation (7.21) produces:

\[ U_h+1(s) = \max_a \left( s^\top R_s s + a^\top R_a a + \int p(w) U_h(T_s s + T_a a + w) \, dw \right) \]  

where \( p(w) \) is the probability density of the random, zero-mean disturbance \( w \).

The optimal one-step value function is:

\[ U_1(s) = \max_a \left( s^\top R_s s + a^\top R_a a \right) = s^\top R_s s \]  
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for which the optimal action is $a = 0$.

We will show through induction that $U_h(s)$ has a quadratic form $s^\top V_h s + q_h$ with symmetric matrices $V_h$. For the one-step value function, $V_1 = R_s$ and $q_1 = 0$. Substituting this quadratic form into equation (7.24) yields:

$$U_{h+1}(s) = s^\top R_s s + \max_a \left( a^\top R_a a + \int p(w) \left( (T_s s + T_a a + w)^\top V_h (T_s s + T_a a + w) + q_h \right) dw \right)$$

(7.26)

This can be simplified by expanding and using the fact that $\int p(w) dw = 1$ and $\int w p(w) dw = 0$:

$$U_{h+1}(s) = s^\top R_s s + s^\top T_s^\top V_h T_s s + \max_a \left( a^\top R_a a + 2s^\top T_s V_h T_a a + a^\top T_a^\top V_h T_a a \right)$$

(7.27)

$$+ \int p(w) \left( w^\top V_h w \right) dw + q_h$$

We can obtain the optimal action by differentiating with respect to $a$ and setting it to 0:21

$$0 = \left( R_a + T_a^\top \right) a + 2T_a^\top V_h T_s s + \left( T_a^\top V_h T_a + \left( T_a^\top V_h T_a \right)^\top \right) a$$

(7.28)

$$= 2R_a a + 2T_a^\top V_h T_s s + 2T_a^\top V_h T_a a$$

Solving for the optimal action yields:22

$$a = -\left( R_a + T_a^\top V_h T_a \right)^{-1} T_a^\top V_h T_s s$$

(7.29)

Substituting the optimal action into $U_{h+1}(s)$ yields the quadratic form that we were seeking $U_{h+1}(s) = s^\top V_{h+1} s + q_{h+1}$, with23

$$V_{h+1} = R_s + T_s^\top V_h^\top T_s - \left( T_a^\top V_h T_s \right)^\top \left( R_a + T_a^\top V_h T_a \right)^{-1} \left( T_a^\top V_h T_s \right)$$

(7.30)

and

$$q_{h+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{h} E_w \left[ w^\top V_i w \right]$$

(7.31)

If $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, then

$$q_{h+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{h} \text{Tr}(\Sigma V_i)$$

(7.32)
We can compute $V_h$ and $q_h$ up to any horizon $h$ starting from $V_1 = R_s$ and $q_1 = 0$ and iterating using the equations above. The optimal action for an $h$-step policy comes directly from equation (7.29):

$$
\pi_h(s) = -\left( T_a^T V_{h-1} T_a + R_a \right)^{-1} T_a^T V_{h-1} T_s s
$$

(7.33)

Note that the optimal action is independent of the zero-mean disturbance distribution.\footnote{In this case, we can replace the random disturbances with its expected value without changing the optimal policy. This property is known as certainty equivalence.} The variance of the disturbance, however, does affect the expected utility. Algorithm 7.11 provides an implementation. Example 7.4 demonstrates this process on a simple problem with linear Gaussian dynamics.

```python
struct LinearQuadraticProblem
    Ts # transition matrix with respect to state
    Ta # transition matrix with respect to action
    Rs # reward matrix with respect to state (negative semidefinite)
    Ra # reward matrix with respect to action (negative definite)
    h_max # horizon
end

function solve(𝒫::LinearQuadraticProblem)
    Ts, Ta, Rs, Ra, h_max = 𝒫.Ts, 𝒫.Ta, 𝒫.Rs, 𝒫.Ra, 𝒫.h_max
    V = zeros(size(Rs))
    πs = Any[s -> zeros(size(Ta, 2))]
    for h in 2:h_max
        V = Ts'*((V - V*Ta*((Ta'*V*Ta + Ra) \ Ta'*V)))*Ts + Rs
        L = -(Ta'*V*Ta + Ra) \ Ta' * V * Ts
        push!(πs, s -> L*s)
    end
    return πs
end
```

