

DO-IQS: Dynamics-Aware Offline Inverse Q-Learning for Optimal Stopping with Unknown Gain Functions

Anna Kuchko

Department of Statistics
University of Warwick, UK
anna.kuchko@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

We consider Inverse Optimal Stopping (IOS) problem where, based on stopped expert trajectories, one aims to recover the optimal stopping region through continuation and stopping gain functions approximation. The uniqueness of the stopping region allows the use of IOS in real-world applications with safety concerns. While current state-of-the-art inverse reinforcement learning methods recover both a Q-function and the corresponding optimal policy, they fail to account for specific challenges posed by optimal stopping problems. These include data sparsity near the stopping region, non-Markovian nature of the continuation gain, a proper treatment of boundary conditions, the need for a stable offline approach for risk-sensitive applications, and a lack of a quality evaluation metric. These challenges are addressed with the proposed **Dynamics-Aware Offline Inverse Q-Learning for Optimal Stopping (DO-IQS)**, which incorporates temporal information by approximating the cumulative continuation gain together with the world dynamics and the Q-function without querying to the environment. Moreover, a confidence-based oversampling approach is proposed to treat the data sparsity problem. We demonstrate the performance of our models on real and artificial data including an optimal intervention for critical events problem.

1 Introduction

Rapidly advancing autonomous systems require efficient and precise detection and anticipation of hazardous situations. The theory of optimal stopping (OS) can be applied to the problems like stopping of an autonomous vehicle, identification of a shutdown time for a production system or a change point detection, etc. Designing a reward function to solve the OS problems requires a high degree of involvement and often extensive knowledge about the dynamics of the underlying system.

Recent advances in the area of Inverse Reinforcement

Learning (IRL) allow us to learn both a Q-function and the optimal policy directly from demonstrations [8, 12]. For safety-sensitive applications, the world dynamics model can also be learned offline for higher risk awareness [28, 29]. While useful for general optimal control problems, these methods often fail when applied to OS problems, mainly due to the sparsity of the expert data near the stopping region. The intrinsic imbalance between continuation and stopping actions when learning from demonstrations makes it challenging to recover the stopping region in proximity to the stopping boundary or without sacrificing the precision in the continuation region. Another challenge arises due to the non-Markovian nature of the continuation gain and/or the state-space dynamics. We address the aforementioned challenges with our proposed Dynamics-Aware Offline Inverse Q-Learning model for OS problems with unknown gain functions (DO-IQS).

1.1 Outline of contributions

The literature on the (inverse) OS problems is mostly limited to financial applications and considers very specific examples overlooking a more general setup and not fully addressing the main challenges of a practical application. In this paper we make the following contributions to the theory and the solutions of the IOS problems:

- We formally define a reinforcement learning (RL) formulation of the OS problem accounting for both stopping and continuation gain functions, allowing to solve it through conventional RL and IRL methods (Definition 1). Since many state-of-the-art (SOTA) (I)RL methods are entropy based and require stochastic exploratory policies, we provide convergence results and error bounds for the stochastic OS policy (Section 2.3)
- An Inverse Optimal Stopping problem definition is presented (Definition 3). Fitting a stopping surface can be challenging in higher dimensions, while estimating gain functions instead provides higher precision and greater flexibility. In the proposed approach we explicitly use the OS rule to disentangle the continuation and stopping gains from the composite reward function (Insight 1).




Figure 1: POMDP structure of the OS problem with cumulative continuation gain (top) and DO-IQS model structure (bottom).

- We discuss the main challenges arising in the IOS problems including data scarcity near the stopping boundary and sparsity of the stopping decisions caused by a natural class imbalance between continuation and stopping actions on which we elaborate in Section 3. The problem is complicated in risk-sensitive applications that require offline learning from a limited number of demonstrations. We propose a solution to the problem via oversampling strategies (Insight 2).
- To allow offline inference (while also correcting the Bellman error of the IQ-Learning algorithm), we estimate the environment model (Insight 3). We further develop an approach, which we call a Dynamics-Aware Offline Inverse Q-Learning for Optimal Stopping (DO-IQS), for incorporating non-Markovian continuation reward learning to (Section 4.3) and to fight the sparsity problem.
- For the purpose of hyper-parameter tuning and model selection, we propose treating the OS region recovery problem as a classification problem by using classification metrics for imbalanced data. We use Balanced Accuracy as a metrics of choice and also report a median time-to-event to median event-miss-rate trade-off.

We demonstrate the performance of our approach on the OS problems including an OS of a two-dimensional Brownian Motion and learning optimal intervention policies for critical events (Section 5).

1.2 Related work

The literature on IOS and related problems is scarce and often lacks generality. Kruse and Strack [15] considers a problem of finding the way to change (unknown) gain function in a way that makes a given stopping rule optimal and show how such a problem can be analytically solved for a particular class of one-dimensional diffusion processes. We note that this approach lacks generality and is hard to use in higher dimensions. Qiao and Beling

[21] use Bayesian modification of apprenticeship learning first introduced by Abbeel and Ng [1] to solve a standard secretary problem. Al-Hafez et al. [2] modify the IQ-Learn algorithm of Garg et al. [8] to account for problems with absorbing states by introducing a fixed target reward function and regressing it towards the absorbing states. While this approach has some similarities to OS problems, it does not make use of the natural structure of the OS rewards and cannot be applied to more challenging OS examples. An analytical solution to a class of mean-field stopping games is also presented by Huang and Xie [13]. Pattanayak and Krishnamurthy [20] address an inverse optimal Bayesian stopping problem using a modification of the Max-Entropy IRL (Ziebart et al. [31]) with application to inverse sequential hypothesis testing and inverse Bayesian search problems over multiple environments. In our approach, we take on a more general set-up that does not require learning in different environments or a manual engineering of feature vectors. This allows one to conduct inference in higher dimensions and for a wider range of OS problems. Moreover, authors assess the results of their inference by comparing the true environment costs to the IRL estimates. Instead, we use classification metrics to evaluate the quality of the resulting stopping region which, unlike the gain functions, is unique.

Another recent work by Damera Venkata and Bhattacharyya [5] studies an OS approach to the optimal time to intervention (OTI) problems, where the stopping gain function takes a form of a hazard rate process and is recovered using survival analysis and deep recurrent neural networks. We show that our approach can be also applied to inverse OTI problems without imposing any constraints on the form of the stopping gain and avoiding an error made by the survival model.

