

# POMDP Structural Results for Controlled Sensing using Lehmann Precision

Vikram Krishnamurthy,  
Electrical & Computer Engineering,  
Cornell Tech  
Cornell University, USA.  
vikramk@cornell.edu

December 14, 2024

## Abstract

This paper provides sufficient conditions so that the optimal policy of a partially observed Markov decision process (POMDP) can be lower bounded by a myopic policy. The two new proposed conditions, namely, Lehmann precision and copositive dominance, completely fix the problems with two crucial assumptions in the well known papers [20, 27]. For controlled sensing POMDPs, Lehmann precision exploits both convexity and monotonicity of the value function, whereas the well known Blackwell dominance only exploits convexity. Numerical examples compare Lehmann precision with Blackwell dominance.

# 1 Introduction

In this paper we obtain structural results for controlled sensing POMDPs – these are POMDPs where the observation probabilities (which model an adaptive sensor) are controlled whereas the transition probabilities (which model the Markov chain signal being observed by the sensor) are not controlled. Controlled sensing arises in a variety of applications in reconfigurable sensing (how can a sensor reconfigure its behavior in real time), cognitive radio, adaptive radars, optimal search problems for a Markovian target, and active hypothesis testing. Structural results for controlled sensing POMDPs are important since in general solving POMDPs is PSPACE-complete [26].

The seminal papers [20, 27, 28] give sufficient conditions for two very useful results: (i) the value function of a POMDP to be monotone in the belief state (with respect to the likelihood ratio order and multivariate generalizations) and (ii) for the optimal policy of a POMDP to be lower bounded by a myopic policy. Monotonicity of the value function is crucially important and will be used in our main results below. Regarding lower bounding the optimal policy by a myopic policy, unfortunately, despite the enormous usefulness of such a result, the sufficient conditions given in [20] and [27] are not useful - it is impossible to generate non-trivial examples that satisfy the conditions (c), (e), (f) of [20, Proposition 2] and condition (i) of [27, Theorem 5.6]. Our recent works [12, 17] provided a fix for the conditions on the transition probabilities by using copositive dominance. In this paper, motivated by controlled sensing applications, we provide a complete fix to the conditions on the controlled observation probabilities of the POMDP so that the results of [20, 27] hold for constructing a myopic policy that lower bounds the optimal policy.

Unlike the fix for the transition probability assumptions in [17], providing a useful sufficient condition for the controlled observation probabilities is surprisingly nontrivial. The main new assumption that we will use is the *Lehmann precision* condition – this single crossing condition proposed in [22] has recently been used extensively in the economics literature, see [5, 2]. Thus far, there has been no way of obtaining structural results for controlled sensing POMDPs that exploit both monotonicity *and* convexity of the value function. The papers [20, 27] used only monotonicity of the value function (wrt monotone likelihood ratio stochastic order) and the resulting assumptions were not useful (as mentioned above). On the other hand, [31, 27, 28] used only convexity of the value function with Blackwell dominance to construct a lower bound to a controlled sensing POMDP. In this paper, Lehmann precision allows us to use both convexity and monotonicity of the value function to construct the lower bound. Indeed, the Lehmann precision condition on the observation probabilities together with copositive dominance of controlled transition matrices, gives a useful set of conditions for POMDPs which completely fix the problems with the key assumptions in [20] and also [27]. Theorem 3.2 is our main POMDP structural result.

In proving our main result, as an aside we also establish two minor results. First, Theorem 3.4 compares the optimal cumulative rewards of two different POMDPs when the parameters of one dominate the other with respect to Lehmann precision; the result is more useful than the Blackwell dominance case in controlled sensing POMDPs. Second, Theorem 4.3 cleans up the assumption made in [1] which results in the piecewise linear segments of the POMDP value function being monotone vectors. The assumption in [1] is implicit and not easily verifiable. Our proof uses stochastic dominance restricted to certain line segments to show that the conditions in [20] actually do result in monotone vectors for the value function for the case of 3 or fewer underlying states.

## 2 The Partially Observed Markov Decision Process

Consider a discrete time, infinite horizon discounted reward POMDP. A discrete time Markov chain evolves on the state space  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, X\}$ . Denote the action space as  $\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \dots, U\}$  and observation space as  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2, \dots, Y\}$ . Let  $\Pi(X) = \left\{ \pi : \pi(i) \in [0, 1], \sum_{i=1}^X \pi(i) = 1 \right\}$  denote the belief space of  $X$ -dimensional probability vectors. For stationary policy  $\mu : \Pi(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ , initial belief  $\pi_0 \in \Pi(X)$ , discount factor  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , define the discounted cumulative reward:

$$J_\mu(\pi_0) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho^k r'_{\mu(\pi_k)} \pi_k \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here  $r_u = [r(1, u), \dots, r(X, u)]'$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is the reward vector for each sensing action, and the belief state evolves according to Bayes formula as  $\pi_k = T(\pi_{k-1}, y_k, u_k)$  where

$$T(\pi, y, u) = \frac{B_y(u) P'(u) \pi}{\sigma(\pi, y, u)}, \quad \sigma(\pi, y, u) = \mathbf{1}'_X B_y(u) P'(u) \pi, \quad B_y(u) = \text{diag}\{B_{1,y}(u), \dots, B_{X,y}(u)\}. \quad (2)$$

Here  $\mathbf{1}_X$  represents a  $X$ -dimensional vector of ones,  $P(u) = [P_{ij}]_{X \times X}$ ,  $P_{ij}(u) = \mathbb{P}(x_{k+1} = j | x_k = i, u_k = u)$  denote the controlled transition probabilities,  $B_{xy}(u) = \mathbb{P}(y_{k+1} = y | x_{k+1} = x, u_k = u)$  denote the controlled observation probabilities.

