

---

# UNIVERSAL REINFORCEMENT LEARNING IN COALGEBRAS: ASYNCHRONOUS STOCHASTIC APPROXIMATION VIA COINDUCTION \*

---

A PREPRINT

**Sridhar Mahadevan**

Adobe Research and University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
smahadev@adobe.com, mahadeva@umass.edu

August 22, 2025

## ABSTRACT

In this paper, we introduce a categorial generalization of RL, termed universal reinforcement learning (URL), building on powerful mathematical abstractions from the study of coinduction on non-well-founded sets and universal coalgebras, topos theory, and categorial models of asynchronous parallel distributed computation. In the first half of the paper, we review the basic RL framework, illustrate the use of categories and functors in RL, showing how they lead to interesting insights. In particular, we also introduce a standard model of asynchronous distributed minimization proposed by Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, and describe the relationship between metric coinduction and their proof of the Asynchronous Convergence Theorem. The space of algorithms for MDPs or PSRs can be modeled as a functor category, where the co-domain category forms a topos, which admits all (co)limits, possesses a subobject classifier, and has exponential objects. In the second half of the paper, we move on to universal coalgebras. Dynamical system models, such as Markov decision processes (MDPs), partially observed MDPs (POMDPs), a predictive state representation (PSRs), and linear dynamical systems (LDSs) are all special types of coalgebras. We describe a broad family of universal coalgebras, extending the dynamic system models studied previously in RL. The core problem in finding fixed points in RL to determine the exact or approximate (action) value function is generalized in URL to determining the final coalgebra asynchronously in a parallel distributed manner.

**Keywords** Reinforcement Learning · Universal Coalgebras · Coinduction · Category Theory · Topos Theory · AI · Machine Learning

---

\*Draft under revision.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Roadmap to the Paper</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Part I: Functor Categories for RL . . . . .	5
2.2	Part II: Generalizing RL to URL through Coalgebras . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Asynchronous Distributed Minimization</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Asynchronous Convergence Theorem . . . . .	7
3.2	Stochastic Approximation Theory for RL . . . . .	8
3.3	Using Diagrams to Specify URL Architectures . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>What are Universal Coalgebras?</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	MDPs as Coalgebras . . . . .	11
<b>5</b>	<b>What is Coinduction?</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	Dynamic Programming and Metric Coinduction . . . . .	12
5.2	Final Coalgebra Theorem . . . . .	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Introduction to RL</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1	Basics of Reinforcement Learning . . . . .	14
6.2	Action Value Function Approximation . . . . .	14
6.3	Proximal RL . . . . .	15
6.4	Categorical Function Approximation . . . . .	15
<b>7</b>	<b>Categories for URL</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1	MDP or PSR homomorphisms define categories . . . . .	16
7.2	Category $C_Q$ of Action-Value Functions . . . . .	17
7.3	Functor Categories and Yoneda Embeddings . . . . .	18
<b>8</b>	<b>Exact Solution Methods for MDPs as Functor Categories</b>	<b>19</b>
8.1	Value Iteration as a Coalgebra . . . . .	19
8.2	Policy Iteration as an Adjoint Functor . . . . .	19
8.3	Linear Programming for MDPs as a Functor . . . . .	20
<b>9</b>	<b>Simulation-based and Reinforcement Learning Methods as Functors</b>	<b>20</b>
9.1	Monte-Carlo Methods as Functors . . . . .	20
9.2	Temporal-Difference Learning as a Functor . . . . .	20
<b>10</b>	<b>Deep RL as Diagrams over Coalgebras</b>	<b>21</b>
10.1	Symmetric Monoidal Categories . . . . .	21
10.2	Category of Compositional Reinforcement Learners . . . . .	22

10.3	Backpropagation as a Functor . . . . .	24
10.4	Backpropagation as a Coalgebra . . . . .	25
10.5	Zeroth-Order Deep Learning using Stochastic Approximation . . . . .	26
<b>11</b>	<b>Universal Properties of Coalgebras</b>	<b>27</b>
11.1	Lambek’s Theorem and Final Coalgebras . . . . .	28
11.2	Asynchronous Distributed Computation in Universal Coalgebras . . . . .	30
<b>12</b>	<b>Information Fields over Coalgebras</b>	<b>30</b>
12.1	Bisimulation Morphisms as Open Maps . . . . .	31
12.2	Bisimulation in UDMs . . . . .	32
12.3	Observation Objects in UDM . . . . .	33
12.4	Solvability of UDM objects . . . . .	33
<b>13</b>	<b>The Metric Yoneda Lemma: Coinductive Inference in Generalized Metric Spaces</b>	<b>34</b>
13.1	Generalized Metric Spaces as Categories . . . . .	34
13.2	The Metric Yoneda Lemma . . . . .	36
13.3	Applying the Metric Yoneda Lemma in URL . . . . .	36
<b>14</b>	<b>Topos Theory in URL: Complete Categories with Exponentials and Subobjects</b>	<b>37</b>
14.1	Diagrams in URL . . . . .	37
14.2	Limits and Colimits . . . . .	37
14.3	Category of Action-Value Functions is (co)Complete . . . . .	38
<b>15</b>	<b>Category of Action Value Functions form a Topos</b>	<b>38</b>
15.1	Subobject Classifiers for the category $C_Q$ of action-value functions . . . . .	39
15.2	Exponential Objects in the Category $C_Q$ . . . . .	40
15.3	More General Topos Categories in URL . . . . .	41
<b>16</b>	<b>Summary and Future Work</b>	<b>41</b>

## 1 Introduction

The computational study of reinforcement learning (RL) dates back to Arthur Samuel’s pioneering work on the checkers player [Samuel, 1959]. Excellent textbook accounts of RL are given in [Bertsekas, 2019, Sutton and Barto, 1998]. RL has recently begun to play a key role in the fine-tuning of large language models (LLMs) [DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025]. RL has also been successfully combined with deep learning [Bengio, 2009], leading to many interesting demonstrations on challenging video games.

In this paper, we introduce a categorical generalization of RL, which we term universal reinforcement learning (URL), building on the powerful mathematical abstractions of category theory [MacLane, 1971, Riehl, 2017], topos theory [Johnstone, 2002, MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk, 1994], universal coalgebras [Jacobs, 2016, Rutten, 2000], and formal models of parallel asynchronous distributed computation [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997, Witsenhausen, 1975]. The main thesis underlying URL can be stated as follows:

*URL, and by specialization RL, is essentially a process of stochastic metric coinduction in a universal coalgebra defined over a topos of (action)value functions, and all TD-type algorithms can be analyzed in terms of iterative procedures for discovering final coalgebras..*

It is the goal of this paper to explain justify this assertion more formally. Doing so will require significant background in modern category theory, and we can only provide the briefest of introductions here. Besides the wealth of available textbooks on category theory [MacLane, 1971, Riehl, 2017, Richter, 2020], topos theory [MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk, 1994, Bell, 1988, Goldblatt, 2006, Johnstone, 2002], and universal coalgebras [Jacobs, 2016], we refer the reader to our past paper on universal decision models [Mahadevan, 2021a] for an introduction to categorical representations in RL. Our recent papers on categorial causality [Mahadevan, 2023, 2025a,c], categorial foundations of generative AI [Mahadevan, 2024a], universal imitation games [Mahadevan, 2024b], and categorial large language models [Mahadevan, 2025b] contain further examples on many applications of categorial concepts to AI and ML, to which we refer the reader. We will illustrate the main concepts in the context of RL in this paper, and emphasize intuition over rigor given the introductory tutorial nature of this paper.

In essence, URL makes the following distinct contributions:

1. URL introduces the study of RL over universal coalgebras [Rutten, 2000], which is interesting in that it brings with it a new notion of *state* [Jacobs, 2016] that is different from past work in RL.
2. URL broadens the family of dynamical system models studied previously in RL, to include a whole grammar of possible models defined as probabilistic or stochastic coalgebras [Sokolova, 2011].
3. URL introduces the concept of *diagrams* defined as functors  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{URL}$  as a way to specify properties of a URL category, such as (co)limits, pullbacks, pushouts, (co)equalizers etc., all of which are shown to play important roles in obtaining solutions.
4. URL introduces a new way to formulate stochastic approximation, which draw from categorical abstractions of previous work on asynchronous parallel distributed computation [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997, Witsenhausen, 1975].

Our primary interest in this paper is bringing in new theoretical approaches to the study of RL, with the long-term goal of gaining insight into how to learn to make optimal decisions in a tractable way by exploiting structure. Most applications of large-scale RL require an enormous number of samples, and the scale of computation needed seems completely beyond what humans are capable of. We live only for a billion seconds or more, and yet many experimental studies in RL require tens of billions or more episodes. This discrepancy between what humans actually require to learn complex tasks, such as driving, from studies in RL show that the predominant challenge in RL remains how to specify a priori structure (or how to learn parts of such structure from previous tasks).

Our work is also related to past work on MDP homomorphisms [Ravindran and Barto, 2003] and PSR homomorphisms [Soni and Singh, 2007]. These are special cases of the categorial structures studied in this paper, and will be used to illustrate our more abstract analysis. We hasten to add that our paper is not the first to study coalgebraic structure of MDPs. Feys et al. [2018] describes the coalgebraic structure implicit in the definition of dynamic programming methods to solve MDPs, but does not study sampling-based RL methods in particular. Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] explores the application of coalgebraic inference methods, such as *metric coinduction* in the Bellman equation as well. Both of these are specifically limited to the MDP model as well, whereas we explore a far broader range of coalgebras.




Figure 1: URL models MDP solution methods as *functors* mapping from the category of MDPs to the category of value functions. The ensemble of all such methods forms a functor category. Universal properties of these categories are studied in this paper. For example, the category of (action) value functions is shown to form a *topos* [MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk, 1994].

Our work also relates to Witsenhausen’s *intrinsic model* [Witsenhausen, 1975], which we explored previously in our work on universal decision models [Mahadevan, 2021a]. Witsenhausen proposed the notion of an *information field*, a measure-theoretic notion of state, and also defined a taxonomy of decision problems based on constructing a topology of decision makers. In his framework, every decision-making instant was modeled as a separate decision maker, and his taxonomy included synchronous and asynchronous forms of decision making. There is of course an enormous literature in operations research on dynamic programming models, and we refer the reader to standard textbook treatments [Bertsekas, 2005]. Finally, our URL framework builds on past theoretical work on using stochastic approximation methods to analyze the convergence of RL algorithms, such as Q-learning [Kushner and Yin, 2003]. The main difference here is that we are using categorical constructions, such as Kan extensions Kan [1958], to model martingale processes, building on recent work by Belle [2023].

## 2 Roadmap to the Paper

Here is a brief roadmap to our paper, which is comprised of two parts.