7.9 Summary

- Discrete Markov decision processes with bounded rewards can be solved exactly through dynamic programming.
- Policy evaluation for such problems can be done exactly through matrix inversion or can be approximated by an iterative algorithm.
- Policy iteration can be used to solve for optimal policies through iterating between policy evaluation and policy improvement.
Consider a continuous MDP where the state is composed of a scalar position and velocity \( s = [x, v] \). Actions are scalar accelerations \( a \) that are each executed over a time step \( \Delta t = 1 \). Find an optimal 5-step policy from \( s_0 = [-10, 0] \) given a quadratic reward:

\[
R(s, a) = -x^2 - v^2 - 0.5a^2
\]

such that the system tends toward rest at \( s = 0 \).

The transition dynamics are:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    x' \\
    v'
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    x + v\Delta t + \frac{1}{2}a\Delta t^2 + w_1 \\
    v + 0.5\Delta t^2 
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
    1 & \Delta t \\
    0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
    x \\
    v
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
    0.5\Delta t^2 \\
    \Delta t
\end{bmatrix} [a] + w
\]

where \( w \) is drawn from a zero-mean multivariate Gaussian distribution with covariance \( 0.1I \).

The reward matrices are \( R_s = -I \) and \( R_a = -[0.5] \).

The resulting optimal policies are:

\[
\pi_1(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    0
\end{bmatrix} s
\]

\[
\pi_2(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
    -0.286 \\
    -0.857
\end{bmatrix} s
\]

\[
\pi_3(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
    -0.462 \\
    -1.077
\end{bmatrix} s
\]

\[
\pi_4(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
    -0.499 \\
    -1.118
\end{bmatrix} s
\]

\[
\pi_5(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
    -0.504 \\
    -1.124
\end{bmatrix} s
\]
• Value iteration and asynchronous value iteration save computation by directly iterating the value function.

• The problem of finding an optimal policy can be framed as a linear program and solved in polynomial time.

• Continuous problems with linear transition functions and quadratic rewards can be solved exactly.

7.10 Exercises

Exercise 7.1. Show that for an infinite sequence of constant rewards \( r_t = r \) for all \( t \) the infinite horizon discounted return converges to \( r / (1 - \gamma) \).

Solution: We can prove that the infinite sequence of discounted constant rewards converges to \( r / (1 - \gamma) \) in the following steps

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t = r + \gamma r + \gamma^2 r + \cdots
\]

\[
= r + \gamma \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t
\]

We can move the summation to the left side and factor out \( 1 - \gamma \):

\[
(1 - \gamma) \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t = r
\]

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{t-1} r_t = \frac{r}{1 - \gamma}
\]

Exercise 7.2. Suppose we have a Markov decision process consisting of five states \( s_{1:5} \) and two actions, to stay \( (a_S) \) and continue \( (a_C) \). We have the following

\[
T(s_i \mid s_i, a_S) = 1 \text{ for } i \in \{1,2,3,4\}
\]

\[
T(s_{i+1} \mid s_i, a_C) = 1 \text{ for } i \in \{1,2,3,4\}
\]

\[
T(s_5 \mid s_5, a) = 1 \text{ for all actions } a
\]

\[
R(s_i, a) = 0 \text{ for } i \in \{1,2,3,5\} \text{ and for all actions } a
\]

\[
R(s_4, a_S) = 0
\]

\[
R(s_4, a_C) = 10
\]

What is the discount factor \( \gamma \) if the optimal value \( U^*(s_1) = 1 \)?
Thus, the discount factor is \( \gamma = 0.11^{1/3} \approx 0.464 \)

**Exercise 7.3.** What is the time complexity of performing \( k \) steps of iterative policy evaluation?

**Solution:** Iterative policy evaluation requires computing the lookahead equation:

\[
U_{k+1}^{\pi}(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, \pi(s)) U_k^\pi(s')
\]

Updating the value at a single state requires summing over all \( |S| \) states. For a single iteration over all states, we must do this operation \( |S| \) times. Thus, the time complexity of \( k \) steps of iterative policy evaluation is \( O(k|S|^2) \).

