
Tractable Representations for Convergent Approximation of Distributional HJB Equations

Julie Alhosh

School of Computer Science
McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada
julie.alhosh@mail.mcgill.ca

Harley Wiltzer

School of Computer Science
Mila, McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada
harley.wiltzer@mail.mcgill.ca

David Meger

Centre for Intelligent Machines
School of Computer Science
McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada
dmeger@cim.mcgill.ca

Abstract

In reinforcement learning (RL), the long-term behavior of decision-making policies is evaluated based on their average returns. Distributional RL has emerged, presenting techniques for learning return *distributions*, which provide additional statistics for evaluating policies, incorporating risk-sensitive considerations. When the passage of time cannot naturally be divided into discrete time increments, researchers have studied the *continuous-time RL (CTRL)* problem, where agent states and decisions evolve continuously. In this setting, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation is well established as the characterization of the expected return, and many solution methods exist. However, the study of distributional RL in the continuous-time setting is in its infancy. Recent work has established a *distributional HJB (DHJB)* equation, providing the first characterization of return *distributions* in CTRL. These equations and their solutions are intractable to solve and represent exactly, requiring novel approximation techniques. This work takes strides towards this end, establishing conditions on the method of parameterizing return distributions under which the DHJB equation can be approximately solved. Particularly, we show that under a certain topological property of the mapping between statistics learned by a distributional RL algorithm and corresponding distributions, approximation of these statistics leads to close approximations of the solution of the DHJB equation. Concretely, we demonstrate that the *quantile representation* common in distributional RL satisfies this topological property, certifying an efficient approximation algorithm for continuous-time distributional RL.

Keywords: Distributional RL, Continuous-Time RL

Acknowledgements

We thank Marc Bellemare, Jesse Farebrother, Nate Rahn, and Hanna Yurchyk for their helpful feedback.

1 Introduction

Reinforcement Learning (RL) methods classically focus on evaluating policies by the returns they earn in expectation [7]. The field of *distributional RL* [1, 2] provides techniques for evaluating policies on the basis of their return *distributions*. Such techniques have demonstrated impressive empirical performance in various deep RL benchmarks [1, 11], and additionally present new possibilities for designing *risk-sensitive* RL agents.

Research in RL has traditionally focused on discrete-time problems, where time stops until a decision is made at fixed discrete timesteps. In contrast, continuous-time RL (CTRL) is concerned with settings where decisions and state transitions evolve continuously in time. In CTRL, the expected return of a policy is governed by a differential equation known as the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, which has been studied extensively in the RL [6] and optimal control [4] literature. Recent works [8, 9, 5, 10] have studied distributional RL in the continuous-time setting. Particularly, a *distributional HJB (DHJB)* equation was introduced [8, 9], which characterizes the CDF of return distributions in the CTRL setting. However, methods for solving the DHJB equation are not as well understood.

In this work, we establish conditions under which solutions to the DHJB equation can be approximated tractably and efficiently using familiar gradient-based iterative update schemes. Since return distributions have infinitely-many degrees of freedom, they cannot be represented exactly on a computer, and therefore solutions to the DHJB equation are intractable. In response to this, Wiltzer et al. [9] introduced a *statistical HJB (SHJB) loss* as an objective for approximately solving the DHJB equation by optimizing a finite set of return distribution statistics. However, until this work, it has not been known whether minimization of the SHJB loss truly yields close approximations to ground truth return distributions. We make the following contributions:

1. We prove that, as long as the *imputation strategy*—that is, the mapping from statistics to return distributions—satisfies a certain topological property, minimizing the SHJB loss yields convergent approximations of the return distributions;
2. We demonstrate that the *quantile* distribution representation [3] and its corresponding imputation strategy satisfy this topological property, providing a principled loss function for continuous-time distributional RL.

2 Background

In this section, we briefly summarize the relevant prior results of [9], in the continuous-time infinite-horizon discounted return setting. The state space is denoted \mathcal{X} and is assumed to be bounded and Euclidean, and the discount factor is $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. We assume the reward function r is bounded, so that returns are confined to a bounded set $\mathcal{R} = [V_{\min}, V_{\max}]$.

We will consider a fixed policy π , and our goal is to estimate its *return distribution function* $\eta^\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{R})$, which is the distribution of

$$\int_0^\infty \gamma^t r(X_t) dt =: G^\pi(x) \sim \eta^\pi(x), \quad X_0 = x, \quad dX_t = \mu_\pi(X_t) dt + \sigma_\pi(X_t) dB_t. \quad (1)$$

Here, $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion, and μ_π, σ_π describe the stochastic differential equation governing the agent’s state under the policy π . Recall that the *value function* V^π given by

$$V^\pi : x \mapsto \mathbf{E}[G^\pi(x)] \quad (2)$$

is characterized by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation [4],

$$\langle \nabla_x V^\pi(x), \mu_\pi(x) \rangle + \log \gamma V^\pi(x) + r(x) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma_\pi(x)^\top (\nabla_x^2 V^\pi(x)) \sigma_\pi(x)) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Henceforth, we will write $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$ to denote the CDF of $\eta^\pi(x)$. To begin, we formalize how imputation strategies encode distribution approximations.