### 2.1 Part I: Functor Categories for RL

A *category*  $C$  is a collection of *objects*  $c \in C$ , and a collection of arrows between each pair of objects  $f \in C(c, c')$ , including an identity arrow  $1_c$  for each object  $c \in C$ , and composability of arrows  $C(c, c') \times C(c', c'') \rightarrow C(c, c'')$ . A functor  $F : C \rightarrow D$  maps each object  $c \in C$  to the object  $Fc \in D$  and each arrow  $f \in C$  to the arrow  $Ff \in D$ . A category of functors  $D^C$  is one where each object is a functor  $F : C \rightarrow D$ .

Figure 1 gives a high-level illustration of the first part of the paper. We conceptualize the solution of RL problems modeled as MDPs as *functors* that map from a *category* of MDPs  $C_{MDP}$  to a *category* of value functions  $C_V$ . A functor  $F : C_{MDP} \rightarrow C_V$  are specified by an *object* function mapping a particular MDP  $M$  to some associated value function  $FM = V_M$ , and  $FM' = V_{M'}$ , and an *arrow* function mapping some MDP homomorphism [Ravindran and Barto, 2003]  $f \in C_{MDP}(M, M')$  into a corresponding arrow  $Ff \in C_V(V_M, V_{M'})$ . A similar structure exists for the category  $C_{PSR}$  of predictive state representations (PSRs) [Soni and Singh, 2007], whose objects are PSR models and whose arrows are PSR homomorphisms.

Functors come in many varieties, but two important classes are used in this paper.

**Definition 1.** A **covariant functor**  $F : C \rightarrow D$  from category  $C$  to category  $D$ , is defined as the following:

- An object  $FX$  (also written as  $F(X)$ ) of the category  $D$  for each object  $X$  in category  $C$ .
- An arrow  $F(f) : FX \rightarrow FY$  in category  $D$  for every arrow  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in category  $C$ .
- The preservation of identity and composition:  $F id_X = id_{FX}$  and  $(Ff)(Fg) = F(g \circ f)$  for any composable arrows  $f : X \rightarrow Y, g : Y \rightarrow Z$ .

**Definition 2.** A **contravariant functor**  $F : C \rightarrow D$  from category  $C$  to category  $D$  is defined exactly like the covariant functor, except all the arrows are reversed.

We give a brief overview of RL in Section 6 for readers unfamiliar with the field. Section 7 illustrates the definition of categories over MDPs, using the familiar notions of MDP or PSR homomorphisms [Ravindran

and Barto, 2003, Soni and Singh, 2007], although it is worth stressing that the arrows in an MDP or PSR category may represent any composable operation on these dynamical systems. Section 8 begins a series of sections, illustrating how the space of solution methods in RL can be modeled as functor categories, as illustrated in Figure 1, first with exact solution methods, such as policy and value iteration, and linear programming. Section 9 shows that simulation and RL-based methods can also be viewed in terms of functor categories. Section 10 shows how deep RL can be modeled as a functor, building on the functorial characterization of backpropagation [Fong et al., 2019].

## 2.2 Part II: Generalizing RL to URL through Coalgebras

In the second part of the paper, we generalize RL to *universal RL* (URL). Section 4 introduces the topic of universal coalgebras, a categorical framework for dynamical systems, which generalizes a vast range of dynamical systems, from finite state automata, grammars and Turing machines, to stochastic dynamical systems like MDPs or PSRs by universal coalgebras [Jacobs, 2016, Rutten, 2000, Sokolova, 2011]. A coalgebra is simply defined as the structure

$$\alpha_F = X \rightarrow F(X)$$

where  $X$  is an object in some category  $\mathcal{C}$ , usually referred to as the *carrier*, and the functor  $F$  defines the  $F$ -dynamics of the coalgebra. As an example of a coalgebra, consider the functor  $\mathcal{P}_X : X \rightarrow 2^X$  that maps from a set  $X$  to its powerset  $2^X$  in the category **Sets** of sets. Sokolova [2011] describes how to build an entire language of *probabilistic* coalgebras, using the context-free grammar:

$$F := \_ | A | \_^A | \mathcal{P} | \mathcal{D} | F \circ F | F \times F | F + F$$

where  $F$  denotes a functor constructed from this grammar. Here,  $\_$  is the identity functor over the category **Sets**.  $A$  is the constant functor mapping any set to the fixed set  $A$ .  $\mathbf{id}^A$  defines a mapping from any set  $X$  to the set of all functions from  $A$  to  $X$ . The *powerset* functor  $\mathcal{P}$  maps a set  $X$  to its collection of subsets. Most importantly, the probability distribution functor  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined as follows.

**Definition 3.** *The probability distribution functor  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined as  $\mathcal{D} : \mathbf{Sets} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$  maps a set  $X$  to  $\mathcal{D}X = \{\mu : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} | \mu[X] = 1\}$ , and a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to  $\mathcal{D}f : \mathcal{D}X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}Y$  as  $(\mathcal{D}f)(\mu) = \lambda. \mu[f^{-1}(\{y\})]$ .*

In plain English, a distribution functor constructs a probability distribution over any set that has finite support, and given any function  $f$  from set  $X$  to set  $Y$ , maps any element  $y$  in the codomain  $\mathcal{D}Y$  to the probability mass assigned by to its preimage by  $\mathcal{D}f$ . We can now define an entire family of stochastic coalgebras as shown in Table 1. We follow the terminology introduced in [Sokolova, 2011]. To translate into the RL language, Segala systems correspond to MDPs, and Vardi systems are essentially concurrent Markov chains. It is possible to derive properties of the entire family of such coalgebras using the universal properties sketched out in the previous section, which we will refer the reader to [Sokolova, 2011]. Our goal here is to adapt this categorical language into the URL framework, which we discuss next.

Coalg <sub>F</sub>	F	Explanation
MC	$\mathcal{D}$	Markov chain
DLTS	$(\_ + 1)^A$	Deterministic automata
LTS	$\mathcal{P}(A \times \_) \simeq \mathcal{P}^A$	Non-deterministic automata
React	$(\mathcal{D} + 1)^A$	Reactive systems
Generative	$\mathcal{D}(A \times \_) + 1$	Generative Systems
Str	$\mathcal{D} + (A \times \_) + 1$	Stratified systems
Alt	$\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{P}(A \times \_)$	Alternating systems
Var	$\mathcal{D}(A \times \_) + \mathcal{P}(A \times \_)$	Vardi systems
SSeg	$\mathcal{P}(A \times \mathcal{D})$	Simple Segala Systems
Seg	$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}(A \times \_)$	Segala systems
Bun	$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}(A \times \_)$	Bundle systems
PZ	$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}(A \times \_)$	Pneuli-Zuck systems
MG	$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}(A \times \_ \times \_)$	Most general systems

Table 1: Stochastic Coalgebras in URL using the notation from [Sokolova, 2011].

### 3 Asynchronous Distributed Minimization

Before proceeding to outline our coinduction-based URL framework, we briefly review the induction-based framework of asynchronous stochastic approximation. Many RL algorithms, such as  $Q$ -learning, are essentially stochastic approximation methods [Kushner and Yin, 2003] that are amenable to parallel distributed computation techniques, and we briefly review this methodology here, particularly the work of Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1997] that formed the basis for the convergence analysis of  $Q$ -learning by Tsitsiklis [1993]. It is, as we will see, couched in the language of *induction*. In sharp contrast, URL will be couched in the language of *coinduction*, which we will discuss in Section 5 next. In a nutshell, the classical problem studied in [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997] relates to solving the fixed point equation

$$F(x^*) = x^*, \quad x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

where the mapping  $F$  is comprised of a set of component mappings  $f_i$ , which admit asynchronous parallel distributed computation. In the language of coalgebras, this fixed point equation will be described as finding a *final coalgebra*, a problem that has been solved in great generality [Aczel, 1988]. The space of solutions that  $x^*$  lies in is assumed to be the Cartesian product

$$X = X_1 \times X_2 \dots X_n$$

and the solutions are vectors of the form

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

where the component functions  $f_i$  assemble together as

$$F(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x)), \quad \forall x \in X$$

and the fixed point of  $F$  is computed using an asynchronous distributed version of the iterative method

$$x_i = f_i(x), \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

Algorithm 1 describes a formulation of asynchronous distributed minimization of a decomposable function, partly rephrased in terms of the coalgebraic language we will use in the URL framework. Later in the paper, we will give the coalgebraic URL generalization of this procedure as Algorithm 4.

#### 3.1 Asynchronous Convergence Theorem

The general theory of convergence of such an approach to computing fixed points was later applied to the convergence of  $Q$ -learning by Tsitsiklis [1993], as discussed below. The general convergence theorem in Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1997] (Section 6.2) of Algorithm 3.1 proceeds by postulating that there is a sequence of nonempty sets  $\{X(k)\}$  such that

$$\dots \subset X(k+1) \subset X(k) \subset \dots \subset X$$

satisfying the two conditions:

1. *Synchronous convergence condition:* Here,  $f(x) \in X(k+1), \forall k$  and  $x \in X(k)$ . Also, if  $\{y^k\}$  is some sequence of vectors where  $y^k \in X(k)$  for every  $k$ , then every limit point of  $y^k$  is a fixed point of  $F$ .
2. *Box condition:* For every  $k$ , there exists a sets  $X_i(k) \subset X_i$  such that

$$X(k) = X_1(k) \times X_2(k) \times \dots \times X_n(k)$$

Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1997] then prove the following *Asynchronous Convergence Theorem*:

**Algorithm 1:** Asynchronous Distributed Minimization [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997]

**Input:** Some function  $F : X \rightarrow X$ , where  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$  or some (generalized) metric space decomposable as  $X = X_1 \times X_2 \times \dots \times X_n$ , and  $F = (f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_n(x))$ , for all  $x \in X$ .

**Output:** A fixed point of  $F$ , namely an element  $x^* \in X$  such that  $F(x^*) = x^*$ , which can be expressed also as  $x_i^* = f_i(x^*)$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . This problem can be stated in the coalgebraic language of URL as finding a final coalgebra of a decomposable coalgebra.

1: **repeat**

2: At each time step  $t \in T$ , where  $T = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ , update some component  $x_i$  of  $x$ , using an asynchronous distributed version of the coalgebraic iteration:

$$x_i \rightarrow f_i(x)$$

3: Each update of  $x_i$  is done in parallel by some "processor" that may not have access to the latest values of all components of  $x$ , but we can assume that

$$x_i(t+1) = f_i(x_1(\tau_i^1(t)), \dots, x_n(\tau_n^i(t))), \quad \forall t \in T^i$$

4: where  $T^i$  is the set of time points where  $x_i$  is updated, and  $0 \leq \tau_j^i(t) \leq t$ , and at all times  $t \notin T^i$ , we assume that

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t)$$

5: **if** the fixed point of  $F$  is not reached **then**

6: Set  $t = t + 1$ , and return to Step 2.

7: **else**

8: Set **done**  $\leftarrow$  **true**.

9: **end if**

10: **until done**.