The aim is to compute the optimal stationary policy  $\mu^* : \Pi(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  such that  $J_{\mu^*}(\pi_0) \leq J_\mu(\pi_0)$  for all  $\pi_0 \in \Pi(X)$ . Obtaining the optimal policy  $\mu^*$  is equivalent to solving Bellman's dynamic programming equation:  $\mu^*(\pi) = \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Q(\pi, u)$ ,  $J_{\mu^*}(\pi_0) = V(\pi_0)$ , where

$$V(\pi) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Q(\pi, u), \quad Q(\pi, u) = r'_u \pi + \rho \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} V(T(\pi, y, u)) \sigma(\pi, y, u). \quad (3)$$

Indeed  $V(\pi)$  is the fixed point of the following value iteration algorithm: Initialize  $V_0(\pi) = 0$  for  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}(\pi) &= \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Q_{k+1}(\pi, u), \quad \mu_k = \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} Q_k(\pi, u), \\ Q_{k+1}(\pi, u) &= r'_u \pi + \rho \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} V_k(T(\pi, y, u)) \sigma(\pi, y, u), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

It is well known that the sequence  $\{V_k(\pi), k = 0, 1, \dots\}$  converges uniformly to  $V(\pi)$  on  $\Pi(X)$  geometrically fast. Since  $\Pi(X)$  is continuum, Bellman's equation (3) and the value iteration algorithm (4) do not directly translate into practical solution methodologies since they need to be evaluated at each  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . Almost 50 years ago, [30] showed that for any finite  $k$ ,  $V_k(\pi)$  has a finite dimensional piecewise linear and convex characterization. Unfortunately, the number of piecewise linear segments can increase exponentially with the action space dimension  $U$  and double exponentially with time  $k$ . Thus there is strong motivation for structural results: to construct useful myopic lower bounds  $\underline{\mu}(\pi)$  for the optimal policy  $\mu^*(\pi)$ . Then clearly for belief states  $\pi$  where  $\underline{\mu}(\pi) = U$ , the optimal policy  $\mu^*(\pi)$  coincides with the myopic policy  $\underline{\mu}(\pi)$ .

*Remark:* In controlled sensing POMDPs, the transition matrix  $P$ , which characterizes the dynamics of the signal being sensed, is functionally independent of the action  $u$ . Only  $r_u$ , which models the information acquisition reward of the sensor, and observation probabilities  $B(u)$ , which models the sensor's accuracy when it operates in mode  $u$ , are action dependent.

### 3 Main Structural Result

Although our main motivation stems from controlled sensing (where only the reward and observation matrix are action dependent), we state our main result for general POMDPs where the reward, transition and observation matrices are action dependent; so that the results provide a complete fix to the conditions in [20, 27]. In particular, Assumptions A4 and A6 below provide a complete fix to the problems inherent in conditions (c) and (f) of [20].

**Definition 3.1** (Copositive Ordering of Transition Matrices [12]). *Given transition matrices  $P(u)$  and  $P(u + 1)$ , we say that  $P(u) \preceq P(u + 1)$  if the sequence of  $X \times X$  matrices  $\Gamma^{j,u}$ ,  $j = 1 \dots, X - 1$  are copositive, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi' \Gamma^{j,u} \pi &\geq 0, \quad \forall \pi \in \Pi(X), \quad \text{for each } j, \text{ where} \\ \Gamma^{j,u} &= \frac{1}{2} [\gamma_{mn}^{j,u} + \gamma_{nm}^{j,u}]_{X \times X}, \quad \gamma_{mn}^{j,u} = P_{m,j}(u)P_{n,j+1}(u+1) - P_{m,j+1}(u)P_{n,j}(u+1). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Our main assumptions are the following:

- (A1) [Monotone reward]  $r(i, u)$  is increasing in  $i$  for each  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ .
- (A2) [TP2 transition]  $P(u)$  is totally positive of order 2 (TP2): all second-order minors are nonnegative.<sup>1</sup>
- (A3) [TP2 observation]  $B(u)$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  is TP2.
- (A4) [Copositive dominance]  $P(u) \preceq P(u + 1)$
- (A5) [Stochastic dominance of observations]  $\sum_{y < j} B_{iy}(u) \leq \sum_{y < j} B_{iy}(u + 1)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Equivalently,  $B_i(u) \leq_s B_i(u + 1)$  where  $B_i(u)$  denotes the  $i$ -th row of observation matrix  $B(u)$  and  $\leq_s$  denotes first order stochastic dominance.
- (A6) [Lehmann precision]  $\sum_{y \leq j} B_{iy}(u) - \sum_{y \leq l} B_{iy}(u + 1)$  changes sign at most once from negative to positive as  $i$  increases for all  $j, l \in \mathcal{Y}$ . We denote this as  $B(u + 1) >_L B(u)$ .

The single crossing property A6 is called ‘‘Lehmann precision’’ in [6] and integral precision in [5]; see also [19].

**Theorem 3.2** (Main Structural using Lehmann Precision). *1. Controlled Sensing POMDP: Suppose the transition probabilities  $P$  are functionally independent of the action, but the observation probabilities  $B(u)$  are action dependent. Assume A1, A2, A3, A6 (Lehmann precision) hold. Then  $Q(\pi, u) - r'_u \pi \uparrow u$ . Therefore, the myopic policy  $\underline{\mu}(\pi) = \arg \max_u r'_u \pi$  forms a lower bound to the optimal policy in the sense that  $\mu^*(\pi) \geq \underline{\mu}(\pi)$  for all  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ .*

*2. General POMDP: Suppose both the transition probabilities  $P(u)$  and observation probabilities  $B(u)$  are action dependent. Then under A1, A2, A3, A4 (copositive dominance), A5, A6 (Lehmann precision), the above result holds.*

The proof is in Section 4.

<sup>1</sup>Equivalently, the  $i$ -th row is monotone likelihood ratio (MLR) dominated by the  $(i + 1)$ -th row for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, X - 1$ ; MLR dominance is defined in Section 4.

## Discussion

From a practical point of view, the myopic policy  $\underline{\mu}$  is trivial to compute and implement. The rest of this section discusses several implications of Theorem 3.2 and its assumptions.

1. **Assumptions:** Assumptions A1 to A6 along with Theorem 3.2 completely fixes the problems with the assumptions in [20] and [27]. The theorem provides a provably lower bound to the optimal policy.

