ON THE ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATED POLICY FUNCTION USING THE BELLMAN CONTRACTION METHOD

[1]Wilfredo L. Maldonado †
[2]B. F. Svaiter ‡

[1]Department of Economics, Universidade Federal Fluminense
Rua Tiradentes 17, Ingá, Niterói
CEP 24210-510, RJ, BRAZIL
Email: willy@impa.br

[2]Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada
Est. Dona Castorina 110, Jardim Botânico, Rio de Janeiro
CEP 22460-320, RJ, BRAZIL
E-mail: benar@impa.br

February, 2001

Abstract. In this paper we show that the approximation error for the optimal policy function in the stochastic dynamic programing problem using the policies defined by the Bellman contraction method is lower than a constant (which depends on the modulus of strong concavity of the one-period return function) times the square root of the value function approximation error. Since the Bellman's method is a contraction it results that we can control the approximation error for the policy function. This method for estimating the approximation error is robust under small numerical errors in the computation of value and policy functions.

Keywords: Stochastic dynamic programing problem, estimation of the policy function

JEL Classification Numbers: C61, D90

1. Introduction

One of the classical methods for estimating the optimal policy function in a stochastic dynamic programming problem is using the iterations of the Bellman operator (Christiano (1990), Tauchen (1990), Santos and Vigo (1998)). Since this operator is a contraction such a method gives us a fast algorithm for estimating the value function with high precision, so we can find an estimated value function as close as we want to the exact value function. Unfortunately this method cannot say anything about the precision in the estimated policy function. The best we can do until now is to verify, for cases where the optimal policy

† I would like to thank the CNPq of Brazil for financial support 300059/99-0(RE).
‡ Partially supported by CNPq Grant 301200/93-9(RN) and by PRONEX–Optimization.

function has a closed form, if the estimated policy is in fact close to the exact optimal policy function[1].

There exist other approaches for obtaining good estimatives of the optimal policy function. The Euler equation grid method (Baxter *et al.* (1990), Coleman (1990,1991)), the parameterized expectations method (Marcet and Marshall (1991)) and projection methods (Judd (1992)). Eventhough all this methods give sequences of approximated policy functions that converge to the optimal policy function, only for a few cases it is possible to obtain an error estimation of the approximated policy function to the *true* optimal policy function.

In this paper we show that the strong concavity of the return function is a sufficient condition for obtaining a control of the error in the approximation of the optimal policy function by the policy function from the n-th iteration of the Bellman operator. This results gives a theoretical foundation for the used method in the literature.

We also prove that the Bellman equation provides a robust numerical method for obtaining accurate estimatives of the optimal policy function.

This paper is divided in five sections. Section 2 describes the framework we will be dealing and the hypotheses assumed. Section 3 gives the main theorem relating the error bounds of the estimated policy function and the estimated value function when it is using the Bellman contraction method. Section 4 gives an extension of the result in section 3 for alternative hypotheses and shows the robustness of the error control in the policy function when it is used the Bellman map. Conclusions are given in section 5 and the proofs are given in the appendix.

2. The framework

The stochastic dynamic programming problem is defined using the following elements: the set of values for the endogenous state variables $X \subset R^l$ (which is a convex Borel set), the set of values for the exogenous shocks $Z \subset R^k$ (which is a compact set); both are mesurable spaces with their σ-algebras $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ respectively. The evolution of the stochastic shocks is given by the transition function Q defined on $(Z, \mathcal{Z})$ with the Feller property. A (measurable) set $\Omega \subset X \times X \times Z$ describing the feasibility of decisions, *i.e.* if $(x, z) \in X \times Z$ are the current values of the state variable and the shock then $y \in X$ is feasible for the next period if and only if $(x, y, z) \in \Omega$. From this we can define the correspondence $\Gamma : X \times Z \to R$ by $\Gamma(x, z) = \{y \in X;\ (x, y, z) \in \Omega\}$. The one-period return function $F : \Omega \to R$ is such that $F(x, y, z)$ is the current return if y is chosen for the next period from (x, z). The discount factor is $\beta \in (0, 1)$. With all these elements, the stochastic dynamic programming problem is to find a sequence of contingent plans $(\hat{x}_t)_{t\geq 1}$ (where for all $t \geq 1$, $\hat{x}_t : Z^t \to X$ is a measurable function) such that it solves the following