11: Return the fixed point  $x^*$  of  $F$ .

**Theorem 1.** *If the above two conditions hold, and the initial solution estimate*

$$x(0) = (x_1(0), \dots, x_n(0))$$

*belongs to the set  $X(0)$ , then every limit point of  $\{x(t)\}$  is a fixed point of  $F$ .*

What's important here is that the actual proof given in [Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997] is a proof based on *mathematical induction*: if the induction hypothesis is true for  $k = 0$ , which it is since the initial estimate  $x(0)$  is assumed to lie inside the set  $X(0)$ , then they show that there exists a time  $t_{k+1}$  with the requisite properties. URL sharply deviates from this framework in that it is based not on induction, and consequently *initial algebras* of well-founded sets, but on the principle of *coinduction* on *non-well-founded* sets. We will revisit the proof of the ACT theorem in Section 13 using an interesting way to construct embeddings in generalized metric spaces.

### 3.2 Stochastic Approximation Theory for RL

There are many ways to analyze the convergence of RL algorithms, from stochastic approximation using ordinary differential equations (ODEs) [Kushner and Yin, 2003, Borkar, 2008] to parallel distributed computation [Tsitsiklis, 1993, Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis, 1997]. As a concrete example, Tsitsiklis [1993] analyzes the convergence of the following iteration:

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \alpha_i(t)\{F_i(x^i(t)) - x_i(t) + w_i(t)\}, \quad t \in T^i \quad (1)$$

where  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a mapping from  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space back to itself, whose fixed point  $F(x) = x$  is to be determined at some point  $x^*$ . This is essentially a coalgebraic equation, and the fixed point  $F(x^*) = x^*$  is the final coalgebra. To find the fixed point of the mapping  $F$  defined in Equation 1, Tsitsiklis

[1993] defines a sequence of nested  $\Sigma$ -algebras, denoted  $\mathcal{F}(\sqcup)p_0^\infty$ , on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$  over which all the random variables  $(x(t), \tau_j^i(t), \alpha_i(t), w_i(t))$ , are  $\mathcal{F}(t)$  measurable.

To guarantee convergence of stochastic approximation in RL, Tsitsiklis [1993] proposed a framework wherein RL algorithms could be solved using parallel distributed computation comprising of a series of decision makers, each of which updates a particular state-action pair  $(s, a)$  asynchronously, and in parallel with no coordination between them. This framework builds on previous work described in Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1997]. A key assumption made in this work, and applied to the convergence of Q-learning is that the resulting  $\Sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}(t)$  are all measurable, meaning that the random variables in Equation 1 are all measurable at each time instant. Later, we review and generalize the work of Witsenhausen [1975] on the *intrinsic* model, a parallel distributed computational model, which addresses the problem of how to structure a sequence of information fields such that the resulting  $\Sigma$ -algebras are indeed measurable. It is this specific question that is somewhat left unaddressed in the work of Tsitsiklis [1993] and Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis [1997]. We describe a categorical generalization of the Witsenhausen’s framework, first proposed in our previous work on universal decision models (UDMs) [Mahadevan, 2021a], and here specialized to a category of coalgebras for URL.

### 3.3 Using Diagrams to Specify URL Architectures

A general theme in URL is the use of diagrams  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow C$ , where  $\mathcal{J}$  is a finite category, and  $F$  is a functor that maps each object  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  to an object  $Fj \in C$  and each arrow  $f : j \rightarrow j'$  in  $\mathcal{J}$  to the corresponding arrow  $Ff : Fj \rightarrow Fj'$  in  $C$ . Let us relate this abstract view to the structure defined in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 uses a simple product structure, which corresponds to a diagram of the form  $\mathcal{J} = \bullet \cdots \bullet$ , where each  $\bullet$  is a placeholder for an actual object in category  $C$ , which in Algorithm 1 corresponds to one whose objects are defined as elements of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and whose arrows are mappings over  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The actual product structure itself emerges as the *limit* of the diagram  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow C$ . As we will see in later sections of this paper, we can conceptualize all of the previous work in RL in terms of diagrams, ranging from simple table-lookup methods, which corresponds to a discrete category with only identity arrows, to deep RL where the diagram is specified by a neural network as shown in [Fong et al., 2019]. We will generalize Algorithm 1 eventually to Algorithm 4, where the product structure will be replaced by a functor diagram over a category of coalgebras.

## 4 What are Universal Coalgebras?

Rather than deal with concrete models, such as MDPs or PSRs, URL is formulated in terms of universal coalgebras [Rutten, 2000, Jacobs, 2016], a categorical language for specifying dynamical systems. At a high level, algebras *combine* entities, like  $1 + 1 = 2$ . On the other hand, coalgebras *expand* entities, and are invaluable in describing the behavior of automata, grammars, and programs that generate infinite data streams. A standard example that is often used to illustrate coalgebras, and provides a foundation for many AI and ML applications, is that of a *labeled transition system*.

**Definition 4.** A **labeled transition system (LTS)**  $(S, \rightarrow_S, A)$  is defined by a set  $S$  of states, a transition relation  $\rightarrow_S \subseteq S \times A \times S$ , and a set  $A$  of labels (or equivalently, “inputs” or “actions”). We can define the transition from state  $s$  to  $s'$  under input  $a$  by the transition diagram  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ , which is equivalent to writing  $\langle s, a, s' \rangle \in \rightarrow_S$ . The  $\mathcal{F}$ -coalgebra for an LTS is defined by the functor

$$\mathcal{F}(X) = \mathcal{P}(A \times X) = \{V \mid V \subseteq A \times X\}$$

We can also define a category of  $F$ -coalgebras over any category  $C$ , where each object is a coalgebra, and the morphism between two coalgebras is defined as follows, where  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is any morphism in the category  $C$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $F : C \rightarrow C$  be an endofunctor. A homomorphism of  $F$ -coalgebras  $(A, \alpha)$  and  $(B, \beta)$  is an arrow  $f : A \rightarrow B$  in the category  $C$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta \\ F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(B) \end{array}$$

For example, consider two labeled transition systems  $(S, A, \rightarrow_S)$  and  $(T, A, \rightarrow_T)$  over the same input set  $A$ , which are defined by the coalgebras  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$ , respectively. An  $F$ -homomorphism  $f : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  is a function  $f : S \rightarrow T$  such that  $F(f) \circ \alpha_S = \alpha_T \circ f$ . Intuitively, the meaning of a homomorphism between two labeled transition systems means that:

- For all  $s' \in S$ , for any transition  $s \xrightarrow{a}_S s'$  in the first system  $(S, \alpha_S)$ , there must be a corresponding transition in the second system  $f(s) \xrightarrow{a}_T f(s')$  in the second system.
- Conversely, for all  $t \in T$ , for any transition  $t \xrightarrow{a}_T t'$  in the second system, there exists two states  $s, s' \in S$  such that  $f(s) = t, f(s') = t'$  such that  $s \xrightarrow{a}_S s'$  in the first system.

If we have an  $F$ -homomorphism  $f : S \rightarrow T$  with an inverse  $f^{-1} : T \rightarrow S$  that is also a  $F$ -homomorphism, then the two systems  $S \simeq T$  are isomorphic. If the mapping  $f$  is *injective*, we have a *monomorphism*. Finally, if the mapping  $f$  is a surjection, we have an *epimorphism*. In the RL literature, there has been substantial interest in MDP “bisimulation” [Ravindran and Barto, 2003, Castro and Precup, 2010, Ruan et al., 2015], all of which are special cases of the more general notion of *bisimulation* in universal coalgebras. Intuitively, bisimulation allows us to construct a more “abstract” representation of a dynamical system that is still faithful to the original system. We will explore many applications of the concept of bisimulation to AI and ML systems in this paper. We introduce the concept in its general setting first, and then in the next section, we will delve into concrete examples of bisimulations.

**Definition 6.** Let  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  be two systems specified as coalgebras acting on the same category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Formally, a  **$F$ -bisimulation** for coalgebras defined on a set-valued functor  $F : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a relation  $R \subset S \times T$  of the Cartesian product of  $S$  and  $T$  is a mapping  $\alpha_R : R \rightarrow F(R)$  such that the projections of  $R$  to  $S$  and  $T$  form valid  $F$ -homomorphisms.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & S \\ \downarrow \alpha_R & & \downarrow \alpha_S \\ F(R) & \xrightarrow{F(\pi_1)} & F(S) \end{array}$$
  

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & T \\ \downarrow \alpha_R & & \downarrow \alpha_T \\ F(R) & \xrightarrow{F(\pi_2)} & F(T) \end{array}$$

Here,  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are projections of the relation  $R$  onto  $S$  and  $T$ , respectively. Note the relationships in the two commutative diagrams should hold simultaneously, so that we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\pi_1) \circ \alpha_R &= \alpha_S \circ \pi_1 \\ F(\pi_2) \circ \alpha_R &= \alpha_T \circ \pi_2 \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, these properties imply that we can “run” the joint system  $R$  for one step, and then project onto the component systems, which gives us the same effect as if we first project the joint system onto each component system, and then run the component systems. More concretely, for two labeled transition systems that were considered above as an example of an  $F$ -homomorphism, an  $F$ -bisimulation between  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  means that there exists a relation  $R \subset S \times T$  that satisfies for all  $\langle s, t \rangle \in R$

- For all  $s' \in S$ , for any transition  $s \xrightarrow{a}_S s'$  in the first system  $(S, \alpha_S)$ , there must be a corresponding transition in the second system  $f(s) \xrightarrow{a}_T f(s')$  in the second system, so that  $\langle s', t' \rangle \in R$
- Conversely, for all  $t \in T$ , for any transition  $t \xrightarrow{a}_T t'$  in the second system, there exists two states  $s, s' \in S$  such that  $f(s) = t, f(s') = t'$  such that  $s \xrightarrow{a}_S s'$  in the first system, and  $\langle s', t' \rangle \in R$ .

There are a number of basic properties about bisimulations, which we will not prove, but are useful to summarize here:

- If  $(R, \alpha_R)$  is a bisimulation between systems  $S$  and  $T$ , the inverse  $R^{-1}$  of  $R$  is a bisimulation between systems  $T$  and  $S$ .
- Two homomorphisms  $f : T \rightarrow S$  and  $g : T \rightarrow U$  with a common domain  $T$  define a *span*. The *image* of the span  $\langle f, g \rangle(T) = \{\langle f(t), g(t) \rangle | t \in T\}$  of  $f$  and  $g$  is also a bisimulation between  $S$  and  $U$ .
- The composition  $R \circ Q$  of two bisimulations  $R \subseteq S \times T$  and  $Q \subseteq T \times U$  is a bisimulation between  $S$  and  $U$ .
- The union  $\cup_k R_k$  of a family of bisimulations between  $S$  and  $T$  is also a bisimulation.
- The set of all bisimulations between systems  $S$  and  $T$  is a complete lattice, with least upper bounds and greatest lower bounds given by:

$$\bigvee_k R_k = \bigcup_k R_k$$

$$\bigwedge_k R_k = \bigcup \{R | R \text{ is a bisimulation between } S \text{ and } T \text{ and } R \subseteq \cap_k R_k\}$$

- The kernel  $K(f) = \{\langle s, s' \rangle | f(s) = f(s')\}$  of a homomorphism  $f : S \rightarrow T$  is a bisimulation equivalence.