Definition 2.1 (Imputation Strategy). An imputation strategy is a map $\Phi_N : \mathbf{R}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{R})$ which maps a set of N statistics into a probability measure with those statistics. Additionally, for every imputation strategy Φ_N , we define a map $\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}} : \mathbf{R}^N \times \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(s, z) = [\Phi_N(s)]([V_{\min}, z]). \quad (4)$$

As an example, we may consider a *Gaussian* imputation strategy, such as

$$\Phi_2 : (\mu, \sigma^2) \mapsto \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2), \quad (5)$$

which is a valid imputation strategy when μ, σ^2 are interpreted as mean and variance statistics. Alternatively, for a fixed subset $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathcal{R}$, the map

$$\Phi_N : p \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^N p_i \delta_{\xi_i} \quad (6)$$

is an imputation strategy for statistics p in the simplex Δ_N , which maps a set of probabilities to a categorical distribution on the support $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^N$. Generally, N controls the *resolution* of our distribution approximations; as N increases, we hope to achieve higher fidelity approximations, and to more closely solve the DHJB equation.

Next, we recall some useful definitions regarding generalized functions.

Definition 2.2 (Schwartz Class). Let X be a normed space. A Schwartz class is a class \mathcal{S} of rapidly decaying-smooth functions

$$\mathcal{S} = \{f \in C^\infty(X; \mathbf{R}) : \sup_{x \in X} [(1 + \|x\|^k) |f^{(m)}(x)|] < \infty \quad \forall k, m \in \mathbf{N}\}. \quad (7)$$

Definition 2.3 (Tempered Distribution). A tempered distribution is an element of the topological dual \mathcal{S}' of the Schwartz class \mathcal{S} . That is, a tempered distribution is a linear map $\varrho : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

It is important to note that ‘‘Distribution’’, in the context of a tempered distribution, refers to a type of generalized function, and not a *probability* distribution.

This formalism allows us to generalize notions of solutions to differential equations, permitting solutions where derivatives are tempered distributions. For a differential operator \mathcal{L} , we say a differential equation $\mathcal{L}f = 0$ in the *distributional sense* if

$$\int \phi(y) (\mathcal{L}f)(y) dy = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (8)$$

We are now able to state the main regularity conditions assumed on the imputation strategy.

Definition 2.4 (Statistical Smoothness [9]). An imputation strategy Φ_N is said to be statistically smooth if $\Phi_N(s)$ is a tempered distribution for each $s \in \mathbf{R}^N$. Likewise, a return distribution function $\eta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{R})$ is said to be statistically smooth if its state-conditioned CDF, $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$ is a tempered distribution for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $F_{\eta^\pi}(\cdot, z)$ is twice continuously differentiable almost everywhere for each $z \in \mathcal{R}$.

Assumption 1. At every state $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\eta^\pi(x)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Assumption 2. The mapping $(x, z) \mapsto F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z)$ is twice differentiable over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R}$ almost everywhere, and its second partial derivatives are continuous almost everywhere.

Having established these technical assumptions, we can state the DHJB equation, which characterizes return distributions in CTRL. Finally, we will recall the SHJB loss, which is our central focus.

Theorem 2.1 (DHJB Equation, [9]). Under assumptions 1 and 2, for almost every $(x, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R}$, the distributional HJB (DHJB) equation

$$(\mathcal{L}F_{\eta^\pi})(x, z) = 0 \quad (9)$$

holds in the distributional sense, where

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(x, z) = \langle \nabla_x f(x, z), \mu_\pi(x) \rangle - (r(x) + z \log \gamma) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} f(x, z) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\sigma_\pi(x)^\top (\nabla_x^2 f(x, z)) \sigma_\pi(x)). \quad (10)$$

The characterization of return distributions from Theorem 2.1 gives rise to a *statistical HJB (SHJB)* loss for evaluating finitely-parameterized return distribution approximations.