[1]For example, in Santos and Vigo (1998) is made a discretization of the state space and it is proved that the optimal policy for the original problem is as close as we want to the optimal policy for the discretized problem; again, we do not have an accurate method for computing the optimal policy for the discretized problem

maximization:

$$v(x_0, z_0) = \text{Max} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \int_{Z^t} \beta^t F(x_t, x_{t+1}, z_t)\, Q^t(z_0, dz^t)$$
$$\text{subject to } (x_t, x_{t+1}, z_t) \in \Omega \text{ for all } t \geq 0$$
$$(x_0, z_0) \in X \times Z \text{ given}$$

The following hypotheses will be used in this work.

Hypothesis 1. The correspondence Γ is nonempty, compact-valued, continuous and for all $x, x' \in X$, $z \in Z$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ it satisfies:

$$\alpha\Gamma(x, z) + (1-\alpha)\Gamma(x', z) \subset \Gamma(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)x', z).$$

Hypothesis 2. The function F is bounded, continuous and there exists $\eta_1 > 0$ such that $F(x, y, z) + (\eta_1/2)|x|^2$ is a concave function in (x, y).

3. The main result

In this section we will set the main theorem that relates the approximation error in the optimal policy function with the approximation error in the value function. Let T be the Bellman operator on $C(X \times Z)$ (the set of continuous and bounded functions defined in $X \times Z$ with the topology induced by the supremum norm) defined by:

$$TV(x, z) = \underset{\{y \in X;\, (x,y,z) \in \Omega\}}{\text{Max}} F(x, y, z) + \beta \int_Z V(y, z')\, Q(z, dz').$$

It is well known (see Stokey and Lucas (1989)) that under hypotheses 1 and 2 this operator is a contraction with modulus β and fixed point v (the value function). The numerical method based on this contraction is defined as follows. Let $v_0 \in C(X \times Z)$ be a concave function in x and define the sequence $(v_n)_{n \geq 0}$ by:

$$v_{n+1}(x, z) = Tv_n(x, z),\ \forall\, (x, z) \in X \times Z, \forall\, n \geq 0 \qquad (1)$$

Lemma 3.1. *With hypotheses 1 and 2, v_n defined by (1), is strongly concave*[2] *in x with modulus η_1 for all $n \geq 1$. In particular the value function v is also strongly concave in x with the same modulus.*

Since for each $n \geq 1$, v_n is strongly concave, we can define:

$$g_n(x, z) = \underset{\{y \in X;\, (x,y,z) \in \Omega\}}{\text{Argmax}} F(x, y, z) + \beta \int_Z v_n(y, z')\, Q(z, dz'), \qquad (2)$$

and the policy function is defined by:

$$g(x, z) = \underset{\{y \in X;\, (x,y,z) \in \Omega\}}{\text{Argmax}} F(x, y, z) + \beta \int_Z v(y, z')\, Q(z, dz').$$

[2] A function $f : C \subset R^n \to R$ is strongly concave with modulus $\eta \geq 0$ if $f(x) + (\eta/2)|x|^2$ is a concave function.

The main theorem. *With hypotheses 1 and 2 the sequence $(v_n, g_n)_{n\geq 1}$ defined by (1) and (2) satisfies:*

$$\|g - g_n\| \leq (\frac{2}{\eta_1})^{1/2}\|v - v_n\|^{1/2}$$

where $\|.\|$ is the supremum norm in $C(X \times Z)$.

4. Extensions and robustness of the approximation method

In this section we will give an alternative to hypothesis 2 which still guarantees the same type of estimation for the optimal policy function. We also consider the case in which the approximated value function is generated by an arbitrary numerical process.

Hypothesis 3 The function F is bounded, continuous and there exists $\eta_2 > 0$ such that $F(x, y, z) + (\eta_2/2)|y|^2$ is a concave function in (x, y).