#### 4.1 MDPs as Coalgebras

Feys et al. [2018] and Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] have previously explored coalgebraic formulations of MDPs and dynamic programming. The main difference with URL is our emphasis on solving universal coalgebras – meaning to find the final coalgebra – by stochastic sampling methods, rather than assuming the  $F$ -dynamics is fully known, as in their treatments. We refer the reader to their original papers for details of their particular approaches. We will review the basics of MDPs and RL in Section 6.

### 5 What is Coinduction?

As the term *coinduction* may be unfamiliar to many readers of this paper, we give a brief review of the literature on this topic [Rutten, 2000]. The earliest work in machine learning was the problem of *identification in the limit*, first studied by Gold [Gold, 1967] and Solomonoff [Solomonoff, 1964], and subsequently extended to the stochastic setting by Valiant [Valiant, 1984] and Vapnik [Vapnik, 1999]. Inductive inference is related to mathematical induction, which in the categorical setting, refers to *initial algebras over well-founded sets*. In contrast, *coinductive inference* arose originally in the study of non-well-founded sets Aczel [1988], and subsequently in universal coalgebras Jacobs [2016], Rutten [2000].

Coinductive inference provides a novel theoretical foundation for ML that is based on the conceptualization of non-well-founded sets in terms of accessible pointed graphs (APGs) Aczel [1988], a representation that uses graphs not sets. The original motivation was how to deal with infinite data streams or data structures in computer science. The term coinductive inference is based on *coinduction*, a proof principle, developed initially by Peter Aczel in his ground-breaking work on non-well-founded circular (or recursively defined) sets Aczel [1988]. Figure 2 illustrates the general framework of coinductive inference that is based on the theory of universal coalgebras. Comparing the framework for inductive inference presented above, the major difference is the use of AGPs or universal coalgebras as the formalism for describing the language used by the teacher to specify a particular model from which data is generated, and by the learner to produce a solution. Universal coalgebras provide a universal language for AI and ML in being able to describe a wide class of problems, ranging from causal inference, (non)deterministic and probabilistic finite state machines, game theory and reinforcement learning.

To take some concrete examples, let us begin with the standard problem of learning a deterministic finite state machine model. We can specify a finite state machine model as a *labeled transition system*  $(S, \rightarrow_S, A)$  consisting of a set  $S$  of states, a transition relation  $\rightarrow_S \subseteq S \times A \times S$ , where  $A$  is a set of input labels. Let us define a functor  $\mathcal{B}(X) = \mathcal{P}(A \times X) = \{V | V \subseteq A \times X \text{ for any set } X\}$ .  $\mathcal{B}$  is then an endofunctor on the category of sets, which specifies the transition dynamics of the finite state machine. We can then represent a labelled transition system as a universal coalgebra of the following type:

$$\alpha_S : S \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(S), \quad s \mapsto \{(a, s') | s \xrightarrow{a} s'\}$$

## CoInductive Inference: Co-Identification in the Limit




Figure 2: The coinductive inference framework for URL proposed in this paper models the process of machine learning as discovering a final coalgebra in the category of coalgebras. Rather than enumerating sets, as in inductive inference, representations of non-well-founded sets as accessible pointed graphs (APGs) or universal coalgebras are enumerated. Coidentification refers to the use of *bisimulation*, a fundamental relation used to compare two non-well-founded sets or universal coalgebras.

for some fixed set of input symbols  $A$ . The coinductive inference framework assumes the teacher selects a particular coalgebra specifying a finite state machine and generates a presentation of it for the learner. Upon receiving a sequence of examples, the learner produces a hypothesis coalgebra describing the finite state machine. The learner's ultimate goal can be succinctly summarized as discovering the final coalgebra that represents the minimal finite state machine model that is isomorphic to the coalgebra selected by the teacher.

### 5.1 Dynamic Programming and Metric Coinduction

It is commonplace in ML and RL to investigate successive approximation algorithms in *metric spaces*, where some notion of distance is available. A standard procedure for checking the convergence of dynamic programming and RL methods is to show that the Bellman operator  $T(V)$  is a *contraction* in some norm in Euclidean space [Bertsekas, 2005]. We discuss here the principle of *metric coinduction* [Kozen and Ruozzi, 2009], which introduced the idea of coinduction in metric spaces, as well as applied it to show the convergence of dynamic programming methods for solving MDPs. We will see later in Section 13 how to generalize this framework using the metric Yoneda Lemma [Bonsangue et al., 1998] to generalized metric spaces.

Let us consider a metric space  $(V, d)$ , and a function  $F : V \rightarrow V$  that is *contractive* in that for some  $0 \leq c < 1$  such that for all  $u, v \in V$ ,

$$d(F(u), F(v)) \leq c \cdot d(u, v)$$

A continuous function  $F$  is *eventually contractive* if  $F^n$  is contractive for some  $n \geq 1$ . Fixed points of contractive maps  $F$  can be found as the limit of a Cauchy sequence

$$u, F(u), F^2(u), \dots,$$

with a standard argument being that

$$d(F^{n+m}(u), F^n(u)) \leq c^n(1 - c^m)(1 - c)^{-1} \cdot d(F(u), u)$$

Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] introduce the following metric coinduction rule:

**Definition 7.** [Kozen and Ruozzi, 2009] **The Coinduction Rule:** *If  $\phi$  is a closed nonempty subset of a metric space  $V$ , and if  $F$  is an eventually contractive map on  $V$  that preserves  $\phi$ , then the unique fixed point  $u^*$  of  $F$  is in  $\phi$ .*

To understand further why this rule is an example of coinduction, one has to show a category of coalgebras and that this rule essentially equivalent to saying that a certain coalgebra is *final* in this category. An object in a category is *final* if there exists a unique arrow *into* it from every other object in the category. Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] show that this property is indeed a consequence of such a category of coalgebras, and we refer the reader to their paper for details. Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] apply the metric coinduction principle to many interesting problems, including the property that any irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain converges to the stationary distribution, a rather intricate proof in the usual inductive setting, but much simpler in the coinductive setting. They also show that in MDPs, stochastic policies do not perform better than deterministic strategies. However, Kozen and Ruozzi [2009] do not use coinduction to analyze the behavior of RL methods, which is the main topic of our paper. We can use metric coinduction to analyze the convergence of Algorithm 1, where the key difference is that there is no induction step! The box condition and the synchronous convergence condition are sufficient to show that the induced mapping in Algorithm 1 is eventually contractive in some (generalized) metric space.

It is also worth pointing out that the fundamental notion of a Cauchy sequence and a complete metric space are actually consequence of applying the famous Yoneda Lemma [MacLane, 1971] in a generalized metric space [Bonsangue et al., 1998]. We refer the reader to this paper for details, which are also discussed in our earlier work on universal imitation games [Mahadevan, 2021b]. We will return to this topic in Section 13.

## 5.2 Final Coalgebra Theorem

There is a large and rich literature on conditions under which a category of coalgebras has a final coalgebra. Aczel [1988] discusses this problem in the context of non-well-founded sets, which he models using a graph representation. Aczel and Mendler [1989] proves that every set-based functor on the category of classes has a final coalgebra. The key idea in coinduction is that one can exploits such general results to simplify the otherwise tedious proofs that are required to show convergence of successive approximation methods. Rutten [2005] analyzes the behavior of infinite data streams using coinduction. A wealth of additional examples are given in the book by Jacobs [2016] on coalgebra.

## 6 Introduction to RL

Most readers will not need a review of basic RL (e.g., see [Bertsekas, 2019] for a more detailed treatment), but we include a basic introduction to fix our notation. We will not get into more sophisticated proximal RL methods, such as in our previous work [Mahadevan et al., 2014], or methods for learning representation and control, such as our work on proto-value functions [Mahadevan, 2005].

The learning environment for sequential decision-making is generally modeled by the well-known *Markov Decision Process* [Puterman, 1990]  $M = (S, A, P, R, \gamma)$ , which is derived from a Markov chain.

**Definition 8.** (*Markov Chain*): *A Markov Chain is a stochastic process defined as  $M = (S, P)$ . At each time step  $t = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , the agent is in a state  $s_t \in S$ , and the state transition probability is given by the state transition kernel  $P : S \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\|P\|_\infty = 1$ , where  $P(s_t|s_{t-1})$  is the state-transition probability from state  $s_{t-1}$  at time step  $t - 1$  to the state  $s_t$  at time step  $s_t$ .*

As we will see in Section 1, Markov chains are a simple type of stochastic coalgebra defined by a functor  $\mathcal{D}$ , the distribution functor [Sokolova, 2011]. A Markov decision process (MDPs) is comprised of a set of states  $S$ , a set of (possibly state-dependent) actions  $A$  ( $A_s$ ), a dynamical system model comprised of the transition probabilities  $P_{ss'}^a$ , specifying the probability of transition to state  $s'$  from state  $s$  under action  $a$ , and a reward model  $R$ .

**Definition 9.** (*Markov Decision Process*) [Puterman, 1990]: *A Markov Decision Process is a tuple  $(S, A, P, R, \gamma)$  where  $S$  is a finite set of states,  $A$  is a finite set of actions,  $P : S \times A \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the transition kernel, where  $P(s, a, s')$  is the*

probability of transmission from state  $s$  to state  $s'$  given action  $a$ , and reward  $r : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is a reward function (or equivalently, a cost function),  $0 \leq \gamma < 1$  is a discount factor.

## 6.1 Basics of Reinforcement Learning

A policy  $\pi : S \rightarrow A$  is a deterministic (stochastic) mapping from states to actions.

**Definition 10.** (Policy): A deterministic stationary policy  $\pi : S \rightarrow A$  assigns an action to each state of the Markov decision process. A stochastic policy  $\pi : S \times A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ .

Value functions are used to compare and evaluate the performance of policies.