Assumptions A1, A2, A3 and A5 correspond to conditions (a), (c), (d), (e) in [20, Proposition 1, Proposition 2]. Indeed, [20] proves that A1, A2, A3 are sufficient for  $V(\pi)$  to increase with respect to  $\pi$  (wrt monotone likelihood ratio order).

Let us focus on A4 and A6 which are the key new assumptions that replace Assumption (c) and (f) in [20, Proposition 2]. Assumptions (c) and (f) in [20] are sufficient for  $\sigma(\pi, \cdot, u) \leq_s \sigma(\pi, \cdot, u + 1)$  and  $T(\pi, y, u) \leq_r T(\pi, y, u + 1)$  for all  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . Unfortunately these conditions are mutually exclusive apart from trivial cases as we now discuss.

The compositive condition A4 on the transition probabilities presented in our recent work [17, 12] fixes Assumption (c) in [20] that  $P(1) \leq_{\text{TP2}} P(2)$ ; such TP2 dominance only holds if  $P(1) = P(2)$  or rank 1, and so is not useful.

Our main new assumption is the Lehmann precision condition A6 on the observation probabilities. This fixes the condition (f) in [20] that  $B_{iy}(2)B_{i+1,y} \leq B_{i+1,y}(2)B_{iy}(1)$ . Apart from the trivial case  $B(1) = B(2)$ , it is impossible for two stochastic matrices  $B(1), B(2)$  to satisfy condition (f) and A5 (condition (d) in [20]) simultaneously. In comparison, there is a continuum of useful examples that satisfy the conditions A5 and A6 (Lehmann precision) in Theorem 3.2; see examples below.

2. **Continuous observations POMDPs:** Theorem 3.2 also holds for continuous observation POMDPs. To avoid technicalities, assume the existence of the conditional probability density function  $B_{iy}(u)$  of  $y$  given state  $i$  and action  $u$ . Then Theorem 3.2 continues to hold. Of course the Lehmann precision condition A6 becomes the difference between the two cumulative distribution functions. One specific case of interest is the additive noise sensing case where  $y_k = x_k + w_k$  where the additive noise  $w_k$  is an independent and identically distributed sequence of random variables with density  $p_w(\cdot|u)$ . Then  $B_{iy} = p_w(y - i|u)$ . Then it can be shown [22] that A6 holds iff  $B_{iy}(u)$  is larger than  $B_{iy}(u + 1)$  with respect to the dispersive stochastic order.

3. **Blackwell dominance vs Lehmann Precision:** As mentioned in Section 1, thus far the only known cases of structural results for controlled sensing POMDPs involves Blackwell dominance [27, 28]. Since Theorem 3.2 uses Lehmann precision to give a new set of conditions for controlled sensing POMDP compared to Blackwell dominance, it is worthwhile comparing Blackwell dominance with Lehmann precision.

Suppose  $B(1) = B(2) \times L$  where  $L$  is a stochastic matrix. Then  $B(2)$  is said to Blackwell dominate  $B(1)$ ; denoted as  $B(2) >_B B(1)$ . Intuitively  $B(1)$  is noisier than  $B(2)$ . It is well known using a straightforward Jensen's inequality argument that the following result holds:

**Theorem 3.3** (Blackwell dominance. [31, 27]). *1. Controlled Sensing POMDP: Suppose  $P$  is functionally independent of the action. Then  $B(u + 1) >_B B(u)$ ,  $u = 1, \dots, U - 1$  is a sufficient condition for the conclusion of Theorem 3.2 to hold.*  
*2. General POMDP: Suppose A1, A2, A3, A4 hold. Then  $B(u + 1) >_B B(u)$  is a sufficient condition for the conclusion of Theorem 3.2 to hold.*

Blackwell dominance exploits only the convexity of the value function. In comparison, Lehmann

precision in Theorem 3.2 exploits both the monotonicity and convexity of the value function.

*Examples.* (i) Suppose  $X = 2$ ,  $U = 2$ ,  $Y = 2$ . Then A3 holds if  $B_{11}(u) + B_{22}(u) \geq 1$ ,  $u = 1, 2$ . Also A6 holds if either  $B_{11}(1) > B_{11}(2)$ ,  $B_{22}(1) < B_{22}(2)$  or  $B_{11}(1) < B_{11}(2)$ ,  $B_{22}(1) > B_{22}(2)$ , or  $B_{11}(1) < B_{11}(2)$ ,  $B_{22}(1) < B_{22}(2)$ .

In particular, if  $B_{11}(1) > B_{11}(2)$ ,  $B_{22}(1) < B_{22}(2)$ . then the conditions A3, A5, A6 always hold. In comparison, it is not always true that  $B(2) >_B B(1)$ . For example,

$$B(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9894 & 0.0106 \\ 0.8550 & 0.1450 \end{bmatrix}, B(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6141 & 0.3859 \\ 0.4754 & 0.5246 \end{bmatrix}$$

satisfies A3, A5, A6, so Theorem 3.2 holds; but Blackwell dominance does not hold. Another example which satisfies A3, A5, A6 but not Blackwell dominance is

$$X = 3, U = 2, Y = 3, B(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7757 & 0.2157 & 0.0086 \\ 0.4392 & 0.5203 & 0.0405 \\ 0.1714 & 0.3969 & 0.4317 \end{bmatrix}, B(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5629 & 0.2667 & 0.1705 \\ 0.2091 & 0.3846 & 0.4064 \\ 0.1231 & 0.3744 & 0.5025 \end{bmatrix}$$

(ii) A consequence of [6] is that for symmetric  $2 \times 2$  matrices  $B(1), B(2)$ , if  $B_{11}(1) \leq B_{11}(2)$ , then Blackwell dominance is equivalent to Lehmann precision A6. This is easy to show, see [5]:  $B(2) >_B B(1)$  since  $L = B^{-1}(2)B(1)$  is a valid stochastic matrix as can be verified by explicit symbolic computation.