2 Background and problem setup

2.1 Optimal stopping: general formulation

Let $S = \{s_t\}_{t \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a time-homogeneous Markov state-space process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_s, s \in S)$ equipped with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ generated by the history of observed states up to time t . A stopping time $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \infty\}$ is a random variable $\tau \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$. Given a *continuation gain function* $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a *stopping gain function* $G : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a value function defines the expected cumulative future payoff, if the state process is stopped at the time τ :

$$V^\tau(s) = \mathbb{E}_s \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1} \gamma^t g(S_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau \geq 1\}} + \gamma^\tau G(S_\tau) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is a discount factor. The corresponding *optimal stopping problem* consists in finding an optimal stopping time τ^* maximising the value function, i.e. $V^{\tau^*}(s) = \sup_\tau V^\tau(s)$. By the general theory of OS [23], $V^{\tau^*} = V^*$, which is a fixed point of the dynamic programming operator $T : V^* = TV^*$, where $TV = \max\{G, g + \gamma PV\}$, and P is a transition operator $\mathbb{E}[V(s') | \mathcal{F}_t] = \int V(y) P(s, dy) = (PV)(s)$. Then the *optimal stopping region* can be defined as a set of states:

$$\begin{aligned} D^* &= \{s | G(s) \geq V^*(s)\} \\ &= \{s | G(s) \geq g(s) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s'} V^*(s')\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with the *optimal stopping time* being the shortest stopping time when the process hits the stopping region $\tau^* = \min\{t \geq 0 | s_t \in D^*\}$.

2.2 Optimal stopping via reinforcement learning

To apply SOTA methods to the OS, we first formulate it as an RL problem. Consider a problem related to the OS problem that we define in terms of a Stopped Markov Decision Process.

Definition 1 (SMDP). *A Stopped Markov Decision Process (SMDP) is a tuple $M_\Delta = (S_\Delta, A, \mathcal{P}, g, G, \gamma)$, where $S_\Delta := \{s\} \cup \{\Delta\}$ is a Borel set of states augmented with a set of cemetery points $\{\Delta\}$. $A : S_\Delta \rightarrow A$ is a mapping on S_Δ such that $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a non-empty set of admissible binary action $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ where the decision to stop is associated with $a = 0$ and the decision to continue with $a = 1$. The history of observations up to time $n \geq 0$ is $o_n := (s_0, a_0, s_1, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, s_n)$ defined on the space $O_n := (S_\Delta \times \mathcal{A})^n \times S_\Delta$. $g, G : S_\Delta \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ are the continuation and stopping gain functions respectively with $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$. For convenience, the rewards are assumed to be bounded and Borel measurable (discounted MDPs with countable state space and unbounded gains can be turned into the analogous problems with bounded gains [24]). $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is a discount factor. The MDP dynamic is given by a family of well-defined probabilities:*

$$\mathcal{P}(B|s, a) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}_s(s_1 \in B) & \text{if } s \in S, a = 1, \\ \delta_\Delta(B) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

for any $B \subseteq S_\Delta$, and where we assume that for $s \in S_\Delta$, δ_s is the Dirac measure with the concentration in s .

For this SMDP a Markov deterministic policy $\pi : S_\Delta \rightarrow A$ is defined by a set of Dirac measures $\pi : S_\Delta \rightarrow \{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$, such that $\pi(\cdot | \Delta) = \delta_0(\cdot)$. Any such policy, together with an initial states distribution p_0 yields a pair of processes $(S_t^\dagger, A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on a probability space $(\Omega^\dagger, \mathcal{F}^\dagger, \mathbb{P}_{p_0}^\pi)$. Introduce a composite reward function:

$$r(s, a) = g(s)a + G(s)(1 - a), \quad (4)$$

for $s \in S_\Delta, a \in \mathcal{A}$ and the corresponding value function:

$$V^\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_s^\pi \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(S_t^\dagger, A_t) \right], \quad (5)$$

where we write the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{p_0}^\pi$ as $\mathbb{E}_{p_0}^\pi$ (\mathbb{P}_s^π and \mathbb{E}_s^π for $p_0 = \delta_s$ respectively). This form of reward function will be central in translating an OS problem into a universal RL problem.

Following the definitions above, for the bounded reward functions there exists [10] an optimal stationary deterministic policy solving

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s) &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_s^\pi \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(S_t^\dagger, A_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_s^{\pi^*} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(S_t^\dagger, A_t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proposition 1. $V^{\tau^*}(s) = V^{\pi^*}(s)$ are equivalent.

Proof. Proof through coupling of S_t and S_t^\dagger and showing that the stopping time under and optimal policy in the RL problem is equal to the hitting time of the optimal stopping region in the OS problem. See Appendix A for the full proof. In what follows we will focus on SMDPs and will write S instead of S^\dagger for brevity.

It is often useful to consider a state-action Q -function $Q^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{|S| \times |\mathcal{A}|}$, representing the value of a policy π which started at a state s and executed an action a , defined as $Q^\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{s_0=s, a_0=a}^\pi [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t)] = r(s, a) + \gamma V^\pi(s')$.

2.3 Stochastic policies and soft-Q learning

We first note that the optimal deterministic policy can be represented by a set of Dirac-delta functions, assigning a probability mass to one of the optimal actions. [3] showed that for any MDP there exists a stationary deterministic policy that is optimal. In this work we assume that all the policies are (time-)stationary, i.e. the probability distribution over actions does not change over time. The OS policy defined by a set of Delta-functions conditioned on the continuation and stopping region is equivalent to

a greedy policy with respect to the Q -function, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(a|s) &= \begin{cases} \delta_1(a) : s \in C^* \\ \delta_0(a) : s \in D_\Delta^* \end{cases} \\ &= \delta \left(a = \arg \max_a Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

See Appendix A for the proof.

Since many SOTA algorithms for (inverse) RL are entropy based, we define a stochastic exploratory policy using the Boltzmann distribution (or softargmax function), which, in limit, converges to the optimal deterministic Delta-policy:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \pi_\epsilon(a|s) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\exp\{Q(s, a)/\epsilon\}}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} \exp\{Q(s, a')/\epsilon\}} \\ &= \delta \left(a = \arg \max_{a'} Q(s, a') \right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where ϵ is the energy parameter defining the level of the stochasticity of the Boltzmann policy (see Appendix A for the proof).

This stochastic policy turns to be an optimal policy under the maximum entropy RL [30]. We define the soft Bellman operator $\mathcal{B}^{\pi_\epsilon} : \mathbb{R}^{S \times \mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{S \times \mathcal{A}}$ acting in the set of soft Q -functions: $(\mathcal{B}^{\pi_\epsilon} Q)(s, a) = r(s, a) + \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a)} V^{\pi_\epsilon}(s')$, where $V^{\pi_\epsilon}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{a \sim \pi_\epsilon(\cdot|s)} [Q(s, a) - \epsilon \log \pi_\epsilon(a|s)] = \sigma_a^\epsilon Q(s, a)$ and $\sigma_a^\epsilon Q(s, a) = \epsilon \log \sum_{a'} \exp\{Q(s', a')/\epsilon\}$ is a softmax function with the temperature parameter ϵ . The soft Bellman operator is a contraction mapping of the soft Q -function, i.e. $\mathcal{B}^{\pi_\epsilon} Q = Q$ [9]. In what follows we write $H(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_\pi [-\log \pi(a|s)]$ to define the discounted causal entropy and $\rho_\pi(s, a) = \pi(a|s) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t P(s_t = s|\pi)$ to define an occupancy measure (state visitation counts) of a policy π .