**Definition 11.** (Value Function): A value function w.r.t a policy  $\pi$  termed as  $V^\pi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  assigns each state the expected sum of discounted rewards (or equivalently, minimize the discounted sum of costs)

$$V^\pi = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^t \gamma^{i-1} r_i \right] \quad (2)$$

The goal of reinforcement learning is to find a (near-optimal) policy that maximizes the value function.  $V^\pi$  is a fixed-point of the Bellman equation:

$$V^\pi(s_t) = \mathbb{E} [r(s_t, \pi(s_t)) + \gamma V^\pi(s_{t+1})] \quad (3)$$

As we will see in URL, this fixed point can be seen as the final coalgebra of a category of coalgebras defined by the MDP. Equation (3) can be written in a concise form by introducing the Bellman operator  $T^\pi$  w.r.t a policy  $\pi$  and denoting the reward vector as  $R^\pi \in \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $R_i^\pi = \mathbb{E}[r(s_i, \pi(s_i))]$ .

$$V^\pi = T^\pi(V^\pi) = R^\pi + \gamma P^\pi V^\pi \quad (4)$$

Any optimal policy  $\pi^*$  defines the unique optimal value function  $V^*$  that satisfies the nonlinear system of equations:

$$V^*(s) = \max_a \sum_{s'} P_{ss'}^a (R_{ss'}^a + \gamma V^*(s')) \quad (5)$$

## 6.2 Action Value Function Approximation

The most popular and widely used RL method is temporal difference (TD) learning [Sutton and Barto, 1998]. TD learning is a stochastic approximation approach to solving Equation (5). The *state-action value*  $Q^*(s, a)$  represents a convenient reformulation of the value function, defined as the long-term value of performing  $a$  first, and then acting optimally according to  $V^*$ :

$$Q^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E} \left( r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s_{t+1}, a') \mid s_t = s, a_t = a \right) \quad (6)$$

where  $r_{t+1}$  is the actual reward received at the next time step, and  $s_{t+1}$  is the state resulting from executing action  $a$  in state  $s_t$ . The (optimal) action value formulation is convenient because it can be approximately solved by a temporal-difference (TD) learning technique called Q-learning Sutton and Barto [1998]. The simplest TD method, called TD(0), estimates the value function associated with the fixed policy using a normal stochastic gradient iteration, where  $\delta_t$  is called temporal difference error:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{t+1}(s_t) &= V_t(s_t) + \alpha_t \delta_t \\ \delta_t &= r_t + \gamma V_t(s_{t+1}) - V_t(s_t) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

TD(0) converges to the optimal value function  $V^\pi$  for policy  $\pi$  as long as the samples are “on-policy”, namely following the stochastic Markov chain associated with the policy; and the learning rate  $\alpha_t$  is decayed according to the Robbins-Monro conditions in stochastic approximation theory:  $\sum_t \alpha_t = \infty$ ,  $\sum_t \alpha_t^2 < \infty$  Borkar [2008]. When the set of states  $S$  is large, it is often necessary to approximate the value function  $V$  using a set of handcrafted basis functions (e.g., polynomials, radial basis functions, wavelets etc.) or automatically generated basis functions Mahadevan et al. [2014]. In linear value function approximation, the value function



Figure 3: Two popular games easily solvable by RL can be modeled as categories.

is assumed to lie in the linear spanning space of the basis function matrix  $\Phi$  of dimension  $|S| \times d$ , where it is assumed that  $d \ll |S|$ . Hence,

$$V^\pi \approx V_\theta = \Phi\theta \tag{8}$$

The equivalent TD(0) algorithm for linear function approximated value functions is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{t+1} &= \theta_t + \alpha_t \delta_t \phi(s_t) \\ \delta_t &= r_t + \gamma \phi(s_{t+1})^T \theta_t - \phi(s_t)^T \theta_t \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

### 6.3 Proximal RL

In a previous paper [Mahadevan et al., 2014], we proposed a comprehensive theory of *proximal RL* in primal-dual spaces. We briefly summarize this work as an example of a more sophisticated framework that could be extended to URL, but which we will leave aside for now. Proximal RL addresses the following challenges: (i) how to design reliable, convergent, and robust reinforcement learning algorithms (ii) how to guarantee that reinforcement learning satisfies pre-specified “safely” guarantees, and remains in a stable region of the parameter space (iii) how to design “off-policy” temporal difference learning algorithms in a reliable and stable manner, and finally (iv) how to integrate the study of reinforcement learning into the rich theory of stochastic optimization. The most important idea that proximal RL uses is the notion of *primal dual spaces* connected through the use of a *Legendre* transform. This allows temporal difference updates to occur in dual spaces, allowing a variety of important technical advantages. The Legendre transform, elegantly generalizes past algorithms for solving reinforcement learning problems, such as *natural gradient* methods, which we show relate closely to the previously unconnected framework of *mirror descent* [Beck, 2003]. Equally importantly, proximal operator theory enables the systematic development of *operator splitting* methods that show how to safely and reliably decompose complex products of gradients that occur in recent variants of gradient-based temporal difference learning. This key technical innovation makes it possible to finally design “true” stochastic gradient methods for reinforcement learning. Finally, Legendre transforms enable a variety of other benefits, including modeling sparsity and domain geometry.

### 6.4 Categorical Function Approximation

Category theory provides powerful tools for approximating functions on categories, including ideas from algebraic topology [May, 1999]. We have explored these ideas in past work in categorical causality, such as the use of simplicial sets that construct “nice” CW-complexes in topology [Mahadevan, 2023]. As we said earlier in Section 1, we can construct general architectures in URL in terms of functor diagrams  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{J}$  is a finite category that specifies some set of abstract objects and their relationship that gets mapped into the actual RL category. As we will see in Section 10, deep RL itself corresponds precisely to such a functor diagram.

## 7 Categories for URL

To warm up before the main course begins, let us consider simple examples of how to define categories for (U)RL. Formally, a *category*  $\mathcal{C}$  is a collection of *objects*  $\text{ob}(\mathcal{C})$  and a collection of *arrows*  $\text{arr}(\mathcal{C})$ . Between each

pair of objects  $c, c' \in \mathcal{C}$ , we are given a collection of arrows  $\mathcal{C}(c, c')$ . Arrows compose in an intuitive way: the arrow  $f : c \rightarrow c'$  composes with the arrow  $g : c' \rightarrow d$ , which is written as  $g \circ f : c \rightarrow d$ . There is a privileged *identity* arrow associated with each object  $\text{id}_c : c \rightarrow c$ .

Figure 3 gives two examples of popular games easily solvable by RL, which can be modeled as categories. The Rubiks cube is an example of a category called a *groupoid* [May, 1999]: in such a category, every arrow is invertible. All the moves in Rubiks cube are of course invertible. Backgammon, one of the earliest successes of deep RL [Tesauro, 2002], can be modeled under a fixed (say random) policy as an absorbing Markov chain, and as such defines a stochastic coalgebra [Sokolova, 2011].

A *functor*  $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  consists of two functions: the *object* function maps each object  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  to the corresponding  $Fc \in \mathcal{D}$ ; the *arrow* function maps each arrow  $f \in \text{ar}(\mathcal{C})$  to the corresponding arrow  $Ff \in \text{ar}(\mathcal{D})$ . To illustrate functors, we can define a functor  $F : \mathcal{C}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_T$  from the Rubiks cube category, where each object is Rubiks cube state and arrows are moves, to a topological category  $\mathcal{C}_T$  where each object is an element of a topological space and arrows are paths that connect one point to another. Just as in the Rubiks cube, a topological space defines a groupoid under the connectivity relationship [May, 1999].

### 7.1 MDP or PSR homomorphisms define categories

Let us consider some further examples of categories for RL, to help build more intuition. A Markov decision process [Bertsekas, 2005, White and White, 1989, Puterman, 1990] is defined by a tuple  $\langle S, A, \Psi, P, R \rangle$ , where  $S$  is a discrete set of states,  $A$  is the discrete set of actions,  $\Psi \subset S \times A$  is the set of admissible state-action pairs,  $P : \Psi \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the transition probability function specifying the one-step dynamics of the model, where  $P(s, a, s')$  is the transition probability of moving from state  $s$  to state  $s'$  in one step under action  $a$ , and  $R : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the expected reward function, where  $R(s, a)$  is the expected reward for executing action  $a$  in state  $s$ .

Since Rubiks cube and Backgammon are highly simplified problems, not indicative of real-world problems like medical diagnosis, where internal body states are not directly perceivable, there has been much interest in partially observable MDPs. A predictive state representation (PSR), an example of a POMDP-type representation, is (in the simplest case) a discrete controlled dynamical system, characterized by a finite set of actions  $A$ , and observations  $O$ . At each clock tick  $t$ , the agent takes an action  $a_t$  and receives an observation  $o_t \in O$ . A *history* is defined as a sequence of actions and observations  $h = a_1 o_1 \dots a_k o_k$ . A *test* is a possible sequence of future actions and observations  $t = a_1 o_1 \dots a_n o_n$ . A test is successful if the observations  $o_1 \dots o_n$  are observed in that order, upon execution of actions  $a_1 \dots a_n$ . The probability  $P(t|h)$  is a prediction of that a test  $t$  will succeed from history  $h$ .

We can easily define categories, whose objects are MDPs or PSRs, by defining the arrows of these categories to be the respective homomorphisms. We can define a category MDP homomorphisms [Ravindran and Barto, 2003, Rezaei-Shoshtari et al., 2022] or predictive state representation (PSR) homomorphisms [Soni and Singh, 2007]. These are actually categories in disguise, although they have so far not been viewed as such. Let us walk through the main ideas in category theory using the MDP or PSR homomorphism example.

MDP homomorphisms can be viewed as a principled way of abstracting the state (action) set of an MDP into a "simpler" MDP that nonetheless preserves some important properties, usually referred to as the stochastic substitution property (SSP). This is a special instance of the general bisimulation property that holds among coalgebras, which we defined above.

**Definition 12.** An MDP homomorphism Ravindran and Barto [2003] from object  $M = \langle S, A, \Psi, P, R \rangle$  to  $M' = \langle S', A', \Psi', P', R' \rangle$ , denoted  $h : M \rightarrow M'$ , is defined by a tuple of surjections  $\langle f, \{g_s | s \in S\} \rangle$ , where  $f : S \rightarrow S'$ ,  $g_s : A_s \rightarrow A'_{f(s)}$ , where  $h((s, a)) = \langle f(s), g_s(a) \rangle$ , for  $s \in S$ , such that the stochastic substitution property and reward respecting properties below are respected:

$$P'(f(s), g_s(a), f(s')) = \sum_{s'' \in [s']_f} P(s, a, s'') \quad (10)$$

$$R'(f(s), g_s(a)) = R(s, a) \quad (11)$$

We can construct a commutative diagram to illustrate MDP homomorphisms. Such diagrams will be used extensively in Section 15 to illustrate properties of the topos of action-value functions. Intuitively, we can "simulate" the base MDP in the "abstract" MDP by either taking the abstraction step through the left  $f$  down arrow, and then "running" the abstract MDP for one step, or equivalently, running the base MDP for one step, and then abstracting the resultant state  $t$ . One can define an equivalent commutative diagram for the

reward-respecting abstractions, which should satisfy the equation  $R(\cdot, a) = R'(\cdot, a) \circ f$ . We can define such commutative diagrams in RL in terms of more advanced categorical constructions, such as (co)limits and (co)equalizers, which we will discuss in more detail in Section 15. Briefly, these constructions are formally *diagram* functors  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  from some finite category  $\mathcal{J}$  into the category of choice  $\mathcal{C}$ . One can show that, for instance, the category  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  of action-value  $Q$ -functions is a *topos* [Mac Lane and Moerdijk, 1992], which means it has all (co)limits. These properties will play a significant role in URL.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} s & \xrightarrow{P(\cdot, a)} & t \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\ s' & \xrightarrow{P'(\cdot, a)} & t' \end{array}$$

Given this definition, the following result is straightforward to prove.