**4. Blackwell dominance vs Lehmann Precision in Hierarchical Sensing:** A quirk with Blackwell dominance is that the multiplication order matters. If the multiplication order is reversed, i.e., suppose  $B(1) = M \times B(2)$  where  $M$  is a stochastic matrix, then even though  $B(1)$  is still more “noisy” than  $B(2)$ , Blackwell dominance (i.e.,  $B(1) = B(2) \times L$  where  $L$  is stochastic) does not necessarily hold. As an example consider

$$X = 3, Y = 3, U = 2, B(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3229 & 0.4703 & 0.2068 \\ 0.2237 & 0.4902 & 0.2861 \\ 0.1587 & 0.4620 & 0.3793 \end{bmatrix}, B(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4387 & 0.5190 & 0.0423 \\ 0.2455 & 0.6625 & 0.0920 \\ 0.0615 & 0.2829 & 0.6556 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then there exists a stochastic matrix  $M$  such that  $B(1) = M \times B(2)$  but Blackwell dominance does not hold, i.e.,  $B(1) \neq B(2) \times L$  for stochastic matrix  $L$ . But A3, A6 (Lehmann precision) hold for this example and therefore Theorem 3.2 holds.

*Controlled Hierarchical Sensing.* In controlled sensing involving hierarchical sensors (such as hierarchical social networks), level  $l$  of the network receives signal  $x_k$  distorted by the confusion matrix  $M^l$  ( $l$ -th power of stochastic matrix  $M$ ), where  $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, U - 1\}$ . That is, each level of the network observes a noisy version of the previous level. Observing (polling) level  $l$  of the network has observation probabilities  $B$  conditional on the noisy message at level  $l$ . Therefore the conditional probabilities of the observation  $y$  given the state  $x$  are  $B(U - l) = M^l \times B(U)$  where  $l$  is the degree of separation from the underlying source (state). This is illustrated in Figure 1 for  $U = 3$ . The controlled sensing POMDP is to choose which level to poll at each time in order to optimize an infinite horizon discounted reward.

Even though  $B(u)$  is more noisy than  $B(u + 1)$ , Blackwell dominance does not hold (due to the reverse multiplication order). Yet using Lehmann precision, Theorem 3.2 holds (under the stated assumptions).




Figure 1: Controlled Hierarchical Sensing where Blackwell dominance does not necessarily hold. Level  $l$  of the network receives the Markovian signal  $x_k$  distorted by the confusion matrix  $M^l$ . Polling any specific level has observation probabilities  $B$ ; so the conditional probabilities of  $y$  at level  $l$  given  $x$  is specified by stochastic matrix  $M^l B$ .

**5. How does the optimal cumulative reward depend on Lehmann precision?** Consider two controlled sensing POMDPs with model parameters  $\theta = (P, B(1), \dots, B(U))$  and  $\bar{\theta} = (P, \bar{B}(1), \dots, \bar{B}(U))$  and identical rewards. Let  $\mu^*(\theta)$  and  $\mu^*(\bar{\theta})$  denote the corresponding optimal policies and let  $J_{\mu^*(\theta)}(\pi)$  and  $J_{\mu^*(\bar{\theta})}(\pi)$  defined in (1) denote the respective discounted cumulative rewards when using the optimal policies.

**Theorem 3.4.** *1. (Lehmann precision) Suppose  $B(u) >_L \bar{B}(u)$  for  $u \in \{1, \dots, U\}$  (see A6 for notation) and A1, A2, A3 hold. Then  $J_{\mu^*(\theta)}(\pi) \geq J_{\mu^*(\bar{\theta})}(\pi)$ .*  
*2. (Blackwell dominance) Suppose  $B(u) >_B \bar{B}(u)$  for  $u \in \{1, \dots, U\}$ . Then  $J_{\mu^*(\theta)}(\pi) \geq J_{\mu^*(\bar{\theta})}(\pi)$ .*

The proof is similar to that of Statement 2 in Section 4.3 and thus omitted. Even though computing the optimal policy of a POMDP is intractable, Theorem 3.4 facilitates comparing the optimal rewards of two different POMDPs with different observation probabilities. Statement (2) deals with the Blackwell dominance case; see [12, Theorem 14.8.1]. It says that in controlled sensing, the optimal reward of a POMDP  $\bar{\theta}$  with noisier observations is smaller than that of the POMDP  $\theta$ ; this is intuitively obvious.

Statement 1 is more useful than Statement 2 in controlled sensing applications, since Lehmann precision does not necessarily require that  $\bar{\theta}$  has more noisy observations than  $\theta$ . In controlled hierarchical sensing discussed above, Statement 1 says that certain networks intrinsically yield lower optimal cumulative reward than others. For example, consider two networks where network 1 has intrinsic confusion matrix  $M$  and network 2 has intrinsic confusion matrix  $\bar{M} = ML$  for some stochastic matrix  $L$ . Then although Blackwell dominance does not hold (due to the reverse multiplication order), Statement 1 says that controlled sensing with network 1 yields a larger cumulative reward (assuming the conditions of Theorem 3.4 hold).

**6. Monotone vectors in value function for  $X \leq 3$ .** It is well known since [30] that the value function  $V_k(\pi) = \arg\max_i \gamma'_i \pi$  in (4) is piecewise linear and convex in  $\pi$  for any finite  $k$ . Almost 40 years ago, [1] gave conditions under which the elements of each vector  $\gamma_i$  are increasing. Unfortunately the conditions in [1] were implicit and not easily verifiable. As an aside, Theorem 4.3 shows that under A1, A2, A3, Albright's result is true for  $X \leq 3$ .

## 4 Proof of Main Result Theorem 3.2

Here is some intuition for the proof. Classical convex dominance is defined for scalar convex functions  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In a POMDP the value function  $V : \Pi(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and so at first sight is incompatible with convex dominance.<sup>2</sup> So the proof proceeds in two steps. First we work with the value function on certain line segments in the unit simplex (belief space); see Figure 2 for a visual illustration. On each such line segment monotone likelihood ratio dominance becomes a total order and so the value function is convex and increasing. Because of this scalar representation of the belief on each such line, one can use the classical representation of the convex value function as the sum of one-dimensional wedge functions. We then prove convex dominance of the value function in terms of such wedge functions - the key sufficient condition involves the Lehmann precision condition A6. Finally, since any belief (point) in the belief space (unit simplex) lies on one such line, the proof holds for any belief in the simplex.