**Exercise 7.4.** Suppose we have an MDP with six states \( s_{1:6} \) and four actions \( a_{1:4} \). Using the following tabular form of the action value function \( Q(s, a) \), compute \( U(s) \), \( \pi(s) \), and \( A(s, a) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( Q(s, a) )</th>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_3 )</th>
<th>( a_4 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s_1 )</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_2 )</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_3 )</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_4 )</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_5 )</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_6 )</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Solution:** We can compute \( U(s) \), \( \pi(s) \), and \( A(s, a) \) using the following equations

\[
U(s) = \max_a Q(s, a) \quad \pi(s) = \arg \max_a Q(s, a) \quad A(s, a) = Q(s, a) - U(s)
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( s )</th>
<th>( U(s) )</th>
<th>( \pi(s) )</th>
<th>( A(s, a_1) )</th>
<th>( A(s, a_2) )</th>
<th>( A(s, a_3) )</th>
<th>( A(s, a_4) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s_1 )</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_2 )</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_3 )</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_4 )</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_5 )</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_6 )</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 7.5. Suppose we have a three-tile, straight-line hex world (appendix F.1) where
the rightmost tile is an absorbing state. When we take any action in the rightmost state,
we get a reward of 10 and we are transported to a fourth terminal state where we no
longer receive any reward. Use a discount factor of $\gamma = 0.9$. Perform a single step of policy
iteration where the initial policy $\pi$ has us move east in the first tile, northeast in the second
tile, and southwest in the third tile. For the policy evaluation step, write out the transition
matrix $T^\pi$ and the reward vector $R^\pi$ and then solve the infinite horizon value function $U^\pi$
directly using matrix inversion. For the policy improvement step, compute the updated
policy $\pi'$ by maximizing the lookahead equation.

Solution: For the policy evaluation step, we use equation (7.10), repeated below:

$$U^\pi = (I - \gamma T^\pi)^{-1} R^\pi$$

Forming the transition matrix $T^\pi$ and reward vector $R^\pi$ with an additional state for the
terminal state, we can solve for the infinite horizon value function $U^\pi$

$$U^\pi = \left( \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} - (0.9) \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.85 & 0.15 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} -0.3 \\ -0.85 \\ 10 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 1.425 \\ 2.128 \\ 10 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

For the policy improvement step, we apply equation (7.11) using the updated value
function. The actions in the arg max term correspond to $a_E, a_{NE}, a_{NW}, a_W, a_{SW},$ and $a_{SE}$:

$$\pi(s_1) = \arg \max (1.425, 0.527, 0.283, 0.283, 0.283, 0.527) = a_E$$
$$\pi(s_2) = \arg \max (6.575, 2.128, 0.970, 1.172, 0.970, 2.128) = a_E$$
$$\pi(s_3) = \arg \max (10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10) = a, all actions are equally desirable$$

Exercise 7.6. Perform two steps of value iteration to the problem in exercise 7.5, starting
with an initial value function $U_0(s) = 0$ for all $s$.

Solution: We need to use the Bellman equation (equation (7.16)) to perform iterative
backups of the value function. The actions in the max term correspond to $a_E, a_{NE}, a_{NW}$,
$a_W, a_{SW},$ and $a_{SE}$. For our first iteration, the value function is zero for all states, so we only
need to consider the reward component:

$$U_1(s_1) = \max(-0.3, -0.85, -1, -1, -1, -0.85) = -0.3$$
$$U_1(s_2) = \max(-0.3, -0.85, -0.85, -0.3, -0.85, -0.85) = -0.3$$
$$U_1(s_3) = \max(10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10) = 10$$
For the second iteration

\[
U_2(s_1) = \max(-0.57, -1.12, -1.27, -1.27, -1.27, -1.27) = -0.57
\]

\[
U_2(s_2) = \max(5.919, 0.271, -1.12, -0.57, -1.12, 0.271) = 5.919
\]

\[
U_2(s_3) = \max(10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10) = 10
\]

**Exercise 7.7.** Apply one sweep of asynchronous value iteration to the problem in exercise 7.5, starting with an initial value function \(U_0(s) = 0\) for all \(s\). Update the states from right to left.

**Solution:** We use the Bellman equation (equation (7.16)) to iteratively update the value function over each state following our ordering. The actions in the max term correspond to \(a_E, a_{NE}, a_{NW}, a_W, a_{SW}, \) and \(a_{SE}\):

\[
U(s_3) = \max(10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10) = 10
\]

\[
U(s_2) = \max(6, 0.5, -0.85, -0.3, -0.85, 0.5) = 6
\]

\[
U(s_1) = \max(3.48, -0.04, -1, -1, -1, -0.04) = 3.48
\]

**Exercise 7.8.** Prove that a Bellman residual of \(\delta\) guarantees that the value function obtained by value iteration is within \(\delta \gamma / (1 - \gamma)\) of \(U^*(s)\) at every state \(s\).