**Theorem 2.** *The category  $\mathcal{C}_{MDP}$  is defined as one where each object  $\mathcal{M}$  is defined by an MDP, and the arrows are given by MDP homomorphisms as defined in Definition 12.*

**Proof:** Note that the composition of two MDP homomorphisms  $h : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  and  $h' : M_2 \rightarrow M_3$  is once again an MDP homomorphism  $h' \circ h : M_1 \rightarrow M_3$ . The identity homomorphism is easy to define, and MDP homomorphisms, being surjective mappings, obey associative properties.  $\square$

Similarly, we now define the category  $\mathcal{C}_{PSR}$  of predictive state representations [Singh et al., 2004], based on the notion of homomorphism defined for PSRs proposed in [Soni and Singh, 2007]. Note how the PSR straightforwardly generalizes the notion of a diversity-based representation that we explored above for the deterministic finite state environments to the stochastic setting.

A state  $\psi$  in a PSR is a vector of predictions of a suite of *core tests*  $\{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ . The prediction vector  $\psi_h = \langle P(q_1|h) \dots P(q_k|h) \rangle$  is a sufficient statistic, in that it can be used to make predictions for any test. More precisely, for every test  $t$ , there is a  $1 \times k$  projection vector  $m_t$  such that  $P(t|h) = \psi_h \cdot m_t$  for all histories  $h$ . The entire predictive state of a PSR can be denoted  $\Psi$ .

**Definition 13.** *The category  $\mathcal{C}_{PSR}$  defined by PSR objects, the morphism from object  $\Psi$  to another  $\Psi'$  is defined by a tuple of surjections  $\langle f, v_\psi(a) \rangle$ , where  $f : \Psi \rightarrow \Psi'$  and  $v_\psi : A \rightarrow A'$  for all prediction vectors  $\psi \in \Psi$  such that*

$$P(\psi' | f(\psi), v_\psi(a)) = P(f^{-1}(\psi') | \psi, a) \quad (12)$$

for all  $\psi' \in \Psi', \psi \in \Psi, a \in A$ .

**Theorem 3.** *The category  $\mathcal{C}_{PSR}$  is defined by making each object  $c$  represent a PSR, where the morphisms between two PSRs  $h : c \rightarrow d$  is defined by the PSR homomorphism defined in Soni and Singh [2007].*

**Proof:** Once again, given the homomorphism definition in Definition 13, the UDM category  $\mathcal{P}_{PSR}$  is easy to define, given the surjectivity of the associated mappings  $f$  and  $v_\psi$ .  $\square$

For other examples of categories for decision making, we refer the reader to our previous paper on universal decision models [Mahadevan, 2021a].

## 7.2 Category $\mathcal{C}_Q$ of Action-Value Functions

One particularly simple example is worth highlighting as we will use it below to explain the concept of a topos, and to illustrate universal constructions in URL.

**Definition 14.** *The category  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  of action-value functions is defined as the following category:*

- The objects  $\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}_Q)$  are defined as  $Q$ -functions  $f, g$ , each mapping the state action set  $S \times A, S' \times A'$  in an MDP (or PSR etc. into real numbers  $f(s, a), f'(s', a') \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $s \in S, s' \in S'$ .
- The arrows of the category  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  are defined as commutative diagrams of the type shown above (which compose horizontally by adding boxes).

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
S \times A & \xrightarrow{h} & S' \times A' \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\
\mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{g} & \mathbb{R}
\end{array}$$

In the above diagram, the value functions  $f, f'$  correspond to some MDPs, and  $g, h$  are mappings between their corresponding states or values that make the diagram commute.

### 7.3 Functor Categories and Yoneda Embeddings

We now define a novel characterization of isomorphism in MDPs or PSRs using functor categories, in particular, Yoneda embeddings that arise from the application of the Yoneda Lemma [MacLane, 1971]. Given two functors  $F, G : C \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ , the *natural transformation*  $\eta : F \Rightarrow G$  consists of a collection of arrows  $\alpha_c : Fc \rightarrow Gc$  in category  $\mathcal{D}$  such that the commutative diagram below composes (meaning  $Gf \circ \alpha_c = \alpha_{c'} \circ Ff$ ):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Fc & \xrightarrow{\alpha_c} & Gc \\
Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow Gf \\
Fc' & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{c'}} & Gc'
\end{array}$$

We can interpret each arrow  $Ff$  or  $Gf$  in terms of an MDP or PSR homomorphism, for the category  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ . This interpretation will take on additional meaning once we introduce the universal constructions, such as (co)limits.

**Definition 15.** A functor category  $C^{\mathcal{D}}$  is defined as the category where every object is a functor  $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow C$ , and whose arrows are natural transformations between two functors  $F$  and  $G$  as illustrated above.

One particular functor category of great significance for URL is the category of covariant (contravariant) set-valued functors  $\mathbf{Set}^C$  ( $\mathbf{Set}^{C^{op}}$ ), respectively, where each object is a covariant (contravariant)  $F : C \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  ( $F : C^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ ). This functor category plays a key role in the celebrated Yoneda Lemma [MacLane, 1971, Yoneda, 1960], which shows that objects in a category can be defined completely (up to isomorphism) purely from their interactions with other objects. We can use the Yoneda Lemma to give a new definition of isomorphism in MDPs and PSRs, and other dynamical system models in URL.

In particular, the categories  $C_{MDP}$  and  $C_{PSR}$  can be “faithfully” embedded in the category of sets, denoted  $\mathbf{Sets}$ , using the Yoneda embedding  $c \rightarrow C(c, \cdot) : C \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}^C$  (referred to as the *covariant embedding*):

**Lemma 1. Yoneda lemma:** For any functor  $F : C \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , whose domain category  $C$  is “locally small” (meaning that the collection of morphisms between each pair of objects forms a set), any object  $c$  in  $C$ , there is a bijection  $\text{Hom}(C(c, -), F) \simeq Fc$  that defines a natural transformation  $\alpha : C(c, -) \Rightarrow F$  to the element  $\alpha_c(1_c) \in Fc$ . This correspondence is natural in both  $c$  and  $F$ .

To give the complete characterization of MDPs and PSRs in terms of Yoneda embeddings, we can use the following definition:

**Definition 16.** The covariant Yoneda embedding of an MDP is defined as the set-valued functor  $F_{MDP} : C_{MDP} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , where any given MDP  $\mathcal{M}$  is mapped into the set of MDP homomorphisms going out of it, namely  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow C_{MDP}(\mathcal{M}, -)$ . The contravariant Yoneda embedding of an MDP is defined as the set-valued functor  $F_{MDP}^{op} : C_{MDP}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , where any given MDP  $\mathcal{M}$  is mapped into the set of MDP homomorphisms going into it, namely  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow C_{MDP}(-, \mathcal{M})$ .

Similarly, we can define contravariant and covariant Yoneda embeddings of PSRs as well.

**Definition 17.** The covariant Yoneda embedding of a PSR is defined as the set-valued functor  $F_{MDP} : C_{PSR} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , where any given PSR  $\Psi$  is mapped into the set of PSR homomorphisms going out of it, namely  $\Psi \rightarrow C_{PSR}(\Psi, -)$ . The contravariant Yoneda embedding of a PSR is defined as the set-valued functor  $F_{PSR}^{op} : C_{PSR}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , where any given PSR  $\Psi$  is mapped into the set of PSR homomorphisms going into it, namely  $\Psi \rightarrow C_{MDP}(-, \Psi)$ .

## 8 Exact Solution Methods for MDPs as Functor Categories

We now show that exact solution methods for solving MDPs, such as value iteration and policy iteration, as well as simulation-based methods, such as Monte-Carlo methods and TD-learning, can be viewed as functors mapping from the category  $\mathcal{C}_{MDP}$  to the category  $\mathcal{C}_V$  of value functions.

### 8.1 Value Iteration as a Coalgebra

One way to solve an MDP is to construct the optimal value function  $V^*$ , or action value function  $Q^*(s, a)$ . Since these functions are the fixed points of operators, which are final coalgebras, a natural strategy is to find the fixed point by successive approximation. The value iteration algorithm computes the next approximation  $V^{t+1}$  by iteratively “backing up” the current approximation:

$$V^{t+1}(s) = T^*(V^t)(s) = \max_a \left( R_{sa} + \gamma \sum_{s'} P_{ss'}^a V^t(s') \right) \quad (13)$$

Note how  $T^*(V) = V$  is essentially a coalgebraic equation, specified by a functor  $T^*$  that gives the  $T^*$  dynamics of this coalgebra. The value iteration algorithm can be terminated when the difference between successive approximations is less than some tolerance parameter, that is  $\|V^{t+1} - V^t\| \leq \epsilon$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the “norm” or “length” of a function. It can be shown that the operator  $T^*$  is a *contraction* in a Hilbert space, and hence the algorithm will asymptotically converge Bertsekas [2019].<sup>2</sup> A similar procedure can be used to compute the optimal action value function  $Q^*(s, a)$ . A drawback of value iteration is that its convergence can be slow for  $\gamma$  near 1. Also, at each step, it is necessary to “backup” values over the entire state space. This problem has been addressed by a number of approaches: algorithms such as *real-time dynamic programming* (RTDP) and “simulation-based” reinforcement learning methods back up values over only a set of sample transitions Bertsekas [2019].

### 8.2 Policy Iteration as an Adjoint Functor

**Algorithm 2:** The Policy Iteration Algorithm is a Functor  $F_{PI} : \mathcal{C}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_V$ .

Set  $\pi$  to some random initial policy.

1: **repeat**

2: Solve the “Bellman” linear system of equations to determine  $V^\pi$

$$(I - \gamma P^\pi)V^\pi = R^\pi$$

3: Find the “greedy” policy  $\pi'$  associated with  $V^\pi$ :

$$\pi'(s) \in \operatorname{argmax}_a \left( \sum_{s'} P_{ss'}^a (R_{ss'}^a + \gamma V(s')) \right)$$

4: **if**  $\pi' \neq \pi$  **then**

5: Set  $\pi \leftarrow \pi'$  and return to Step 2.

6: **else**

7: Set **done**  $\leftarrow$  **true**.

8: **end if**

9: **until done**.

Return  $\pi$  as the optimal discounted policy for MDP  $M$ .