### 4.1 Notation and Definitions

*Monotone likelihood ratio dominance and first order dominance* Below  $\pi(i)$  denotes the  $i$ -th element of belief  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . Let  $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi(X)$  denote two beliefs.  $\pi_1$  dominates  $\pi_2$  with respect to the MLR order, denoted as  $\pi_1 \geq_r \pi_2$ , if  $\pi_1(i)\pi_2(j) \leq \pi_2(i)\pi_1(j)$   $i < j, i, j \in \{1, \dots, X\}$ .  $\pi_1$  dominates  $\pi_2$  with respect to first order dominance, denoted as  $\pi_1 \geq_s \pi_2$  if  $\sum_{i \geq j} \pi_1(i) \geq \sum_{i \geq j} \pi_2(i)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, X\}$ . A function  $\phi : \Pi(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be MLR (resp. first order) increasing if  $\pi_1 \geq_r \pi_2$  (resp.  $\pi_1 \geq_s \pi_2$ ) implies  $\phi(\pi_1) \geq \phi(\pi_2)$ .

For state-space dimension  $X = 2$ , MLR is a complete order and coincides with first order stochastic dominance. For state-space dimension  $X > 2$ , MLR dominance implies first order dominance. MLR is a *partial order*, i.e.,  $[\Pi(X), \geq_r]$  is a partially ordered set (poset) since it is not always possible to order any two belief states  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . However, on line segments in the simplex defined below (see also Figure 2), MLR is a total ordering; this property is crucial for our proofs below.

Let  $e_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, X\}$  denote the unit  $X$ -dimensional vector with 1 in the  $i$ -th position. For  $i = 1$  and  $i = X$ , define the sub simplex  $\mathcal{H}_i \subset \Pi(X)$  as

$$\mathcal{H}_i = \{\pi \in \Pi(X) : \pi(i) = 0\}. \quad (6)$$

Denote belief states that lie in  $\mathcal{H}_i$  by  $\bar{\pi}$ . For each  $\bar{\pi} \in \mathcal{H}_i$ , construct the line segment  $l(e_i, \bar{\pi})$  that connects  $\bar{\pi}$  to  $e_i$ . Thus  $l(e_i, \bar{\pi})$  comprises of belief states  $\pi$  of the form:

$$l(e_i, \bar{\pi}) = \{\pi \in \Pi(X) : \pi = (1 - \epsilon)\bar{\pi} + \epsilon e_i, 0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1\}, \bar{\pi} \in \mathcal{H}_i. \quad (7)$$

**Definition 4.1** (MLR ordering  $\geq_{L_i}$  on lines).  $\pi_1$  is greater than  $\pi_2$  with respect to the MLR ordering on the line  $l(e_i, \bar{\pi})$  - denoted as  $\pi_1 \geq_{L_i} \pi_2$ , if  $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in l(e_i, \bar{\pi})$  for some  $\bar{\pi} \in \mathcal{H}_i$ , i.e.,  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  are on the same line connected to vertex  $e_i$  of simplex  $\Pi(X)$ , and  $\pi_1 \geq_r \pi_2$ .

Note that  $[\Pi(X), \geq_{L_X}]$  and  $[\Pi(X), \geq_{L_1}]$  are chains<sup>3</sup>, i.e., all elements  $\pi, \pi_2 \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  are comparable, i.e., either  $\pi \geq_{L_X} \pi_2$  or  $\pi_2 \geq_{L_X} \pi$  (and similarly for  $l(e_1, \bar{\pi})$ ). Figure 2 illustrates this. In Lemma 4.2, we summarize useful properties of  $[\Pi(X), \geq_{L_i}]$  that will be used in our proofs.

<sup>2</sup>This is the reason that structural results which exploit convexity in POMDPs dating back to [1] work with two state POMDPs.

<sup>3</sup>A chain is totally ordered subset of a partially ordered set.






Figure 2: Illustration of line segments  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  when  $X = 3$ . The belief space  $\Pi(3)$  lies in an equilateral triangle (2-dimensional unit simplex) with vertices  $e_1 = [1, 0, 0]'$ ,  $e_2 = [0, 1, 0]'$  and  $e_3 = [0, 0, 1]'$ . Any belief  $\pi \in \Pi(3)$  lies on one such dotted line  $l(e_3, \bar{\pi})$  where belief  $\bar{\pi} = [\pi(1)/(1 - \pi(3)), \pi(2)/(1 - \pi(3)), 0]'$  lies on the hyperplane  $\mathcal{H}_3$  opposite  $e_3$ . On each line segment  $l(e_3, \bar{\pi})$  MLR dominance is a total order. Theorem 4.3 shows that the value function is convex and increasing on each such line segment. Theorem 4.4 shows convex dominance on each such line segment; thereby establishing the main result Theorem 3.2.