In case of an OS, we call the stochastic policy (8) an ϵ -**optimal stopping policy** and the corresponding V - and Q -functions **soft value functions**. This gives a rise to near-optimal stopping times.

Definition 2 (ϵ -optimal stopping time). *We say that the stopping time is near-optimal, or ϵ -optimal if it is a solution to the problem (5) under an ϵ -optimal stopping policy, i.e. $\tau_\epsilon^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 | s_t \in D_{\Delta, \epsilon}^*\}$, and*

$$D_{\Delta, \epsilon}^* = \{s | G(s) \geq V^{\pi_\epsilon^*}(s)\}. \quad (9)$$

For the soft-Q learning, noting that the softargmax function (Boltzmann distribution) is the gradient of log-sum-exp function, for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the bound on the value function, and hence on the stopping region, can be made as tight as required: $V^{\pi^*} < V^{\pi_\epsilon^*} \leq V^{\pi^*} + \epsilon \log(2)$.

In practice, if the values of the Q -function are high, and the ϵ is close to zero, the softmax function might explode.

2.4 Inverse reinforcement learning

An inverse reinforcement learning (IRL) aims to recover a reward function $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and a corresponding optimal policy $\pi \in \Pi$ based on a set of expert observations O_t produced by an expert policy π_E .

Maximum entropy IRL In case of Max Entropy IRL [31, 32, 12], the objective is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\pi, r) &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho_E} [r(s, a)] - \mathbb{E}_\rho [r(s, a)] - H(\pi) - \psi(r) \\ &= d_\psi(\rho, \rho_E) - H(\pi), \\ \max_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \min_{\pi \in \Pi} L(\pi, r), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{S \times \mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex reward regulariser, ρ_E is an expert's occupancy measure and $d_\psi = \psi^*(\rho_E - \rho)$ is a statistical distance between two occupancy measures with ψ^* being a convex conjugate of ψ .

Inverse soft-Q learning In recently introduced Inverse soft-Q learning approach (IQ-Learn) [8] authors suggested to project the problem (10) onto the Q -policy space. They first introduce an inverse Bellman operator $(\mathcal{T}^\pi Q)(s, a) = Q(s, a) - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a)} V^\pi(s')$, and then use the following objective function:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(Q) &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho_E} [\phi(Q(s, a) - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a)} \sigma_{a'}^\epsilon(Q(s', a')))] \\ &\quad - (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{\rho_0} [\sigma_a^\epsilon(Q(s_0, a))], \\ \max_{Q \in \Omega} \mathcal{J}(Q) &= \max_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \min_{\pi \in \Pi} L(\pi, r). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

IQ-Learn allows to recover the Q -function corresponding to the expert's behaviour, which in turn gives both a reward function $r(s, a) = Q(s, a) - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a)} V^{\pi_\epsilon}(s')$ and the corresponding stochastic policy π_ϵ as in (8). This will be beneficial for recovering the stopping region in IOS using the stopping rule (2).

3 Inverse optimal stopping with unknown gain functions

In the most general sense, the *Inverse Optimal Stopping (IOS)* problem is concerned with finding a continuation reward function $g(\cdot)$ and a stopping reward function $G(\cdot)$, given an OS time τ^* or an optimal value function evaluated at the OS time V^* . This problem is ill-posed and its solution is often intractable. Instead, we define the IOS problem using the IRL formulation.

Definition 3 (Inverse optimal stopping problem: IRL formulation). *Consider realisations $(S_t, A_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ of SMDP as defined in 1 are given and can be characterised by some unknown optimal policy π^* . The problem of finding the continuation and stopping gain functions $g(\cdot)$ and $G(\cdot)$ explaining π^* is called an Inverse Optimal Stopping problem.*

While the reward function in IOS problems is non-unique, unlike general IRL problems, OS have a *unique stopping region*. This means that an inverse algorithm should be




Figure 2: **Left:** Stopping with sparse observations. Continuation and stopping region are represented by green and red areas respectively. Red dots: expert stopping decisions. **Right:** OS True Negatives (TN), True Positives (TP), False Negatives (FN) and False Positives (FP).

able to find this unambiguous stopping region which provides clear benefits for safety-sensitive applications. Here we aim to fully utilise the OS rule (2) where the choice between the continuation and stopping decisions stems from comparing the value of the stopping gain function and the state-value V -function. Our RL formulation (1) of the OS problem allows to utilise an IQ-Learn algorithm (12), while preserving the structure of the original problem. We address the main challenges associated with the IOS problem with the following insights.

Insight 1: IOS as a reward shaping problem Although IQ-Learn and other SOTA methods for IRL show a high positive correlation with the ground-truth rewards [8] (some of them recovering the true rewards up to a constant, e.g. GAIL [12]) most of them suffer from a covariance shift problem and considerably high uncertainty in the reward estimation. Incorporating model-based approach into the IRL model and shaping the reward in a more informed way helps to reduce the uncertainty (see e.g. [12, 27]).

Our solution: We suggest to: **(a)** Iteratively update both Q-function and the model of the dynamics in a bi-level constrained optimization manner similar to [28] and [11]. This means that at each iteration we update our beliefs about the environment dynamics model $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ to fit the observed dynamics \mathcal{P} under the current Q-model, and, similarly, update \hat{Q} to fit the approximated dynamics model. For details see Section 4.1; **(b)** Utilise the reward form suggested in (4) to incorporate the stopping and continuation gain functions into the learning process to ensure consistency with the OS update (2).

Insight 2: Data sparsity near and on the stopping boundary First, there is a natural data sparsity caused

by class imbalance between stopping and continuation actions. E.g. for a stopped expert dataset with N paths (hence N stopping actions), and M observations in total, the ratio between stopping and continuation actions is $\frac{N}{M-N}$ with $M \gg N$. Second, in certain cases only a few trajectories will reach further side of the stopping boundary at later times (e.g. LHS of Figure 2).

Our solution: We first propose to apply oversampling strategies where the oversampling error is leveraged by IRL (see Sections 4.2 and 5 for details and examples). Since this only works in Markovian case, we show how approximating a cumulative continuation gain improves the performance of the algorithm in a presence of sparsity. We will describe the latter approach in the next insight.

Insight 3: Cumulative continuation gain for dynamics-aware reward shaping Looking back to the RL formulation (5), we could notice, that the problem cannot be studied in a Markovian way, since at each step the stopping decision is made if: $G(s_t) \geq \sum_{t' \leq t, t' \geq 0} \gamma^{t'} g(s_{t'}) + \gamma^{t+1} \mathbb{E}_{s_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot | s_t, a_t)} V^*(s_{t+1})$, turning the original RL problem into a problem with non-Markovian rewards.

Our solution: To make this problem Markovian we augment the state-space to include $Y_t = g(s_t) + \sum_{t' < t} \gamma^{t'} g(s_{t'})$, $t \geq 0$. The resulting triplet of processes (Y_t, S_t, A_t) is Markovian. We develop a model containing a constraint optimization on three levels through an iterative update of the Q-function $\hat{Q}(\cdot, \cdot)$, the environment-dynamics model $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$, and the model of the cumulative continuation gain \hat{Y}_t , allowing us to incorporate a non-Markovian component into the Q-function approximation (Section 4.3).