In terms of the Figure 1, we can view policy iteration as a *adjoint* pair of functions, one that maps from a policy  $\pi$  to its associated value function  $V^\pi$ , and then another functor that maps from a value function  $V^\pi$  back to the greedy policy  $\pi'$  associated with  $V^\pi$ .

The *policy iteration* algorithm was introduced by Howard Howard [1960]. In this procedure, at each iteration, the decision maker “evaluates” a specific policy  $\pi$ , finding its associated value function  $V^\pi$ . Then, the

<sup>2</sup>Intuitively, this property implies that at each iteration, the “distance” between  $V^t$  and  $V^*$  shrinks, and hence asymptotically, the algorithm must converge.

associated “greedy” policy  $\pi'$  associated with  $V^\pi$  is computed, which deviates from  $\pi$  for one step by finding the action that maximizes the one-step reward and then follows  $\pi$  subsequently. Howard proved that if  $\pi$  is not the optimal policy, then the greedy policy associated with  $V^\pi$  must improve on  $\pi$ . As described here, the policy iteration algorithm assumes that value functions (and other functions such as rewards, transition models, and policies) can be stored exactly, using a “table lookup” representation.

### 8.3 Linear Programming for MDPs as a Functor

A third approach to exactly solving MDPs is based on *linear programming* Nazareth and Kulkarni [1986]. The variables for the linear program are the values  $V(i)$ . The exact formulation is given below:

**Definition 18.** *The linear program required to solve an MDP  $M$  is given as*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Variables} & : V(1), \dots, V(n) \\ \text{Minimize} & : \sum_s \alpha_s V(s) \\ \text{Subject to} & : V(s) \geq \sum_{s'} P_{ss'}^a (R_{ss'}^a + \gamma V(s')), \quad \forall s \in S, a \in A, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha$  is a state relevance weight vector whose weights are all positive.

There is one constraint for each state  $s$  and action  $a$ , thus leading to an intractable set of constraints in problems with an exponential state space.

## 9 Simulation-based and Reinforcement Learning Methods as Functors

We now turn to briefly describe a class of approximation methods for solving MDPs, which retain the restriction of representing functions exactly, but require only sample transitions  $(s_t, a_t, r_t, s'_t)$  instead of true knowledge of the MDP. Such methods can be generically referred to as *simulation-based* methods, and are the topic of much study in various areas, including *approximate dynamic programming* Bertsekas [2019] and *reinforcement learning* Sutton and Barto [1998]. Two classes of methods will be described: Monte-Carlo methods, which approximate the exact return  $V^\pi$  by summing the actual returns, and *temporal-difference learning* methods, which can be viewed as a biased version of Monte-Carlo methods.

### 9.1 Monte-Carlo Methods as Functors

Monte-Carlo methods have long been studied in a variety of fields, and there is a well-developed statistical theory underlying them. Monte-Carlo methods for solving MDPs are based on the simple idea that the value of a particular state  $V^\pi(s)$  associated with a particular policy  $\pi$  can be empirically determined by “simulating” the policy  $\pi$  on a given MDP  $M$ , and averaging the sum of rewards received. Monte-Carlo methods are simple to implement. As a statistical procedure, they have the attractive property of being *unbiased* estimators of the true value. Unfortunately, their variance can be high. A more detailed discussion of Monte-Carlo methods for MDPs is given in Bertsekas [2019], Sutton and Barto [1998]. Note that we can represent Monte-Carlo evaluation of a policy  $\pi$  as a functor from the category  $C_{MDP}$  of MDPs into the category  $C_V$  of value functions.

### 9.2 Temporal-Difference Learning as a Functor

Temporal-difference learning (TD) methods Sutton and Barto [1998] exploit the property that the value of a state  $V^\pi(s)$  can be estimated as the sum of the immediate reward received,  $r_t$ , and a *biased* estimate of the value at the next state. If we think of TD-learning as a sample-based variant of value iteration, then it follows straightforwardly that it can be modeled as a coalgebra or endofunctor on the category of value functions  $C_V$ . In other words, given some guess of a current value function  $\hat{V}$ , which is an object in  $C_V$ , an update step of TD simply returns a revised value function  $\hat{V}'$ . The simplest TD(0) algorithm can be written as:

$$\hat{V}_{t+1}^\pi(s) \leftarrow (1 - \alpha_t) \hat{V}_t^\pi(s) + \alpha_t (r_t + \hat{V}_t^\pi(s)) \quad (14)$$

Here,  $\alpha_t \in (0, 1)$  is a time-varying “learning rate” that averages the estimate over multiple samples. As in the Monte-Carlo procedure, the TD(0) algorithm also only requires a simulation of an MDP, and asynchronously

**Algorithm 3:** Monte Carlo evaluation as a functor  $F_M : \mathcal{C}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_V$ .

```

Given an MDP  $\mathcal{M}$  and a policy  $\pi$  for drawing samples from  $\mathcal{M}$ .
for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
  Set the step counter  $t = 0$ , initial state  $s_t = s$ , and  $\hat{V}_i = 0$ .
  Set the action  $a = \pi(s_t)$ , and "execute" action  $a$ .
  Let the sample reward received be  $r_t$ . Set  $t \leftarrow t + 1$ .
  Set  $\hat{V}_i = \hat{V}_i + r_t$ .
  if terminated then
    Set  $\hat{V}_i = \frac{1}{t} \hat{V}_i$ .
  end if
end for
Return  $\hat{V}^\pi(s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{V}_i$ .

```

evaluates the value of states in an MDP over sampled trajectories. Readers familiar with the theory of stochastic approximation Kushner and Yin [2003] may recognize the TD update rule given above as similar to the *Robbins-Munro* method of finding the roots of a function. Indeed, a rigorous convergence analysis of TD learning has been made drawing on the theory of stochastic approximation Borkar [2008]. A TD-based method for learning action values called Q-learning was introduced by Waktins, whose convergence was analyzed by Tsitsiklis [1993]. Q-learning estimates the optimal action value function using the following learning rule:

$$Q_t(s, a) \leftarrow (1 - \alpha_t)Q_t(s, a) + \alpha_t(r_t + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_t(s', a')) \tag{15}$$

Q-learning is sometimes referred to as an "off-policy" learning algorithm since it estimates the optimal action value function  $Q^*(s, a)$ , while simulating the MDP using any policy, such as a random walk. In practice, a greedy policy is used that picks actions at each state with the highest  $Q(x, a)$ , occasionally choosing random actions to ensure sufficient exploration.

## 10 Deep RL as Diagrams over Coalgebras

Getting back to our earlier remark that in URL, architectures are specified as functor diagrams  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , we can concretize this view with the example of deep RL. We now show how we can model deep RL as a functor diagram, which can be seen as a variant of the general functorial characterization of backpropagation [Fong et al., 2019]. Our principal goal in this section to extend the categorical framework for deep learning proposed in Fong et al. [2019] to model deep RL. We first introduce a brief review of symmetric monoidal categories, where objects and arrows can be "multiplied" as a tensor product. Diagrammatically, these refer to running processes in parallel to compute outputs. This interpretation will be of value when we discuss asynchronous computation in URL.

### 10.1 Symmetric Monoidal Categories

We assume the reader understands the basics of symmetric monoidal categories, which we briefly review below (see Figure 4). Good introductions are available in a number of textbooks MacLane [1971], Richter [2020]. A brief introduction to some basic category theory suitable for causal inference is in my previous paper Mahadevan [2023]. Detailed overviews of symmetric monoidal categories appear in many books, and our definitions are based on Richter [2020].

**Definition 19.** A **monoidal category** is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  together with a functor  $\otimes : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , an identity object  $e$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  and natural isomorphisms  $\alpha, \lambda, \rho$  defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{C_1, C_2, C_3} : C_1 \otimes (C_2 \otimes C_3) &\cong (C_1 \otimes C_2) \otimes C_3, \text{ for all objects } C_1, C_2, C_3 \\
\lambda_C : e \otimes C &\cong C, \text{ for all objects } C \\
\rho : C \otimes e &\cong C, \text{ for all objects } C
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 4: Structure of monoidal categories.

The natural isomorphisms must satisfy coherence conditions called the “pentagon” and “triangle” diagrams MacLane [1971]. An important result shown in MacLane [1971] is that these coherence conditions guarantee that all well-formed diagrams must commute.

There are many natural examples of monoidal categories, the simplest one being the category of finite sets, termed **FinSet** in Fritz [2020], where each object  $C$  is a set, and the tensor product  $\otimes$  is the Cartesian product of sets, with functions acting as arrows. Deterministic causal models can be formulated in the category **FinSet**. Other examples include the category of sets with relations as morphisms, and the category of Hilbert spaces Heunen and Vicary [2019]. The category **FinSet** has other properties, principally that the  $\otimes$  is actually a product (in that it satisfies the universal property of products in categories, and is formally a limit). Not all monoidal categories satisfy this property. Sets are also Cartesian closed categories, meaning that there is a right adjoint to the tensor product, which represents exponential objects, and is often referred to as the “internal hom” object. Markov categories are monoidal categories, where the identity element  $e$  is also a terminal object, meaning there is a unique “delete” morphism  $d_e : X \rightarrow e$  associated with each object  $X$ . This property can be used to show that projections of tensor products  $X \otimes Y$  exist, but they do not satisfy the universal property. Markov categories do not satisfy uniform copying.

**Definition 20.** A **symmetric monoidal category** is a monoidal category  $(C, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda, \rho)$  together with a natural isomorphism

$$\tau_{C_1, C_2} : C_1 \otimes C_2 \cong C_2 \otimes C_1, \text{ for all objects } C_1, C_2$$

where  $\tau$  satisfies the additional conditions: for all objects  $C_1, C_2$   $\tau_{C_2, C_1} \circ \tau_{C_1, C_2} \cong 1_{C_1 \otimes C_2}$ , and for all objects  $C$ ,  $\rho_C = \lambda_C \circ \tau_{C, e} : C \otimes e \cong C$ .

An additional hexagon axiom is required to ensure that the  $\tau$  natural isomorphism is compatible with  $\alpha$ . The  $\tau$  operator is called a “swap” in Markov categories Fritz [2020].

## 10.2 Category of Compositional Reinforcement Learners

Fong et al. [2019] give an elegant characterization of the well-known backpropagation algorithm that serves as the “workhorse” of deep learning as a functor over symmetric monoidal categories. In such categories, objects can be “multiplied”: for example, sets form a symmetric monoidal category as the Cartesian product of two sets defines a multiplication operator. A detailed set of coherence axioms are defined for monoidal categories (see MacLane [1971] for details), which we will not go through, but they ensure that multiplication is associative, as well as that there are identity operators such that  $I \otimes A \simeq A$  for all objects  $A$ , where  $I$  is the identity object.

**Definition 21.** Fong et al. [2019] The symmetric monoidal category **Learn** is defined as a collection of objects that define sets, and a collection of an equivalence class of learners. Each learner is defined by the following 4-tuple (see Figure 5).