**Lemma 4.2.** *The following properties hold on  $[\Pi(X), \geq_r]$ ,  $[l(e_X, \bar{\pi}), \geq_{L_X}]$ .*

(i) *On  $[\Pi(X), \geq_r]$ ,  $e_1$  is the least and  $e_X$  is the greatest element. On  $[l(e_X, \bar{\pi}), \geq_{L_i}]$ ,  $\bar{\pi}$  is the least and  $e_X$  is the greatest element.*

(ii) *Convex combinations of MLR comparable belief states form a chain. For any  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\pi \leq_r \pi_2 \implies \pi \leq_r \gamma\pi + (1 - \gamma)\pi_2 \leq_r \pi_2$ . (iii) *All points on a line  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  are MLR comparable. Consider any two points  $\pi^{\gamma_1}, \pi^{\gamma_2} \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  (7). Then  $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$ , implies  $\pi^{\gamma_1} \geq_{L_i} \pi^{\gamma_2}$ .**

## 4.2 Two key results

**Theorem 4.3** (Monotone value function). *Under A1, A2 and A3:*

1. *The value functions  $V_k(\pi)$  in (4) and  $V(\pi)$  in (3) are MLR increasing and convex on  $\Pi(X)$ . Therefore  $V_k(\pi)$  and  $V(\pi)$  are increasing and convex on each line  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ .*
2. (a) *For any finite  $k$ , the value function  $V_k(\pi) = \max_{i \in I_k} \gamma'_{i,k} \pi$  in (4) is piecewise linear and convex.*  
 (b) *The vector  $\gamma_{ik} = [\gamma_{ik}(1), \dots, \gamma_{ik}(X)]'$  satisfies:  $\gamma_{ik}(1) \leq \gamma_{ik}(j)$ ,  $j \in \{2, \dots, X - 1\} \leq \gamma_{ik}(X)$ . Therefore, for  $X \leq 3$ , each vector  $\gamma_{ik}$  has increasing elements.*
3. *On any line  $l(\bar{\pi}, e_X)$  the value function is of the form*

$$V_k(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \max(g'_i \pi - f_i, 0), \quad \pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi}) \quad (8)$$

where  $g_i \in \mathbb{R}^X$  are increasing elementwise and  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Regarding Statement 1, [20] proved that the value function is MLR monotone on  $\Pi(X)$ . Convexity of the value function on the belief space goes back to [30]. Therefore, the value function is monotone and convex on each line segment  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ . Statement 2(a) is in [30]. The proof of Statement 2(b) follows from the fact that  $V(\pi)$  is increasing on lines towards  $e_1$  which implies  $\gamma_{ik}(1) \leq \gamma_{ik}(j)$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, X$  and also increasing on lines towards  $e_X$  which implies  $\gamma_{ik}(X) \geq \gamma_{ik}(j)$ ,  $j = 1, X - 1$ . For  $X = 3$  this implies  $\gamma_{ik}(1) \leq \gamma_{ij}(2) \leq \gamma_{ik}(3)$ .

The proof of Statement 3 is as follows: Start with Statement 2(a), namely,  $V_k(\pi) = \max_{i \in I_k} \gamma'_{i,k} \pi$ . Obviously, all beliefs  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$  that lie on each line segment  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  satisfy the straight line equation

$$\pi = \pi(X) e_X + (1 - \pi(X)) \bar{\pi}, \quad \pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$$

Therefore each piecewise linear segment  $\gamma'_i \pi$  of the value function on the line  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  has the form

$$\gamma'_i \pi = \gamma'_i \bar{\pi} + \pi(X) (\gamma_i(X) - \gamma'_i \bar{\pi})$$

implying that for  $\pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ , the value function  $V_k(\pi)$  has the explicit representation

$$V_k(\pi) = \max_{i \in I_k} \gamma'_i \bar{\pi} + \pi(X) (\gamma_i(X) - \gamma'_i \bar{\pi}), \quad (9)$$

in terms of the scalar variable  $\pi(X) \in [0, 1]$ . Statement 1 showed that  $V_k(\pi)$  on each such line  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$  is increasing and convex. Next, any increasing convex function on a line (i.e., a convex function that maps  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ) is the maximum of a countable set of increasing linear (wedge) functions; see [23, Theorem 1.5.7]. Therefore, given the explicit representation (9) of  $V_k(\pi)$  in terms of the scalar variable  $\pi(X)$  for  $\pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ , it follows that for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$V_k(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \max(\alpha_i \pi(X) - f_i, 0), \quad \pi(X) \in [0, 1],$$

for some constants  $\alpha_i \geq 0$ ,  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . Equivalently,

$$V_k(\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \max(\alpha_i e'_X \pi - f_i, 0), \quad \pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$$

which is of the form (8) with each vector  $g_i = \alpha_i e_X$  and therefore increasing elementwise.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4** (Convex dominance for controlled sensing POMDP). *Suppose  $P(u)$  is functionally independent of  $u$ . Assume A3, A6. Then for any convex function  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and increasing vector  $g \in \mathbb{R}^X$ , the following convex dominance holds:*

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \phi(g'T(\pi, y, u)) \sigma(\pi, y, u) \uparrow u \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* Proof of Theorem 4.4 For notational convenience assume the actions are  $u = 1, 2$ . As is well known [23, Theorem 1.5.7, pp18], establishing convex dominance is equivalent to showing for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  that<sup>4</sup>

$$\psi(\lambda) \stackrel{\text{defn}}{=} \sum_y [g'T(\pi, y, 2) - \lambda]^+ \sigma(\pi, y, 2) - \sum_y [g'T(\pi, y, 1) - \lambda]^+ \sigma(\pi, y, 1) \geq 0 \quad (11)$$

Let  $\mathcal{Y}_u^\lambda = \{y : g'T(\pi, y, u) > \lambda\}$ , and  $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_u^\lambda = \mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Y}_u^\lambda$  for  $u = 1, 2$ . By A3, since  $T(\pi, y, u) \uparrow y$  wrt MLR order, it follows that  $\mathcal{Y}_u^\lambda = \{y_{\lambda_u}^*, \dots, Y\}$  for some integer  $y_{\lambda_u}^*$ . Therefore the complement set  $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_u^\lambda$  is of the form  $\{1, \dots, y_{\lambda_u}^* - 1\}$ .

<sup>4</sup>In simple terms pdf/pmf  $p$  convex dominates  $q$  if  $\int \phi(x)p(x)dx \geq \int \phi(x)q(x)dx$  for all convex functions  $\phi$ . As shown in [23, Theorem 1.5.7], a necessary and sufficient condition for convex dominance is that  $\int [x - \lambda]^+ p(x)dx \geq \int [x - \lambda]^+ q(x)dx$  where  $[x - \lambda]^+ = \max(x - \lambda, 0)$  is the wedge function.