**Solution:** For a given \(U_k\), suppose we know that \(\|U_k - U_{k-1}\|_\infty < \delta\). We can bound the improvement in the next iteration:

\[
U_{k+1}(s) - U_k(s) = \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) U_k(s') \right)
\]

\[
- \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) U_{k-1}(s') \right)
\]

\[
\leq \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) U_k(s') \right)
\]

\[
- \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' \mid s,a) (U_k(s') - \delta) \right)
\]

\[
= \delta \gamma
\]
Similarly,

\[ U_{k+1}(s) - U_k(s) > \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) U_k(s') \right) \]

\[ - \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) (U_k(s') + \delta) \right) \]

\[ = -\delta \gamma \]

The accumulated improvement after infinite iterations is thus bounded by:

\[ \| U^*(s) - U_k(s) \|_\infty < \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta^i \gamma^i = \frac{\delta \gamma}{1 - \gamma} \]

A Bellman residual of \( \delta \) thus guarantees that the optimal value function obtained by value iteration is within \( \delta \gamma / (1 - \gamma) \) of \( U^* \).

**Exercise 7.9.** Prove that if \( \| U - U^* \|_\infty < \epsilon \) for an estimate of the value function \( U \), then the policy \( \pi \) extracted from \( U \) using equation (7.11) has a policy loss bound of \( \| U^\pi - U^* \|_\infty < 2\epsilon \).

**Solution:** We are given \( \| U - U^* \|_\infty < \epsilon \). The worst-case deviation between the policy extracted from \( U \) and an optimal policy occurs when the policy from \( U \) has value just under \( U + \epsilon \) and the true optimal policy has value just above \( U - \epsilon \). In this case, \( U^\pi - U^* < U + \epsilon - (U - \epsilon) = 2\epsilon \).

**Exercise 7.10.** Suppose we run policy evaluation on an expert policy to obtain a value function. If acting greedily with respect to that value function is equivalent to the expert policy, what can we deduce about the expert policy?

**Solution:** We know from the Bellman equation that greedy lookahead on an optimal value function is stationary. If the greedy policy matches the expert policy, then the greedy policy is optimal.

**Exercise 7.11.** Show how an LQR problem with a quadratic reward function \( R(s,a) = s^\top R_s s + a^\top R_a a \) can be reformulated so that the reward function includes linear terms in \( s \) and \( a \).

**Solution:** We can introduce an additional state dimension that is always equal to 1, yielding a new system with linear dynamics:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    s' \\
    1
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
    T_s & 0 \\
    0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    s \\
    1
\end{bmatrix} + T_a a
\]

The reward function of the augmented system can now have linear state reward terms:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    s \\
    1
\end{bmatrix}^\top R_{\text{augmented}}
\begin{bmatrix}
    s \\
    1
\end{bmatrix} = s^\top R_s s + 2r_{s,\text{linear}} s + r_{s,\text{scalar}}
\]
Similarly, we can include an additional action dimension that is always 1 to obtain linear action reward terms.

**Exercise 7.12.** Why does the optimal policy obtained in example 7.4 produce actions with greater magnitude when the horizon is greater?

**Solution:** The problem in example 7.4 has quadratic reward that penalizes deviations from the origin. The longer the horizon, the greater the negative reward that can be accumulated, making it more worthwhile to reach the origin sooner.

**Exercise 7.13.** Prove that iterative policy evaluation converges to the solution of equation (7.6).

**Solution:** Consider iterative policy evaluation applied to a policy \( \pi \) as given in equation (7.5):

\[
U_{k+1}^\pi(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) U_k^\pi(s')
\]

Let us define an operator \( B_\pi \) and rewrite the above as:

\[
U_{k+1}^\pi = B_\pi U_k^\pi.
\]

We can show that \( B_\pi \) is a contraction mapping:

\[
B_\pi U^\pi(s) = R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) (U^\pi(s') - \hat{U}^\pi(s'))
\]

\[
= B_\pi \hat{U}^\pi(s) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) (U^\pi(s') - \hat{U}^\pi(s'))
\]

\[
\leq B_\pi \hat{U}^\pi(s) + \gamma \|U^\pi - \hat{U}^\pi\|_{\infty}
\]

Hence, \( \|B_\pi U^\pi - B_\pi \hat{U}^\pi\|_{\infty} \leq \alpha \|U^\pi - \hat{U}^\pi\|_{\infty} \) for \( \alpha = \gamma \), implying that \( B_\pi \) is a contraction mapping. As discussed in appendix A.15, \( \lim_{t \to \infty} B_\pi^t U_1^\pi \) converges to a unique fixed point \( U^\pi \) for which \( U^\pi = B_\pi U^\pi \).