Theorem 4.1. *With hypotheses 1 and 3, the sequence $(v_n, g_n)_{n\geq 0}$ defined by (1) and (2) satisfies:*

$$\|g - g_n\| \leq (\frac{2\beta}{\eta_2})^{1/2}\|v - v_n\|^{1/2}.$$

The estimation of the error in the approximation of the optimal policy function described in the method above is robust in the following sense: Suppose that a numerical method is used for computing the value function (discretization of the state space, linear or spline approximation of the one-period return function, etc.) and an approximated value function $\tilde{v} \in C(X \times Z)$ is found. Then the approximation error in the policy function obtained from $\tilde{v}$ can be estimated using the approximation error in the estimated value function.

The policy obtained from $\tilde{v}$ is:

$$\tilde{g}(x, z) = \underset{\{y\in X;\, (x,y,z)\in\Omega\}}{\text{Argmax}} F(x, y, z) + \beta \int_Z \tilde{v}(y, z') \, Q(z, dz'). \tag{3}$$

Observe that in general $\tilde{g}$ can be a correspondence. Even though, we have the following estimation.

Theorem 4.2. *Take $\tilde{v} \in C(X \times Z)$ and let $\tilde{g}$ be defined by (3). If hypotheses 1 and 2 hold then for all $(x, z) \in X \times Z$,*

$$d_H(g(x, z), \tilde{g}(x, z)) \leq (\frac{4}{\eta_1})^{1/2}\|v - \tilde{v}\|^{1/2}$$

where d_H is the Haussdorf distance: $d_H(y, A) = Sup\{|y - a|; a \in A\}$.

Alternatively, if hypotheses 1 and 3 hold then for all $(x, z) \in X \times Z$,

$$d_H(g(x, z), \tilde{g}(x, z)) \leq (\frac{4\beta}{\eta_2})^{1/2}\|v - \tilde{v}\|^{1/2}.$$

Remark: Let us observe that the estimation above holds even though the exact value of $\tilde{g}(x, z)$ is not known. Suppose that our numerical method for maximizing calculates an approximated maximizer within a tolerance $\tau > 0$. So define $\tilde{g}_\tau(x,z)$ as those $\tilde{y} \in \Gamma(x,z)$ such that

$$F(x,\tilde{y},z) + \beta \int_Z \tilde{v}(\tilde{y},z')\, Q(z,dz') \geq F(x,y,z) + \beta \int_Z \tilde{v}(y,z')\, Q(z,dz') - \tau, \ \ \forall y \in \Gamma(x,z).$$

In this case, the estimation of the theorem 4.2 (with hypotheses 1 and 2) will take the form:

$$d_H(g(x,z), \tilde{g}_\tau(x,z)) \leq (\frac{4}{\eta_1}\|v - \tilde{v}\| + \tau)^{1/2}.$$

5. Conclusions

In this paper we gave a theoretical justification for using the Bellman contraction method in the stochastic dynamic programming problem in order to find accurate estimates for the optimal policy function. In applied models this method is largely used in different ways (making a grid or discretization of the state space, or approximating the one-period return function by linear-quadratic or log-linear quadratic functions). All these techniques are used with success and this paper gives an explanation for it.

We can also use the estimations given in the main theorem and theorem 4.1 for numerical purposes. Suppose that we are in the case where hypotheses 1 and 2 hold and we would like to compute an estimated policy function with error $\epsilon > 0$. Let $v_0 \in C(X \times Z)$ be an initial function and define the sequence $(v_n)_{n\geq 1}$ by $v_{n+1} = Tv_n$. Then for $N > 0$ such that $\|v_{N+1} - v_N\| \leq \frac{(1-\beta)\eta_1}{2}\epsilon^2$ the policy function g_N associated with v_N will have the desired property.

Finally, it is important to observe that the Bellman contraction method (and therefore, our estimation) can only be use when the economic model may be written as a dynamic programming problem; in other cases the Euler equation approaches must be used.

APPENDIX

To prove lemma 3.1, let us prove the following

Lemma A. *$F(x,y,z) + (\eta/2)|x|^2$ is a concave function in (x,y) if and only if for all $(x_i,y_i,z) \in \Omega$, $i = 1,2$ and for all $\alpha \in [0,1]$ it holds:*

$$F(x^\alpha, y^\alpha, z) \geq \alpha F(x_1,y_1,z) + (1-\alpha)F(x_2,y_2,z) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)|x_1 - x_2|^2,$$

where $x^\alpha = \alpha x_1 + (1-\alpha)x_2$ and $y^\alpha = \alpha y_1 + (1-\alpha)y_2$.