We establish (11) by showing<sup>5</sup> that  $\psi(\lambda) \geq 0$  at all stationary points  $\lambda$  such that  $d\psi(\lambda)/d\lambda = 0$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi(\lambda) &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_2^\lambda} [g' B_y(2) P' \pi - \lambda \mathbf{1}' B_y(2) P' \pi] - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1^\lambda} [g' B_y(1) P' \pi - \lambda \mathbf{1}' B_y(1) P' \pi] \\
 &= (g - \lambda \mathbf{1})' \left[ \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_2^\lambda} B_y(2) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1^\lambda} B_y(1) \right] P' \pi \\
 &= (g - \lambda \mathbf{1})' \left[ \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1^\lambda} B_y(1) - \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_2^\lambda} B_y(2) \right] P' \pi \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^X \underbrace{(g_i - \lambda)}_{\alpha_i} \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1^\lambda} B_{iy}(1) - \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_2^\lambda} B_{iy}(2) \right]}_{\beta_i} \underbrace{\left| \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1^\lambda} B_{iy}(1) - \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_2^\lambda} B_{iy}(2) \right|}_{p_i} (P' \pi)_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Let us evaluate the stationary points of  $\psi(\lambda)$ : Clearly from (11) and (12),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d\psi(\lambda)}{d\lambda} &= - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} I(g' T(\pi, y, 2) > \lambda) \sigma(\pi, y, 2) + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} I(g' T(\pi, y, 1) > \lambda) \sigma(\pi, y, 1) \\
 &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_2^\lambda} \sigma(\pi, y, 2) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1^\lambda} \sigma(\pi, y, 1) = \mathbf{1}' \left[ \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1^\lambda} B_y(1) - \sum_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}_2^\lambda} B_y(2) \right] P' \pi = \sum_i \beta_i p_i. \tag{13}
 \end{aligned}$$

So  $\frac{d\psi(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = 0$  implies  $\sum_i \beta_i p_i = 0$ . So it only remains to show that  $\psi(\lambda)$  is non-negative at these stationary points. To establish this we use the FKG (Fortuin-Kasteleyn-Ginibre) inequality on (12). In our framework the FKG inequality reads: If  $\alpha, \beta$  are generic increasing vectors and  $p$  a generic probability mass function, then

$$\sum_i \alpha_i \beta_i p_i \geq \sum_i \alpha_i p_i \sum_i \beta_i p_i.$$

Clearly in (12),  $\alpha_i$  is increasing since the elements  $g_i$  are increasing (theorem hypothesis);  $\beta_i$  is increasing by A6;  $p_i$  is non-negative and thus proportional to a probability mass function. Also from (13),  $\sum_i \beta_i p_i = 0$ . Therefore, applying the FKG inequality to (12) yields  $\psi(\lambda) = \sum_i \alpha_i \beta_i p_i \geq 0$ . Thus we have established (10).

### 4.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

With Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 we can now complete the proof.

*Statement 1 (Controlled Sensing).* Assuming A1, A2 and A3, the result (8) yields for all  $\pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ ,

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} V_k(T(\pi, y, u)) \sigma(\pi, y, u) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \max(g_i' T(\pi, y, u) - f_i, 0) \sigma(\pi, y, u)$$

<sup>5</sup>Since  $\psi(-\infty) = \psi(\infty) = 0$ , clearly if  $\psi(\lambda) \geq 0$  at its stationary points (minima), then  $\psi(\lambda) \geq 0$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

where each vector  $g_i = \alpha_i e_X$  is increasing elementwise. Define  $\phi_i(g'_i \pi) = \max(g'_i \pi - f_i, 0)$  which is convex in  $\pi$ . Therefore assuming A3, A6 and using (10), it follows that each term  $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \max(g'_i T(\pi, y, u) - f_i, 0) \sigma(\pi, y, u) \uparrow u$ . This implies  $\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \max(g'_i T(\pi, y, u) - f_i, 0) \sigma(\pi, y, u) \uparrow u$ . We have thus proved that

$$\sum_y V_k(T(\pi, y, u+1)) \sigma(\pi, y, u+1) \geq \sum_y V_k(T(\pi, y, u)) \sigma(\pi, y, u)$$

or equivalently, in terms of the notation in (4),  $Q_k(\pi, u+1) - Q_k(\pi, u) \geq r'_{u+1} \pi - r'_u \pi$ . Therefore  $r'_{u+1} \pi \geq r'_u \pi \implies \mu^*(\pi) = u+1$ , i.e.,  $\mu_k^*(\pi) \geq \underline{\mu}_k(\pi)$  for all  $\pi \in l(e_X, \bar{\pi})$ . Finally, any belief  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$  lies on one such line segment  $l(e_X, \bar{\pi}) = \{\pi : \pi = (1-\epsilon)\bar{\pi} + \epsilon e_X\}$  where explicitly,  $\epsilon = \pi(X)$  and  $\bar{\pi}(i) = \pi(i)/(1-\pi(X))$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, X-1$ . Therefore,  $\mu_k^*(\pi) \geq \underline{\mu}_k(\pi)$  for each  $\pi \in \Pi(X)$ . Finally, for the infinite horizon discounted case, the value iteration algorithm (4) converges uniformly; that is,  $V_k(\pi)$  converges uniformly to  $V(\pi)$  on  $\Pi(X)$ , so the results hold for  $V(\pi)$ .

*Statement 2 (General POMDP).* To simplify notation, assume  $u \in \{1, 2\}$ . With  $V(\pi)$  denoting the value function of the POMDP, recall that for action  $u = 1$ , the POMDP parameters are  $P(1), B(1)$  and for action  $u = 2$ , the parameters are  $P(2), B(2)$ . Define the fictitious action  $u = a$  with parameters  $P(1), B(2)$ . Then Statement 1 implies that

$$\sum_y V(T(\pi, y, 1)) \sigma(\pi, y, 1) \leq \sum_y V(T(\pi, y, a)) \sigma(\pi, y, a) \quad (14)$$

since actions 2 and  $a$  have the same transition matrix. Also under copositive dominance A4,  $T(\pi, y, a) \leq_r T(\pi, y, 2)$ . From Theorem 4.3,  $V(\pi)$  is MLR increasing implying that  $V(T(\pi, y, a)) \leq V(T(\pi, y, 2))$ . Finally, A2-A5 imply that  $\sigma(\pi, \cdot, a) \leq_s \sigma(\pi, \cdot, 2)$ . Therefore,

$$\sum_y V(T(\pi, y, a)) \sigma(\pi, y, a) \leq \sum_y V(T(\pi, y, 2)) \sigma(\pi, y, a) \leq \sum_y V(T(\pi, y, 2)) \sigma(\pi, y, 2)$$

Combining this with (14) proves the result.