Theorem 2.2 (SHJB Loss, [9]). *Let assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and let Φ_N be a statistically smooth imputation strategy. If*

$$F_{\eta^\pi} : (x, z) \mapsto \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) \quad (11)$$

for a differentiable statistics function $\vec{s} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$, then the SHJB loss $\mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}})$ vanishes, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) &= [\nabla_{\vec{s}(x)} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)^\top \vec{s}(x) \mu_\pi(x) - (r(x) + z \log \gamma) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma_\pi(x)^\top (\mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^x(x, z) + \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^s(x, z)) \sigma_\pi(x))]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and denoting by J_x the Jacobian with respect to x ,

$$\mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^x(x, z) = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial s_k(x)} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) \nabla_x^2 \vec{s}_k(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^s(x, z) = J_x \vec{s}(x)^\top (\nabla_{\vec{s}}^2 \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)) J_x \vec{s}(x).$$

3 Convergence of the Statistical HJB Loss

In this section, specifically in Theorem 3.1, we prove that the SHJB loss \mathcal{L}_S converges to 0 as the number of statistics N approaches ∞ , when the imputation strategy Φ_N satisfies a certain topological property. As mentioned in section 1, both Φ_N^{cdf} and the return distribution CDF F_{η^π} are assumed to be tempered distributions.

Theorem 3.1 (Convergence of SHJB Loss). *Let $\{\Phi_N\}_{N=0}^\infty$ be a sequence of statistically smooth imputation strategies, and let $\vec{s} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be a twice continuously differentiable statistics function. Let assumptions in Theorem 2.2 hold. If $\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot)$ converges to $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$ in the space of tempered distributions for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then it holds in the distributional sense that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Express $\mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) = (g(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}))^2$ for

$$\begin{aligned} g(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) &= \left[\nabla_{\vec{s}(x)} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)^\top \vec{s}_x(x) \mu_\pi(x) - (r(x) + z \log \gamma) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\sigma_\pi(x)^\top (\mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^x(x, z) + \mathbf{K}_{\Phi_N}^s(x, z)) \sigma_\pi(x)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Note that the distributional derivative is a continuous operator. By taking the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 into consideration, we have that $g(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}})$ is a linear combination of continuous functions and is therefore continuous. Then, the continuity of \mathcal{L}_S follows from the continuity rule for composite functions. Now, by continuity, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) = \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, by our assumption that $\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot)$ converges to $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$, and since F_{η^π} satisfies the DHJB equation, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}) = \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, F_{\eta^\pi}) = 0 \quad (16)$$

in the distributional sense, by Theorem 2.2. \square

4 Quantile Approximation of Return Distributions

Choosing quantiles as the statistics used to compute the imputation strategy is common in distributional RL [3, 9]. In this section, Theorem 4.1 proves that the corresponding quantile imputation strategy satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1. As a result, we prove in Theorem 4.2 that the SHJB loss vanishes as we increase the number N of quantiles in our distribution representation.

We denote the inverse CDF of $\eta^\pi(x)$ via $F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \cdot)$, given by

$$F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \tau) = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{R}} \{F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) \geq \tau\}, \quad (17)$$

and the τ -quantile of $\eta^\pi(x)$ is $F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(\tau)$ for $\tau \in (0, 1)$. The *quantile imputation strategy* [3, 2] is given by

$$\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \vartheta_{\vec{s}_i(x)}(z), \quad (18)$$

where ϑ_y is the Heaviside step function at $y \in \mathbf{R}$, and $\vec{s}_i(x) = F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, 2^{i-1}/2N)$.

Theorem 4.1 (Convergence of the Quantile Imputation Strategy). *The sequence of quantile imputation strategies $\{\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot)\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges to $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$ in the space of tempered distributions for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. Henceforth, we denote

$$\tau_i = \frac{i}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tau}_i := \frac{\tau_{i-1} + \tau_i}{2} = \frac{2i-1}{2N} \quad i \in [N] \quad (19)$$

Let $N \in \mathbf{N}$ be arbitrary, we will show that $\forall (x, z) \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R})$,

$$|F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) - \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)| \leq \frac{1}{2N}. \quad (20)$$

Then, we will prove the sequence $\{\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}\}_{N=1}^\infty$ converges to F_{η^π} by showing that $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $\exists n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\forall N \geq n$,

$$\|\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot) - F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)\| < \epsilon. \quad (21)$$

Fix any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $i \in [N]$. If $F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i) \neq F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})$, then $\forall z \in [F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i), F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})]$, $\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z) = \tau_i$ and we have that:

$$\hat{\tau}_i \leq F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) \leq \hat{\tau}_{i+1} \quad (22)$$

$$\tau_i - \frac{1}{2N} \leq F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) \leq \tau_i + \frac{1}{2N} \quad (23)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2N} \leq F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) - \tau_i \leq \frac{1}{2N} \quad (24)$$

$$|F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) - \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)| \leq \frac{1}{2N} \quad (25)$$

where inequality (22) holds since F_{η^π} is an increasing function by definition. Otherwise, there exists $i \in [N]$ such that $F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i) = F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^\pi(x)(\{F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})\}) &= \eta^\pi(x)(\{F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i)\}) \\ &= \eta^\pi(x)([V_{\min}, F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})]) - \eta^\pi(x)([V_{\min}, F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i)]) \\ &= F_{\eta^\pi}(x, F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})) - \eta^\pi(x)([V_{\min}, F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i)]) \\ &\geq \hat{\tau}_{i+1} - \hat{\tau}_i \\ &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