Algorithm 1 IQS data pre-processing procedure

Input: Stopped expert observation history $O_{T_m}^M = \{s_{T_m}, a_{T_m}\}^{m=0:M-1}, \forall 0 \leq m \leq M-1$; a zero-valued cemetery state $s_\Delta = \mathbf{0}$

Output: Expert training dataset

- 1: Compose two processes by stacking M paths together $S_{T_m}^M = (s_t^m)_{0 \leq t \leq T_m-1}$, and $A_{T_m}^M = (a_t^m)_{0 \leq t \leq T_m-1}$ and set L to be its length
- 2: Initialise a shifted state process S'_L with zeros
- 3: **for** l from 0 to $L-1$ **do**
- 4: Set $s'_l = s_\Delta$ if $a_l = 0$, else set $s'_l = s_{l+1}$
- 5: **end for**

Insight 4: Boundary conditions The problem of learning a stopping gain function $G(\cdot)$ is similar to learning the reward for the absorbing states as in [2]. Setting the value of the absorbing states to zero results in termination bias [14], when the agent might be more prone to stopping immediately, or never stopping at all, depending on the sign of the continuation reward.

Our solution: In OS this problem is naturally addressed by the stopping gain function $G(\cdot)$, and the action “stop” sends the agent to the set of cemetery states, where the value is zero, $V^\pi(s_\Delta) = 0$. Hence the function $G(\cdot)$ can be thought of as a reward, accumulated during the time spent in the absorbing state. This approach allows us to avoid setting a fixed target as it is done in [2], while still ensuring no termination bias through well-defined boundary conditions. This makes an IOS approach useful for goal-driven applications, replacing the absorbing states reward with the stopping gain learning. We will return to the boundary conditions for IOS problem in the next section.

4 Algorithm

4.1 Offline IQ-learning for IOS

There are two ways to go about estimating the OS region offline. The first approach uses a pure IQ-Learning where only the current state s is required: $\hat{D}_\epsilon = \{s | \hat{G}(s) \geq \hat{V}(s)\}$, where the dynamics is learned explicitly through the Q-function [8]. A more precise estimate for the world dynamics would allow to reduce the Bellman error of the IQ-Learning algorithm and correspondingly to increase its stability.

To address this problem, we present an approach inspired by bi-level constrained optimisation. First, the Q-model is updated in a conservative way to fit the current believes about the world dynamics, and then the estimate of the environment dynamics is updated to fit the current model of the Q-function. This allows to minimise the covariance shift in the learned world model, and improve the sharpness of the reward estimates in case of imperfect demonstrations (see for example [26, 16] and [29]). Learning an environment model is crucial for estimating stopping region offline from demonstrations as in (9). Often a crude

Algorithm 2 DO-IQS for offline IOS with non-Markovian component

Input: Stopped expert observation history $O_{T_m}^M = \{s_{T_m}, a_{T_m}\}^{m=0:M-1}, \forall 0 \leq m \leq M-1$; a discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1]$; a number of training epochs $E > 0$; a batch size $B > 0$; a *softmax* scaling parameter $\epsilon > 0$; a zero-valued cemetery state $s_\Delta = \mathbf{0}$

Output: Approximation of the stopping Q-function \hat{Q} , continuation gain function \hat{g} , and the environment model $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$

- 1: Initialise a Q-function $Q_{\epsilon, \theta}$, an environment dynamics model \mathcal{P}_θ , and a continuation gain function g_ϕ
- 2: Pre-process $O_{T_m}^M$ using Algorithm 1.
- 3: **for** epoch e from 0 to $E-1$ **do**
- 4: Sample a batch of triples (s_l, a_l, s'_l) of size B and their corresponding states history $h_t^m = \{s_0^m, s_1^m, \dots, s_t^m\}$, where s_t^m corresponds to s_l in the stacked process
- 5: Using the batch do a forward pass for $g_\phi(s_k^m) \forall s_k^m \in h_{t+1}^m$ and estimate $y_l = \sum_{k=0}^t \gamma^k g_\phi(s_k^m)$, $y_l' = \sum_{k=0}^{t+1} \gamma^k g_\phi(s_k^m)$ and $y_l^- = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \gamma^k g_\phi(s_k^m)$
- 6: For a new batch $(\tilde{s}_l, a_l, \tilde{s}'_l)$, where $\tilde{s}_l = (s_l, y_l)$ and $\tilde{s}'_l = (s'_l, y'_l)$, do a forward pass for \mathcal{P}_θ and for $Q_{\epsilon, \theta}$
- 7: Estimate $g(\tilde{s}_l) = Q_{\epsilon, \theta}(\tilde{s}_l, a = 1) - \gamma \sum_{\tilde{s}'_l \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \mathcal{P}_\theta(\tilde{s}'_l | \tilde{s}_l, a = 1) V_{\epsilon, \theta}(\tilde{s}'_l) - y_l^-$
- 8: Update \mathcal{P}_θ using $Loss_{\mathcal{P}}$, $Q_{\epsilon, \theta}$ using (12), and g_ϕ using $Loss_g$ via backward pass
- 9: **end for**

estimate of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ that is aware of the value function can be used in place of more complex approaches like MLE [6]. This requires a dynamics loss function $Loss_{\mathcal{P}}$ minimising the Bellman error [7]. While the original IRL objective in case of χ^2 -regularisation minimises a squared soft-Bellman error [2], it still relies on the expert states transitions. Looking at the Bellman error definition: $\delta_Q(s, a) = Q(s, a) - r(s, a) + \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}}[\gamma V(s')]$ we could notice that replacing the true environment dynamics \mathcal{P} by an estimate $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ increases δ_Q by $\gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} (\hat{\mathcal{P}}(s' | s, a) - \mathcal{P}(s' | s, a)) V(s')$. While the choice of a particular $Loss_{\mathcal{P}}$ will change the degree of the Bellman error, updating it in a bi-level constrained optimisation way together with \hat{Q} allows to incorporate information about the value function into the dynamics model.

To recover the OS region we apply the OS rule (2) to the Q-function estimates: $D_{\epsilon, \theta} = \{s | G_{\epsilon, \theta}(s) \geq V_\theta^{\pi_\epsilon}(s)\} = \{s | Q_{\epsilon, \theta}(s, a = 0) \geq Q_{\epsilon, \theta}(s, a = 1)\}$ (see Appendix B).