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ By hypothesis:

$$F(x^\alpha, y^\alpha, z) + \frac{\eta}{2}|x^\alpha|^2 \geq \alpha[F(x_1,y_1,z) + \frac{\eta}{2}|x_1|^2] + (1-\alpha)[F(x_2,y_2,z) + \frac{\eta}{2}|x_2|^2],$$

expanding the square of the left side and simplifying it results:

$$F(x^\alpha, y^\alpha, z) \geq \alpha F(x_1,y_1,z) + (1-\alpha)F(x_2,y_2,z) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)|x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

($\Leftarrow$) Completely analogous.

Proof of lemma 3.1. It will be sufficient to prove that if $V(.,z)$ is a concave function then $TV(.,z)$ is a strongly concave function with modulus η_1. Let $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $\alpha \in [0,1]$, $x^\alpha = \alpha x_1 + (1-\alpha)x_2$ and for $i = 1, 2$ let $y_i \in \Gamma(x_i, z)$ such that:

$$TV(x_i, z) = F(x_i, y_i, z) + \beta \int_Z V(y_i, z') \, Q(z, dz').$$

Then, using hypotheses 1, 2 and lemma A we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} TV(x^\alpha) \geq & F(x^\alpha, \alpha y_1 + (1-\alpha)y_2, z) + \beta \int_Z V(\alpha y_1 + (1-\alpha)y_2, z') \, Q(z, dz') \\ \geq & \alpha F(x_1, y_1, z) + (1-\alpha)F(x_2, y_2, z) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)|x_1 - x_2|^2 + \\ & \beta \int_Z [\alpha V(y_1, z') + (1-\alpha)V(y_2, z')] \, Q(z, dz') \\ = & \alpha TV(x_1, z) + (1-\alpha)TV(x_2, z) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)|x_1 - x_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the set of strongly concave functions is a closed set with the topology induced by the sup norm then the fixed point of T is strongly concave.

lemma B. *$f : C \subset R^n \to R$ (C is a convex set) is strongly concave with modulus η if and only if for all $x_1, x_2 \in C$ it holds:*

$$f(\alpha x_1 + (1-\alpha)x_2) \geq \alpha f(x_1) + (1-\alpha) f(x_2) + (\eta/2)\alpha(1-\alpha)|x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

Proof.
It is analogous to the proof of lemma A.

Lemma C. *Let $f : C \subset R^n \to R$ (C is a convex set) be a strongly concave function with modulus η. If $x^* = Argmax_{x \in C} \, f(x)$ then*

$$f(x) \leq f(x^*) - \frac{\eta}{2}|x - x^*|^2, \quad \forall x \in C.$$

Proof. Let $x \in C$ and $\alpha \in (0,1)$. By definition of x^* and the characterization of strong concavity given in lemma B we have:

$$f(x^*) \geq f(\alpha x^* + (1-\alpha)x) \geq \alpha f(x^*) + (1-\alpha) f(x) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha)|x - x^*|^2$$

$$\Rightarrow f(x^*) \geq f(x) + \frac{\eta}{2}\alpha|x - x^*|^2,$$

making $\alpha \to 1$ we have the result.

Proof of the main theorem.

Let us fix some notations. Let $v_n \in C(X \times Z)$ be the n-th iteration $(n \geq 1)$ of the Bellman's operator from some initial concave function $v_0 \in C(X \times Z)$. Let

$$g_n(x,z) = \mathrm{Argmax}_{\{y\in X;\,(x,y,z)\in\Omega\}}\, F(x,y,z) + \beta \int_Z v_n(y,z')\, Q(z,dz'),$$

$$\phi_n(x,y,z) = F(x,y,z) + \beta \int_Z v_n(y,z',)\, Q(z,dz'),$$

$$\phi(x,y,z) = F(x,y,z) + \beta \int_Z v(y,z')\, Q(z,dz').$$

From lemma 3.1 the functions $\phi(x,.,z)$ and $\phi_n(x,.,z)$ are strongly concave with modulus $\beta\eta_1$. Then from lemma C we have that:

$$\phi(x,g(x,z),z) \geq \phi(x,g_n(x,z),z) + \frac{\beta\eta_1}{2}|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2,$$

$$\phi_n(x,g_n(x,z),z) \geq \phi_n(x,g(x,z),z) + \frac{\beta\eta_1}{2}|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2.$$