But since F_{η^π} is absolutely continuous by Assumption 1, we must have $\eta^\pi(x)(\{F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_{i+1})\}) = 0$, contradicting (26). Therefore, $\forall i \in [N]$, $F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_i)$ is unique. Similarly, we obtain the same result

for $z \in [V_{\min}, F_{\eta^\pi}^{-1}(x, \hat{\tau}_1)]$. Now, we have that $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot) - F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)\| &= \sup_{\|\phi\|=1} \int_{\mathcal{R}} (F_{\eta^\pi}(x, z) - \Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), z)) \phi(z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sup_{\|\phi\|=1} \int_{\mathcal{R}} \phi(z) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Since $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$, it is bounded, and since \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{R} are compact, there exists a finite $M \in \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $\sup_{\|\phi\|=1} \int_{\mathcal{R}} \phi(z) dz \leq M$. So, $\forall \epsilon > 0$, it holds that for $N > M/2\epsilon$,

$$\|\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot) - F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)\| < \epsilon. \quad (28)$$

□

Theorem 4.2 (Convergence of HJB Loss in the Quantile Case). *Let $\vec{s}_i(x)$ denote the $2^{i-1}/2N$ -quantile of $\eta^\pi(x)$, and suppose the quantile map \vec{s} is twice continuously differentiable. Then under assumptions 1 and 2, if Φ_N is the quantile imputation strategy, it holds in the distributional sense that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_S(\vec{s}, \Phi_N) = 0. \quad (29)$$

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, we know that $\Phi_N^{\text{cdf}}(\vec{s}(x), \cdot)$ converges to $F_{\eta^\pi}(x, \cdot)$ as N approaches ∞ . Thus, by our hypotheses, we may apply Theorem 3.1, asserting that the SHJB loss converges to 0 as N approaches ∞ . □

This result has important implications for approximately solving distributional HJB equations. Notably, it certifies that minimizing the SHJB loss yields close approximations to the solution of the DHJB equation, under a novel and simple condition on the imputation strategy. Particularly, we validated that minimization of the SHJB loss yields close approximations to η^π under the quantile imputation strategy; this nicely complements the results of [9], which provides an algorithm for minimizing the SHJB loss over quantile representations. Prior to this work, Wiltzer et al. [9] had shown only that the SHJB loss is 0 when $\eta^\pi(x)$ could be exactly represented by $\Phi_N(\vec{s}(x))$ for some finite N —our results show that this loss is useful even in the much more realistic setting where $\Phi_N(\vec{s}(x))$ is only an approximation of $\eta^\pi(x)$.

References

- [1] Marc G. Bellemare, Will Dabney, and Rémi Munos. A Distributional Perspective on Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017.
- [2] Marc G. Bellemare, Will Dabney, and Mark Rowland. *Distributional reinforcement learning*. MIT Press, 2023.
- [3] Will Dabney, Mark Rowland, Marc G. Bellemare, and Rémi Munos. Distributional reinforcement learning with quantile regression. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [4] Wendell H Fleming and Halil Mete Soner. *Controlled Markov processes and viscosity solutions*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [5] Igor Halperin. Distributional offline continuous-time reinforcement learning with neural physics-informed PDEs (sciphy rl for doctr-l). *Neural Computing and Applications*, 2024.
- [6] Rémi Munos and Paul Bourgin. Reinforcement learning for continuous stochastic control problems. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 10, 1997.
- [7] Richard Sutton and Andrew Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [8] Harley Wiltzer. *On the Evolution of Return Distributions in Continuous-Time Reinforcement Learning*. McGill University (Canada), 2021.
- [9] Harley Wiltzer, David Meger, and Marc G. Bellemare. Distributional Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations for continuous-time reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2022.

- [10] Harley Wiltzer, Marc G. Bellemare, David Meger, Patrick Shafto, and Yash Jhaveri. Action gaps and advantages in continuous-time distributional reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024.
- [11] Peter R Wurman, Samuel Barrett, Kenta Kawamoto, James MacGlashan, Kaushik Subramanian, Thomas J Walsh, Roberto Capobianco, Alisa Devlic, Franziska Eckert, Florian Fuchs, et al. Outracing champion gran turismo drivers with deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 602 (7896):223–228, 2022.