4.2 Oversampling approach to data sparsity in IOS

Sparse and small datasets often pose a challenge for neural networks functional approximation. A conventional way to tackle this problem is to employ various oversampling strategies by simulating artificial stopping and/or

continuation points for dataset enrichment. Therefore we make an assumption about the geometrical properties of the stopping and continuation regions, i.e. we assume that states with the same label are "close" to each other. We propose to view the IOS with oversampling as a problem of learning from imperfect demonstrations [25, 19], where we could assign a certain confidence score to each of the observations based on the probability that these points come from the stopping region set. The expert's stopping points then will have the highest confidence score, while artificially created observations are assigned a score based on their proximity to the real expert's points. Then the expert occupancy measure becomes a mixture of optimal and non-optimal measures $\rho_{ECS}(s, a) = \rho_E(s, a) + \alpha(s, a)\rho_{fake}(s, a)$, where $\alpha(s, a) \in [0, 1]$ is the confidence score and $\alpha(s, a) = 1$ for $\forall (s, a) \in O_E$. The objective function can then be expressed as $\mathcal{J}_{CS}(Q) = \mathcal{J}(Q) + \mathcal{J}_{fake}(Q)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{fake}(Q) = & \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{fake}} [\alpha(s, a)\phi(Q(s, a) \\ & - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{P}(\cdot|s, a)} \sigma_{a'}^e(Q(s', a')))] \\ & - (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{fake}} [\alpha(s, a) (V^\pi(s) - \gamma V^\pi(s'))]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

(Noting that the second term of (12) in an offline learning case can be sufficiently approximated through bootstrapping expert demonstrations with $\mathbb{E}_{(s, a, s') \sim expert} [V^\pi(s) - \gamma V^\pi(s')]$ [8]). In this work we use a SMOTE oversampling technique [4], and its confidence-score based modification, which we call CS-SMOTE. More details of our approach and its implementation are provided in Appendix B.

4.3 DO-IQS

In higher dimensions it might be not possible anymore to perform oversampling (or the approximation error for the Q-function gets significantly bigger). Moreover many real-world problems have non-Markovian dynamics. We solve this problem by bringing in an extra process Y as describe in Section 3. This requires estimation of the continuation function g in parallel with the main algorithm, since it now becomes a part of the input into $Q_{\epsilon, \theta}$ and \mathcal{P}_θ in a form of an augmented state $\tilde{s} = (s, y)$; $\tilde{s} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $y = \sum_{k=0}^t g_\phi(s_k)$ and $y' = y + g_\phi(s_{t+1})$ (Algorithm 2 and Figure 1 (top)). To avoid updating g_ϕ for all the states in the history, we update it only for the current observation in the batch by minimising $Loss_g$ (e.g. L_2 loss) between g recovered through IQ-Learning algorithm $g(\tilde{s}) = Q_{\epsilon, \theta}(\tilde{s}, a = 1) - \gamma \sum_{\tilde{s}' \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \mathcal{P}_\theta(\tilde{s}'|s, a = 1) V_{\epsilon, \theta}(\tilde{s}') - y^-$, where $y^- = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} g_\phi(s_k)$, and the approximate cumulative gain function g_ϕ . See Figure 1 (bottom) for the chart of the approach.

4.4 Quality evaluation

In IRL literature, a popular method to evaluate the quality of the recovered Q-function/policy is to assess their performance in terms of the true accumulated reward. In

practice, querying to the environment is often unavailable. Hence a metric to assess the performance of the IRL algorithm, which could also be efficiently used during model hyper-parameters tuning, is needed. We propose to view the IOS as a classification problem, classifying the states as belonging to the stopping or continuation region (allowing to test the algorithm output against the expert's paths in applications where the state space is large). This requires a choice of goal-specific metrics suitable for imbalanced data (see the RHS of the Figure 2). In case of applying OS to critical events prevention, one could consider a trade-off between a mean time-to-event (m-TTE) and a mean event-miss rate (m-EMR). To represent this trade-off one might use one of the classification metrics which account for imbalanced datasets while not favouring neither True Negatives (continuation actions in case of OS) nor True Positives (stopping actions). We propose to use Balanced Accuracy score as a metrics of choice due to its ability to equally treat positive and negative observations.

5 Experiments

5.1 Environments Description and Results

2D Brownian Motion with Sparse Data

We simulate a 2D Brownian Motion $\mathbb{P}(s'_1|s_0 = s) = N\left(\begin{matrix} s' \\ 1 \end{matrix} \middle| \begin{matrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{matrix}, \sqrt{\Delta t} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) ds'$, where $\Delta t = \frac{1}{50}$, and $s[i]$ is and i -th element of s . The stopping and continuation gains are set to be $G(s) = s[0]^2 + s[1]^2$ and $g(s) = (5 \times \mathbb{1}_{|s| < 1} - 400 \times \mathbb{1}_{|s| \geq 1}) \times \Delta t$, where $|s| = \sqrt{s[0]^2 + s[1]^2}$. We consider two examples. In the first one, the expert stopping decisions are simulated using the stopping gain function G only. In the second example, both the stopping gain G and the cumulative continuation gain g forming the y process are used. We simulate 100 paths and hold out 30% of those for validation and model selection. We further simulate 30 paths for testing. For each simulated path, the expert optimal stopping times are found through a backward induction algorithm for OS.

Figure 3 summarises the modeling results in terms of the m-EMR and the m-TTE trade-off as well as the distribution of the balanced accuracy score. DO-IQS model provides only a marginal improvement in the case of an example simulated using G only and shows a noticeable improvement in case where the original stopping dataset was simulated using cumulative continuation gain.

Optimal Time to Intervention via IOS on Real Data

OTI problem naturally translates into an OS problem over a hazard rate process [5]. The (empirical) hazard rate (or the negative stopping gain function) is defined through minimising both the mean residual time to event (m-TTE) and the mean event miss rate (m-EMR) using survival analysis. This approach requires manual tuning of the desired risk tolerance. Instead, we approximate the




Figure 3: Median m-EMR to m-TTE trade-off (top) and balanced accuracy violin plots (bottom).

risk function using IOS by setting the expert stopping time to be at the time (or as close as required) to the hazardous event. We test our approach on Azure Predictive Maintenance Guide Data [17] and NASA Turbofan Engine Failure Data [22] to show how IOS can be used to solve the corresponding OTI problem. The datasets were down-sampled to every 10 hours. The resulting m-EMR to m-TTE trade-off and the balanced accuracy scores are reported in Figure 3. Note that the results for the DO-IQS model are not reported for the Turbofan Dataset due to its poor performance. Our approach achieves similar or better results compared to the results reported in [5].

5.2 Computational Setup and Training Times

We run the experiments on a VM with 2 vCPUs, 4.0 GiB. Each model is trained for 250 epochs with the batch size of 128 and the best model is selected based on validation set balanced accuracy score. Training each model took an average of 6 min (12.5 min for DO-IQS), and the inference step took 0.003 sec/observation. We report the median values of the scores with the 25-75 IQR error bars over 5 runs with different random seeds. Results for the basic IQ-Learn algorithm are not presented due to their poor performance.