## 5 Additional references

Controlled sensing often uses a reward/cost that is nonlinear in the belief. This is easily accounted for in the framework above; see [8, 15, 9] for structural results involving nonlinear costs in the belief.

In terms of applications: POMDP Structural results: Radar resource allocation [15, 16]; multi-armed bandits [18]; Quickest detection (with nonlinear penalty in belief state) [9, 11]; social learning [10, 14], multiple stopping problems [25, 13]

Applications of POMDPs in cognitive radio [32], optimal search [4, 3, 21, 29, 7], active hypothesis testing [24].

## References

- [1] S. Albright. Structural results for partially observed Markov decision processes. *Operations Research*, 27(5):1041–1053, Sept.-Oct. 1979.

- [2] S. Athey and J. Levin. The value of information in monotone decision problems. *Research in Economics*, 72:101–116, 2018.
- [3] D. Castañón. Optimal search strategies in dynamic hypothesis testing. *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 25(7):1130–1138, 1995.
- [4] J. N. Eagle. The optimal search for a moving target when the search path is constrained. *Operations Research*, 32:1107–1115, 1984.
- [5] J.-J. Ganuza and J. S. Penalva. Signal orderings based on dispersion and the supply of private information in auctions. *Econometrica*, 78(3):1007–1030, 2010.
- [6] I. Jewitt. Information order in decision and agency problems. *Nuffield College*, 2007.
- [7] L. Johnston and V. Krishnamurthy. Opportunistic file transfer over a fading channel - a POMDP search theory formulation with optimal threshold policies. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Commun.*, 5(2):394–405, Feb. 2006.
- [8] V. Krishnamurthy. Algorithms for optimal scheduling and management of hidden Markov model sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 50(6):1382–1397, June 2002.
- [9] V. Krishnamurthy. Bayesian sequential detection with phase-distributed change time and non-linear penalty – a lattice programming POMDP approach. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(3):7096–7124, Oct. 2011.
- [10] V. Krishnamurthy. Quickest detection POMDPs with social learning: Interaction of local and global decision makers. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(8):5563–5587, 2012.
- [11] V. Krishnamurthy. How to schedule measurements of a noisy Markov chain in decision making? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(9):4440–4461, July 2013.
- [12] V. Krishnamurthy. *Partially Observed Markov Decision Processes. From Filtering to Controlled Sensing*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [13] V. Krishnamurthy, A. Aprem, and S. Bhatt. Multiple stopping time pomdps: Structural results & application in interactive advertising on social media. *Automatica*, 95:385–398, 2018.
- [14] V. Krishnamurthy and S. Bhatt. Sequential detection of market shocks with risk-averse cvar social sensors. *IEEE Journal Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 2016.
- [15] V. Krishnamurthy and D. Djonin. Structured threshold policies for dynamic sensor scheduling—a partially observed Markov decision process approach. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 55(10):4938–4957, Oct. 2007.
- [16] V. Krishnamurthy and D. Djonin. Optimal threshold policies for multivariate POMDPs in radar resource management. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 57(10), 2009.
- [17] V. Krishnamurthy and U. Pareek. Myopic bounds for optimal policy of POMDPs: An extension of Lovejoy’s structural results. *Operations Research*, 62(2):428–434, 2015.

- [18] V. Krishnamurthy and B. Wahlberg. POMDP multiarmed bandits – structural results. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34(2):287–302, May 2009.
- [19] E. L. Lehmann. Comparing location experiments. *Annals of Statistics*, 16(2):521–533, 1988.
- [20] W. S. Lovejoy. Some monotonicity results for partially observed Markov decision processes. *Operations Research*, 35(5):736–743, Sept.-Oct. 1987.
- [21] I. MacPhee and B. Jordan. Optimal search for a moving target. *Probability in the Engineering and Information Sciences*, 9:159–182, 1995.
- [22] T. Mizuno. A relation between positive dependence of signal and the variability of conditional expectation given signal. *Journal of applied probability*, 43(4):1181–1185, 2006.
- [23] A. Muller and D. Stoyan. *Comparison Methods for Stochastic Models and Risk*. Wiley, 2002.
- [24] M. Naghshvar and T. Javidi. Active sequential hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(6):2703–2738, 2013.
- [25] T. Nakai. The problem of optimal stopping in a partially observable markov chain. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 45(3):425–442, 1985.
- [26] C. H. Papadimitriou and J. Tsitsiklis. The complexity of Markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 12(3):441–450, 1987.
- [27] U. Rieder. Structural results for partially observed control models. *Methods and Models of Operations Research*, 35(6):473–490, 1991.
- [28] U. Rieder and R. Zagst. Monotonicity and bounds for convex stochastic control models. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 39(2):187–207, June 1994.
- [29] S. Singh and V. Krishnamurthy. The optimal search for a Markovian target when the search path is constrained: the infinite horizon case. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(3):487–492, March 2003.
- [30] E. J. Sondik. *The optimal control of partially observed Markov processes*. PhD thesis, Electrical Engineering, Stanford University, 1971.
- [31] C. C. White and D. P. Harrington. Application of Jensen’s inequality to adaptive suboptimal design. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 32(1):89–99, 1980.
- [32] Q. Zhao, L. Tong, A. Swami, and Y. Chen. Decentralized cognitive MAC for opportunistic spectrum access in ad hoc networks: A POMDP framework. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas Communications*, pages 589–600, 2007.