**Exercise 7.14.** Prove that value iteration converges to a unique solution.

**Solution:** The value iteration update (equation (7.16)) is:

\[
U^{k+1}(s) = \max_a \left( R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s, a) U_k(s') \right)
\]

We will denote the Bellman operator as \( B \) and rewrite an application of the Bellman equation as \( U_{k+1} = BU_k \). As with the previous problem, if \( B \) is a contraction mapping, then repeated application of \( B \) to \( U \) will converge to a unique fixed point.
We can show that $B$ is a contraction mapping:

$$BU(s) = \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) U(s') \right)$$

$$= \max_a \left( R(s,a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) (U(s') - \hat{U}(s') + \hat{U}(s')) \right)$$

$$\leq B\hat{U}(s) + \gamma \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a) (U(s') - \hat{U}(s'))$$

$$\leq B\hat{U}(s) + \alpha \|U - \hat{U}\|_\infty$$

for $\alpha = \gamma \max_s \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s' | s,a)$, with $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Hence, $\|BU - B\hat{U}\|_\infty \leq \alpha \|U - \hat{U}\|$, which implies $B$ is a contraction mapping.

**Exercise 7.15.** Show that the point to which value iteration converges corresponds to the optimal value function.

**Solution:** Let $U$ be the value function produced by value iteration. We want to show that $U = U^*$. At convergence, we have $BU = U$. Let $U_0$ be a value function that maps all states to 0. For any policy $\pi$, it follows from the definition of $B_\pi$ that $B_\pi U_0 \leq BU_0$. Similarly, $B_\pi^t U_0 \leq B^t U_0$. Because $B_\pi^t U_0 \to U^*$ and $B^t U_0 \to U$ as $t \to \infty$, it follows that $U^* \leq U$, which can only be the case if $U = U^*$.

**Exercise 7.16.** Suppose we have a linear Gaussian problem with disturbance $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ and quadratic reward. Show that the scalar term in the utility function has the form:

$$q_{h+1} = \sum_{i=1}^h \mathbb{E}_w \left[ w^\top V_i w \right] = \sum_{i=1}^h \text{Tr}(\Sigma V_i)$$

You may want to use the trace trick:

$$x^\top A x = \text{Tr}(x^\top A x) = \text{Tr}(A x x^\top)$$

**Solution:** The above equation is true if $\mathbb{E}_w \left[ w^\top V_i w \right] = \text{Tr}(\Sigma V_i)$. Our derivation is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} \left[ w^\top V_i w \right] = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} \left[ \text{Tr}(w^\top V_i w) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} \left[ \text{Tr}(V_i w w^\top) \right]$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left( \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} \left[ V_i w w^\top \right] \right)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left( V_i \mathbb{E}_{w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} \left[ w w^\top \right] \right)$$

$$= \text{Tr} \left( V_i \Sigma \right)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(\Sigma V_i)$$
Exercise 7.17. What is the role of the scalar term \( q \) in the LQR optimal value function, as given in equation (7.31):

\[
q_{h+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{h} \mathbb{E}_w \left[ w^\top V_i w \right]
\]

Solution: A matrix \( M \) is positive definite if for all non-zero \( x \), that \( x^\top M x > 0 \). In equation (7.31), every \( V_i \) is negative semi-definite, so \( w^\top V w \leq 0 \) for all \( w \). Thus, these \( q \) terms are guaranteed to be non-positive. This should be expected, as in LQR problems it is impossible to obtain positive reward, and we seek instead to minimize cost.

The \( q \) scalars are offsets in the quadratic optimal value function:

\[
U(s) = s^\top V s + q
\]

Each \( q \) represents the baseline reward around which the \( s^\top V s \) term fluctuates. We know that \( V \) is negative definite, so \( s^\top V s \leq 0 \), and \( q \) thus represents the expected reward that one could obtain if one were at the origin, \( s = 0 \).