6 Discussion and Outlook

In this paper we develop a set of methods to solve an Inverse Optimal Stopping problem by coupling the original problem to a related RL problem in a way that allows the application of SOTA methods for IRL. The main challenges associated with IOS are addressed with the modifications to IQ-Learning algorithm. While the

conceptual IOS challenges are addressed, some more advances methods for confidence scores evaluations (e.g. semi-supervised classification, assigning confidence scores to expert demonstrations, etc.), environment dynamics estimation (e.g. Bayesian methods, GANs, etc.) and a more efficient way to approximate continuation function are needed. We note that making a use of the binary structure of the OS problem and applying (“naive”) oversampling techniques substantially improved the performance of the baseline IQ-Learning algorithm even in a more complex case of OTI problems on real data. The potential future direction of research would be to use more principled methods of oversampling with corrections for potential non-convex shape of the stopping region, as well as allowing for oversampling of diverse typed of data (e.g. generative adversarial minority oversampling [18]). While the choice of the IQ-Learning algorithm as a basis for the approach was mostly motivated by the easiness of Q-function recovery in an offline setup, it would be an interesting research direction to compare the performance and stability of other IRL algorithms coupled with IOS.

References

- [1] Pieter Abbeel and Andrew Y. Ng. Apprenticeship learning via inverse reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '04*, page 1, New York, NY, USA, 2004. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 1581138385. doi: 10.1145/1015330.1015430. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1015330.1015430>.
- [2] Firas Al-Hafez, Davide Tateo, Oleg Arenz, Guoping Zhao, and Jan Peters. LS-IQ: Implicit reward regularization for inverse reinforcement learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=o3Q4m8jg4BR>.
- [3] D. P. Bertsekas. *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control*. Athena Scientific, Belmont, 1995.
- [4] N. V. Chawla, K. W. Bowyer, L. O. Hall, and W. P. Kegelmeyer. Smote: Synthetic minority oversampling technique. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 16:321–357, June 2002. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.953. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1613/jair.953>.
- [5] Niranjana Damera Venkata and Chiranjib Bhattacharyya. When to intervene: Learning optimal intervention policies for critical events. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 30114–30126. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/c26a8494fe31695db965ae8b7244b7c1-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [6] Amir-Massoud Farahmand, Andre Barreto, and Daniel Nikovski. Value-Aware Loss Function for Model-based Reinforcement Learning. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1486–1494. PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/farahmand17a.html>.
- [7] Scott Fujimoto, David Meger, Doina Precup, Ofir Nachum, and Shixiang Shane Gu. Why should i trust you, bellman? the bellman error is a poor replacement for value error, 2022.
- [8] D. Garg, S. Chakraborty, C. Cundy, J. Song, and S. Ermon. IQ-learn: Inverse soft-q learning for imitation. In A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Aeo-xqtb5p>.
- [9] Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft actor-critic: Off-policy maximum entropy deep reinforcement learning with a stochastic actor, 2018.
- [10] J. Michael Harrison. Discrete Dynamic Programming with Unbounded Rewards. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 43(2):636 – 644, 1972. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177692643. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177692643>.
- [11] Michael Herman, Tobias Gindele, Jörg Wagner, Felix Schmitt, and Wolfram Burgard. Inverse reinforcement learning with simultaneous estimation of rewards and dynamics. In Arthur Gretton and Christian C. Robert, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 51 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 102–110, Cadiz, Spain, 09–11 May 2016. PMLR. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v51/herman16.html>.
- [12] J. Ho and S. Ermon. Generative adversarial imitation learning. In D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/file/cc7e2b878868cb992d1fb743995d8f-Paper.pdf>.
- [13] Jianhui Huang and Tinghan Xie. A class of mean-field games with optimal stopping and its inverse problem, 2022.
- [14] Ilya Kostrikov, Kumar Krishna Agrawal, Debidatta Dwibedi, Sergey Levine, and Jonathan Tompson. Discriminator-actor-critic: Addressing sample inefficiency and reward bias in adversarial imitation learning, 2018.
- [15] Thomas Kruse and Philipp Strack. An inverse optimal stopping problem for diffusion processes, 2017.
- [16] Jialin Liu, Xinyan Su, Zeyu He, Xiangyu Zhao, and Jun Li. Adversarial batch inverse reinforcement learning: Learn to reward from imperfect demonstration for interactive recommendation, 2023.
- [17] Microsoft. Dataset from azure modeling guide for predictive maintenance. <https://github.com/microsoft/AMLWorkshop>, 2017.
- [18] Sankha Subhra Mullick, Shounak Datta, and Swagatam Das. Generative adversarial minority oversampling, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.09730>.
- [19] Tao Ning, Chunhong Zhang, Zheng Hu, Xiaosheng Tang, and Benhui Zhuang. Learning from imperfect demonstrations via reweighting confidence. In *2022 IEEE Smartworld, Ubiquitous Intelligence & Computing, Scalable Computing & Communications, Digital Twin, Privacy Computing,*

Metaverse, Autonomous & Trusted Vehicles (Smart-World/UIC/ScalCom/DigitalTwin/PriComp/Meta), pages 1105–1112, 2022. doi: 10.1109/SmartWorld-UIC-ATC-ScalCom-DigitalTwin-PriComp-Metaverse.2022.00172.

- [20] Kunal Pattanayak and Vikram Krishnamurthy. Necessary and sufficient conditions for inverse reinforcement learning of bayesian stopping time problems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(52):1–64, 2023. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/20-1202.html>.
- [21] Qifeng Qiao and Peter A. Beling. Behavior pattern recognition using a new representation model, 2013.
- [22] Abhinav Saxena, Kai Goebel, Don Simon, and Neil Eklund. Damage propagation modeling for aircraft engine run-to-failure simulation. In *2008 International Conference on Prognostics and Health Management*, pages 1–9, 2008. doi: 10.1109/PHM.2008.4711414.
- [23] J.N. Tsitsiklis and B. van Roy. Optimal stopping of markov processes: Hilbert space theory, approximation algorithms, and an application to pricing high-dimensional financial derivatives. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 44(10):1840–1851, 1999. doi: 10.1109/9.793723.
- [24] J. van der Wal. *Stochastic dynamic programming: successive approximations and nearly optimal strategies for Markov decision processes and Markov games*. 1980.
- [25] Yueh-Hua Wu, Nontawat Charoenphakdee, Han Bao, Voot Tangkaratt, and Masashi Sugiyama. Imitation learning from imperfect demonstration. *CoRR*, abs/1901.09387, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.09387>.
- [26] Haoran Xu, Xianyuan Zhan, Honglei Yin, and Huiling Qin. Discriminator-weighted offline imitation learning from suboptimal demonstrations. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 24725–24742. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/xu221.html>.
- [27] Sheng Yue, Guanbo Wang, Wei Shao, Zhaofeng Zhang, Sen Lin, Ju Ren, and Junshan Zhang. Clare: Conservative model-based reward learning for offline inverse reinforcement learning, 2023.
- [28] Siliang Zeng, Chenliang Li, Alfredo Garcia, and Mingyi Hong. Understanding expertise through demonstrations: A maximum likelihood framework for offline inverse reinforcement learning, 2023.
- [29] Siliang Zeng, Chenliang Li, Alfredo Garcia, and Mingyi Hong. When demonstrations meet generative world models: A maximum likelihood framework for offline inverse reinforcement learning. In *Thirty-first Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oML3v2cFg2>.
- [30] Zhengyuan Zhou, Michael Bloem, and Nicholas Bambos. Infinite time horizon maximum causal entropy inverse reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, PP:1–1, 11 2017. doi: 10.1109/TAC.2017.2775960.
- [31] Brian D. Ziebart, A. Maas, J. Andrew Bagnell, and Anind K. Dey. Maximum entropy inverse reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 23rd National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 3, AAAI’08*, page 1433–1438. AAAI Press, 2008. ISBN 9781577353683.
- [32] Brian D. Ziebart, J. Andrew Bagnell, and Anind K. Dey. Modeling interaction via the principle of maximum causal entropy. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’10*, page 1255–1262, Madison, WI, USA, 2010. Omnipress. ISBN 9781605589077.