Summing up the above inequalities it results:

$$\beta\{\int_Z [(v_n - v)(g_n(x,z),z') + (v - v_n)(g(x,z),z')]\, Q(z,dz')\} \geq \beta\eta_1|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2$$

$$\Rightarrow 2\|v - v_n\| \geq \eta_1|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2$$

this inequality holds for all $(x,z) \in X \times Z$, so we conclude:

$$\|g - g_n\| \leq [\frac{2}{\eta_1}\|v - v_n\|]^{1/2}.$$

Proof of theorem 4.1.

Under hypothesis 3, $\phi_n(x,.,z)$ and $\phi(x,.,z)$ are strongly concave with modulus η_2. Then from lemma C we have that:

$$\phi(x,g(x,z),z) \geq \phi(x,g_n(x,z),z) + \frac{\eta_2}{2}|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2,$$

$$\phi_n(x,g_n(x,z),z) \geq \phi_n(x,g(x,z),z) + \frac{\eta_2}{2}|g(x,z) - g_n(x,z)|^2.$$

Using the same reasoning as in the proof of the main theorem we conclude that:

$$\|g - g_n\| \leq [\frac{2\beta}{\eta_2}\|v - v_n\|]^{1/2}.$$

Proof of theorem 4.2.

Let

$$\tilde{\phi}(x,y,z) = F(x,y,z) + \beta \int_Z \tilde{v}(y,z') \, Q(z,dz').$$

Take $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{g}(x,z)$. Then

$$\tilde{\phi}(x,\tilde{y},z) \geq \tilde{\phi}(x,g(x,z),z).$$

With hypotheses 1 and 2 we have:

$$\phi(x,g(x,z),z) \geq \phi(x,\tilde{y},z) + \frac{\beta\eta_1}{2}|g(x,z)-\tilde{y}|^2.$$

Adding up these inequalities and using the reasoning above we will obtain the desired result.

With hypotheses 1 and 3 we have

$$\phi(x,g(x,z),z) \geq \phi(x,\tilde{y},z) + \frac{\eta_2}{2}|g(x,z)-\tilde{y}|^2,$$

and the conclusion follows again.

References

1. Baxter, M., M. J. Crucini and K. G. Rouwenhorst, *Solving the Stochastic Growth Model by a Discrete-State-Space, Euler-Equation Approach*, Journal of Business & Economic Statistics **8-1** (1990), 19-21.
2. Coleman, W. J., *Solving the Stochastic Growth Model by Policy-Function Iteration*, Journal of Business & Economic Statistics **8-1** (1990), 27-29.
3. Coleman, W. J., *Equilibrium in a Production Economy with an Income Tax*, Econometrica **59** (1991), 1091-1104.
4. Christiano L., *Solving the Stochastic Growth Model by Linear-Quadratic Approximation and by Value Function Iteration.*, Journal of Business & Economic Statistics **8-1** (1990), 23-26.
5. Judd, K. L., *Projection Methods for Solving Aggregate Growth Models*, Journal of Economic Theory **58** (1992), 410-52.
6. Marcet A. and D. Marshall, *Solving Nonlinear Rational Expectations Models by Parameterized Expectations: Convergence to Stationary Solutions*, Working Paper No. 76, Department of Economics, Universitat Pompeu Fabra (1994).
7. Santos M. and J. Vigo-Aguiar, *Analysis of a Numerical Dynamic Programming Algorithm Applied to Economic Models*, Econometrica **66-2** (1998), 409-426.
8. Stokey N. and R. Lucas , with E. Prescott, *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
9. Tauchen G., *Solving the Stochastic Growth Problem by Using Quadrature Methods and Value-Function Iterations*, Journal of Business and Economic Statistics **8** (1990), 49-51.