A Appendix A: Propositions and proofs

In this section we present supplementary definitions, propositions and proofs.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. To show this we define the first hitting time of the stopping region D_Δ as

$$\tau_{D_\Delta} = \inf\{t \geq 0 | s_t \in D_\Delta\}. \quad (13)$$

with the stopping and continuation regions associated to the original OS problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \{s_t | G(s_t) \leq V^*(s_t)\}, \\ D_\Delta &= S \setminus C \cup \{\Delta\}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and D_Δ is the stopping region augmented with the set of ‘‘cemetery’’ states.

We first can show that the first hitting time of the stopping region D_Δ defined with (13) above is also an optimal stopping time as defined in (2) using the Debut theorem.

Theorem 1 (Debut Theorem). *Let X be an adapted right-continuous stochastic process defined on a filtered probability space. If D is a stopping set which is Borel-measurable, then:*

$$\tau_D = \inf\{t \geq 0 | X_t \in D\} \quad (15)$$

is a stopping time.

Here we assume that the MC evolves with jumps (allowing us to formulate it as a discrete MDP). So if $\tau^* = \tau_{D_\Delta}$ is the first hitting time of D_Δ , we assume that there exists a hard (instantaneous) killing time $\tau_\Delta = \tau_{D_\Delta} + 1$ at which the process enters the set of cemetery states, i.e. $S_t \in \{\Delta\}, \forall t \geq \tau_\Delta$.

Hence the OS problem can be expressed as

$$V^*(s_0) = \mathbb{E}_{s_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{D_\Delta}-1} \gamma^t g(s_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_\Delta} \geq 1\}} + \gamma^{\tau_{D_\Delta}} G(s_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}) \right].$$

We now assume that $s_0 \in C$ and $\tilde{s}_0 = s_0 \in C$ with $C = S \setminus D$. We also define an optimal policy as

$$\pi^*(\cdot | s_t) = \begin{cases} \delta_1(\cdot) : s_t \in C \\ \delta_0(\cdot) : s_t \in D_\Delta \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

and express the sum in (5) as:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s_0) &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{D_\Delta}-1} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_\Delta} \geq 1\}} + \gamma^{\tau_{D_\Delta}} r(s_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}, a_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}) + \sum_{t=\tau_{D_\Delta}+1}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{D_\Delta}-1} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_\Delta} \geq 1\}} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[\gamma^{\tau_{D_\Delta}} r(s_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}, a_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} \left[\sum_{t=\tau_{D_\Delta}+1}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [r(s_t, a_t)] \\ &= p_0(s_0) \sum_{a_0} \pi^*(a_0 | s_0) \sum_{s_1} \mathbb{P}_{s_0, a_0}(s_1) \sum_{a_1} \pi^*(a_1 | s_1) \sum_{s_2} \mathbb{P}_{s_1, a_1}(s_2) \\ &\dots \sum_{s_t} \mathbb{P}_{s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}}(s_t) \sum_{a_t} \pi^*(a_t | s_t) r(s_t, a_t) \\ &= p_0(s_0) \sum_{a_0} \pi^*(a_0 | s_0) \left(\prod_{k=1}^t \sum_{s_k} \mathbb{P}_{s_{k-1}, a_{k-1}}(s_k) \sum_{a_k} \pi^*(a_k | s_k) \right) r(s_t, a_t). \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the following three cases:

1. If $t < \tau_{D_\Delta}$, then $s_t \in C$ and $\pi^*(a_t|s_t) = \delta_1(a_t)$. Then $\pi^*(a_t = 1|s_t) = 1, \pi^*(a_t = 0|s_t) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [r(s_t, a_t)] = \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [g(s_t)], \forall t < \tau_{D_\Delta}$;
2. If $t = \tau_{D_\Delta}$, then

$$\begin{cases} s_k \in C, \pi^*(a_k|s_k) = \delta_1(a_k) \text{ and } \pi^*(a_k = 1|s_k) = 1, \pi^*(a_k = 0|s_k) = 0 \forall k < \tau_{D_\Delta}; \\ s_t \in D_\Delta, \pi^*(a_t|s_t) = \delta_0(a_t) \text{ and } \pi^*(a_t = 1|s_t) = 0, \pi^*(a_t = 0|s_t) = 1 \text{ for } t = \tau_{D_\Delta}. \end{cases}$$

Then $\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [r(s_t, a_t)] = \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [G(s_t)],$ for $t = \tau_{D_\Delta}$;

3. Likewise since $t > \tau_{D_\Delta}$ is equivalent to $t \geq \tau_\Delta$ we have that $s_t \in \{\Delta\}$ and $\pi^*(a_t|s_t) = \delta_0(a_t)$. We also know that $g(s_t) = G(s_t) = 0$ for $s_t \in \{\Delta\}$. Then $\pi^*(a_t = 1|s_t) = 0, \pi^*(a_t = 0|s_t) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [r(s_t, a_t)] = \mathbb{E}_{s_0}^{\pi^*} [G(\Delta)] = 0,$ for $t > \tau_{D_\Delta}$.

Putting it all together we obtain that V^{τ^*} and V^{π^*} are equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\pi^*}(s_0) &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{D_\Delta}-1} \gamma^t g(s_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_\Delta} \geq 1\}} + \gamma^{\tau_{D_\Delta}} G(s_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}) + \sum_{t=\tau_{D_\Delta}+1}^{\infty} \gamma^t G(\Delta) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{s_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\tau_{D_\Delta}-1} \gamma^t g(s_t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_{D_\Delta} \geq 1\}} + \gamma^{\tau_{D_\Delta}} G(s_{\tau_{D_\Delta}}) \right] \\ &= V^*(s_0). \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Proposition: deterministic stopping policy

Proposition 2 (Deterministic stopping policy). *The optimal stopping policy defined by a set of Delta-functions conditioned on the continuation and stopping region is equivalent to a greedy policy with respect to the Q-function, i.e.*

$$\pi^*(a|s) = \begin{cases} \delta_1(a) : s \in C^* \\ \delta_0(a) : s \in D_\Delta^* \end{cases} = \delta \left(a = \arg \max_a Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \right). \quad (17)$$

Proof. Assume there exists an optimal deterministic greedy policy defined by

$$\delta \left(a = \arg \max_a Q^{\pi^*}(s, a) \right).$$

In case of a binary action-space we can write the above in terms of two Delta-functions

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(a|s) &= \begin{cases} \delta(a = 0 \text{ if } Q^{\pi^*}(s, 0) = \max_a Q^{\pi^*}(s, a)) \\ \delta(a = 1 \text{ if } Q^{\pi^*}(s, 1) = \max_a Q^{\pi^*}(s, a)) \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_0(a) : s \in \{s | r(s, 0) + \gamma V^*(s') = V^*(s)\} \\ \delta_1(a) : s \in \{s | r(s, 1) + \gamma V^*(s') = V^*(s)\} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_0(a) : s \in \{s | G(s) = \max\{g(s) + \gamma V^*(s'), G(s)\}\} \\ \delta_1(a) : s \in \{s | g(s) + \gamma V^*(s') = \max\{g(s) + \gamma V^*(s'), G(s)\}\} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_0(a) : s \in \{s | G(s) \leq g(s) + \gamma V^*(s')\} \\ \delta_1(a) : s \in \{s | G(s) > g(s) + \gamma V^*(s')\} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_0(a) : s \in \{s | G(s) \leq V^*(s)\} \\ \delta_1(a) : s \in \{s | G(s) > V^*(s)\} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \delta_1(a) : s \in C^* \\ \delta_0(a) : s \in D_\Delta^*, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the definitions of the Q- and V-functions and stopping and continuation regions and the fact that for a deterministic policy $V^\pi(s) = Q^\pi(s, \pi(s))$. □

A.3 Convergence of a stochastic policy

Proposition 3 (Convergence of the Boltzmann distribution to the Delta distribution). *Define Boltzmann distribution as*

$$s_\epsilon(f(x)) = \frac{\exp\{f(x)/\epsilon\}}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \exp\{f(x')/\epsilon\}}.$$

In the limit

$$s_\epsilon(f(x)) \rightarrow \delta(x = \arg \max_{x'} f(x'))$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Assume that the function $f(x)$ has a unique supremum and define $f(x^*) = \sup_{x \in X} f(x)$. We first divide $s_\epsilon(f(x))$ by $\frac{\exp\{-f(x^*)/\epsilon\}}{\exp\{-f(x^*)/\epsilon\}}$ to obtain

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} s_\epsilon(f(x)) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\exp\{f(x)/\epsilon\} \exp\{-f(x^*)/\epsilon\}}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \exp\{f(x')/\epsilon\} \exp\{-f(x^*)/\epsilon\}} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\exp\{\frac{f(x)-f(x^*)}{\epsilon}\}}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \exp\{\frac{f(x')-f(x^*)}{\epsilon}\}}.$$

Define $\Delta(x) = f(x) - f(x^*) < 0$ if $f(x) \neq f(x^*)$ and $\Delta^*(x) = f(x) - f(x^*) = 0$ if $f(x) = f(x^*)$. Then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} s_\epsilon(f(x)) = \begin{cases} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\exp\{\Delta(x)/\epsilon\}}{\sum_{x' \neq x^*} \exp\{\Delta(x')/\epsilon\} + 1} & \text{if } f(x) \neq f(x^*) \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sum_{x' \neq x^*} \exp\{\Delta(x')/\epsilon\} + 1} & \text{if } f(x) = f(x^*). \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} s_\epsilon(f(x)) &= \begin{cases} \frac{0}{0+1} & \text{if } f(x) \neq f(x^*) \\ \frac{1}{0+1} & \text{if } f(x) = f(x^*) \end{cases} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(x) \neq f(x^*) \\ 1 & \text{if } f(x) = f(x^*) \end{cases} \\ &= \delta\left(x = \arg \max_{x'} f(x')\right). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, softargmax function $s_\epsilon(\cdot)$ converges to the argmax function $\arg \max(\cdot)$ as the scaling parameter goes to zero. \square

B Appendix B: Model and implementation details

This section provides a more detailed description of the model architecture and implementation details.

B.1 Model Implementation

A more detailed structure of the Neural Network used to implement DO-IQS algorithm is presented on the Figure 4.

Algorithm 3 shows how to recover the OS region using approximate Q-function.

Algorithm 3 Stopping region recovery using Model-Based IQS

Input: Unstopped state process S_T^M ; an approximation of the stopping Q-function $Q_{\epsilon,\theta}$ and the environment model \mathcal{P}_θ ; a discount factor $\gamma \in (0, 1]$;

Output: A stopping region $D_{\epsilon,\theta} = \{s | G(s) \geq g(s) + \gamma \mathcal{P}_\theta(s' | s, a = 1) V_{\epsilon,\theta}(s')\}$

- 1: **for** state s_t^m in S_T^M **do**
 - 2: **if** $Q_{\epsilon,\theta}(s_t^m, a = 0) \geq Q_{\epsilon,\theta}(s_t^m, a = 1)$ **then**
 - 3: Add s_t^m to $D_{\epsilon,\theta}$
 - 4: **end if**
 - 5: **end for**
-

B.2 Hyper-parameters selection and implementation details

We use the following hyper-parameter setup throughout the models and examples:

- Learning rates for Q-function, environment dynamics P and the continuation gain g were set to 0.01 decaying exponentially after each epoch with the factor 0.9999. We do not fine tune learning rates specifically for each model to avoid overfitting to the validation set;




Figure 4: ANN structure for the Model-based IQS

- $\epsilon = 0.1$ with the multiplier factor of 0.9999 applied at each epoch to decrease the value of the temperature parameter over the course of training;
- N-neighbours for the SMOTE oversampling algorithm: 12;
- The initial confidence score is set to be $\alpha = 0.99$ and then decreased after each epoch exponentially through multiplying it by a decay factor 0.95;
- Discount factor $\gamma = 0.99$;
- Batch size: 128;
- Number of training epochs: 250.

In this work we are taking a naive approach to the dynamics modeling by predicting the next state s' (and not the distribution over the possible next states) to show how integrating even a simple environment model results in a substantial improvement in the modeling results.

B.3 Robustness to discount factor misspecification

One of the caveats of solving IOS not discussed so far is that the discount factor used by the expert might not always be available to the inverse learner. We first note, that the discount factor misspecification could be intrinsically corrected by IOS, if the time is the part of the state space. To see that, assume that the expert used discount factor γ_E and a reward function r_E to simulate stopped trajectories. Define a discount factor as a function of time so that $\gamma^t = \gamma(t)$. Then $V_E(s) = \mathbb{E}_s [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma_E^t r(s_t, a_t)] = \mathbb{E}_s [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma_E(t) r(s_t, a_t)] = \mathbb{E}_s [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \tilde{r}(s_t, a_t)]$. Hence the Q-function recovered by the IOS algorithm should be able to account for the discount factor misspecification.