- A parameter space  $P$  that defines the representable policies.
- An implementation function  $I : P \times A \rightarrow B$  that computes the (action)value function.




Figure 5: A Reinforcement Learner in the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Learn}$  is defined as a morphism.

- An update function  $U : P \times A \times B \rightarrow P$  that updates the policy parameters (or action-value parameters).
- A request function  $r : P \times A \times B \rightarrow A$  (which can be seen as the TD backup step).

Note that it is the request function that allows learners to be composed, as each request function transmits information back upstream to earlier learners what output they could have produced that would be more “desirable”. This is exactly analogous to the TD backup procedure studied in [Bertsekas, 2019, Sutton and Barto, 1998]. This algebraic characterization of the backpropagation algorithm clarifies its essentially compositional nature

Two reinforcement learners  $(P, I, U, R)$  and  $(P', I', U', r')$  are equivalent if there is a bijection  $f : P \rightarrow P'$  such that the following identities hold for each  $p \in P, a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ .

- $I'(f(p), a) = I(p, a)$ .
- $U'(f(p), a, b) = f(U(p, a, b))$ .
- $r'(f(p), a, b) = r(p, a, b)$

Typically, in deep RL trained with neural networks, the parameter space  $P = \mathbb{R}^N$  where the neural network has  $N$  parameters. The implementation function  $I$  represents the “feedforward” component, and the request function represents the “backpropagation” component. The update function represents the change in parameters as a result of processing a training example  $(a, f(a)) \in A \times B$ , which corresponds to the TD procedure described previously in Section 6.

Each reinforcement learner can be combined in sequentially and in parallel (see Figure 6), both formally using the operations of composition  $\circ$  and tensor product  $\otimes$  in the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Learn}$ , and equivalently in terms of string diagrams. For clarity, let us write out the compositional rule for a pair of learners

$$A \xrightarrow{(P, I, U, r)} B \xrightarrow{(Q, J, V, s)} C$$

The composite learner  $A \rightarrow C$  is defined as  $(P \times Q, I \cdot J, U \cdot V, r \cdot s)$ , where the composite implementation function is

$$(I \cdot J)(p, q, a) := J(q, I(p, a))$$

and the composite update function is

$$U \cdot V(p, q, a, c) := (U(p, a, s(q, I(p, a), c)), V(q, I(p, a), c))$$

and the composite request function is

$$(r \cdot s)(p, q, a, c) := r(p, a, s(q, I(p, a), c)).$$




Figure 6: Sequential and parallel composition of two reinforcement learners in the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Learn}$ .

### 10.3 Backpropagation as a Functor

We can define the backpropagation procedure as a functor that maps from the category  $\text{Para}$  to the category  $\text{Learn}$ . Functors can be viewed as a generalization of the notion of morphisms across algebraic structures, such as groups, vector spaces, and graphs. Functors do more than functions: they not only map objects to objects, but like graph homomorphisms, they need to also map each morphism in the domain category to a corresponding morphism in the co-domain category. Functors come in two varieties, as defined below. The Yoneda Lemma, in its most basic form, asserts that any set-valued functor  $F : C \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$  can be universally represented by a *representable functor*  $C(-, x) : C^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ .

The *functoriality* axioms dictate how functors have to behave:

- For any composable pair  $f, g$  in category  $C$ ,  $Fg \cdot Ff = F(g \cdot f)$ .
- For each object  $c$  in  $C$ ,  $F(1_c) = 1_{F_c}$ .

Note that the category  $\text{Learn}$  is ambivalent as to what particular learning method is used. To define a particular learning method, such as backpropagation, we can define a category whose objects define the parameters of the particular learning method, and then another category for the learning method itself. We

can define a functor from the category  $\mathbf{NNet}$  to the category  $\mathbf{Learn}$  that factors through the category  $\mathbf{Param}$ . Later in the next section, we show how to generalize this construction to simplicial sets.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{NNet} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{Learn} \\ & \searrow F & \nearrow L_{\epsilon, e} \\ & \mathbf{Param} & \end{array}$$

**Definition 22.** *Fong et al. [2019]* The category  $\mathbf{Param}$  defines a strict symmetric monoidal category whose objects are Euclidean spaces, and whose morphisms  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are equivalence classes of differential parameterized functions. In particular,  $(P, I)$  defines a Euclidean space  $P$  and  $I : P \times A \rightarrow B$  defines a differentiable parameterized function  $A \rightarrow B$ . Two such pairs  $(P, I), (P', I')$  are considered equivalent if there is a differentiable bijection  $f : P \rightarrow P'$  such that for all  $p \in P$ , and  $a \in A$ , we have that  $I'(f(p), a) = I(p, a)$ . The composition of  $(P, I) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $(Q, J) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is given as

$$(P \times Q, I \cdot J) \text{ where } (I \cdot J)(p, q, a) = J(q, I(p, a))$$

The monoidal product of objects  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}^m$  is the object  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , whereas the monoidal product of morphisms  $(P, I) : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $(Q, J) : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  is given as  $(P \times Q, I \parallel J)$ , where

$$(I \parallel J)(p, q, a, c) = (I(p, a), J(q, c))$$

Symmetric monoidal categories can also be braided. In this case, the braiding  $\mathbb{R}^m \parallel \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \parallel \mathbb{R}^m$  is given as  $(\mathbb{R}^0, \sigma)$  where  $\sigma(a, b) = (b, a)$ .

The backpropagation algorithm can itself be defined as a functor over symmetric monoidal categories

$$L_{\epsilon, e} : \mathbf{Param} \rightarrow \mathbf{Learn}$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a real number defining the learning rate for backpropagation, and  $e(x, y) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a differentiable error function such that  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial x}(x_0, -)$  is invertible for each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . This functor essentially defines an update procedure for each parameter in a compositional learner. In other words, the functor  $L_{\epsilon, e}$  defined by backpropagation sends each parameterized function  $I : P \times A \rightarrow B$  to the learner  $(P, I, U_I, r_I)$

$$U_I(p, a, b) := p - \epsilon \nabla_p E_I(p, a, b)$$

$$r_I(p, a, b) := f_a(\nabla_a E_I(p, a, b))$$

where  $E_I(p, a, b) := \sum_j e(I_j(p, a), b_j)$  and  $f_a$  is a component-wise application of the inverse to  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial x}(a_i, -)$  for each  $i$ . Here,  $e$  can be defined as the TD error in Q-learning.

Note that we can easily define functors that define other ways of doing parameterized updates, such as a stochastic approximation method Robbins and Monro [1951] that updates each parameter using only the (noisy) value of the function at the current value of the parameter, and uses a gradual decay of the learning parameters to “simulate” the process of taking gradients. These sort of stochastic approximation updates are now called “zeroth-order” optimization in the deep learning literature.

#### 10.4 Backpropagation as a Coalgebra

We describe deep RL now not just as a functor, but rather as an endofunctor that maps an object in a category  $\mathbf{Param}$  of parameters into a new object in the same category as a result of doing a gradient update. We can now formally define backpropagation as a coalgebra over the category  $\mathbf{Param}$  as follows. Recall that the category  $\mathbf{Param}$  defines a strict symmetric monoidal category whose objects are Euclidean spaces, and whose morphisms  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are equivalence classes of differential parameterized functions. To see why the backpropagation algorithm can be defined as an endofunctor over the symmetric monoidal category  $\mathbf{Param}$ , recall from the previous section that backpropagation was viewed as a functor from the category  $\mathbf{Param}$  to the category  $\mathbf{Learn}$ .

$$L_{\epsilon, \rho} : \text{Param} \rightarrow \text{Learn}$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a real number defining the learning rate for backpropagation, and  $e(x, y) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a differentiable error function such that  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial x}(x_0, -)$  is invertible for each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . This functor essentially defines an update procedure for each parameter in a compositional learner. In other words, the functor  $L_{\epsilon, \rho}$  defined by backpropagation sends each parameterized function  $I : P \times A \rightarrow B$  to the learner  $(P, I, U_I, r_I)$

$$U_I(p, a, b) := p - \epsilon \nabla_p E_I(p, a, b)$$

$$r_I(p, a, b) := f_a(\nabla_a E_I(p, a, b))$$

where  $E_I(p, a, b) := \sum_j e(I_j(p, a), b_j)$  and  $f_a$  is a component-wise application of the inverse to  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial x}(a_i, -)$  for each  $i$ .

But a simpler and we argue more elegant characterization of backpropagation is to view it as a coalgebra or dynamical system defined by an endofunctor on  $\text{Param}$ . Here, we view the inputs  $A$  and outputs  $B$  as the input "symbols" and output produced by a dynamical system. The actual process of updating the parameters need not be defined as "gradient descent", but it can involve any other functor (as we saw earlier, it could involve a stochastic approximation method Borkar [2008]). Our revised definition of backpropagation as an endofunctor follows. Note that this definition is generic, and applies to virtually any approach to building foundation models that updates each object to a new object in the category  $\text{Param}$  as a result of processing a data instance.

**Definition 23. Backpropagation** defines an  $F_B$ -coalgebra over the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Param}$ , specified by an endofunctor  $X \rightarrow F_B(X)$  defined as

$$F_B(X) = A \times B \times X$$

Note that in this definition, the endofunctor  $F_B$  takes an object  $X$  of  $\text{Param}$ , which is a set of network weights of a generative AI model, and produces a new set of weights, where  $A$  is the "input" symbol of the dynamical system and  $B$  is the output symbol.

## 10.5 Zeroth-Order Deep Learning using Stochastic Approximation

To illustrate how the broader coalgebraic definition of backpropagation is more useful than the previous definition in Fong et al. [2019], we describe a class of generative AI methods based on adapting stochastic approximation Robbins and Monro [1951] to deep learning, which are popularly referred to zeroth-order optimization Liu et al. [2009] (see Figure 7). A vast range of stochastic approximation methods have been explored in the literature (e.g., see Borkar [2008], Kushner and Yin [2003]). For example, in *random directions* stochastic approximation, each parameter is adjusted in a random direction by sampling from distribution, such as a multivariate normal, or a uniform distribution. Any of these zeroth-order stochastic approximation algorithms can itself be defined as a functor over symmetric monoidal categories

$$L_\epsilon^0 : \text{Param} \rightarrow \text{Learn}$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a real number defining a learning rate parameter that is gradually decayed. Notice now that the error of the approximation with respect to the target plays no role in the update process itself. backpropagation, and  $e(x, y) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a differentiable error function such that  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial x}(x_0, -)$  is invertible for each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The functor  $L_\epsilon^0$  defined by zeroth-order optimization sends each parameterized function  $I : P \times A \rightarrow B$  to the learner  $(P, I, U_I^0, r_I^0)$

$$U_I^0(p, a, b) := p - \epsilon I(p, a, b)$$

Here, the 1-point gradient estimate is approximated by the (noisy) sampled value, averaged over multiple steps using a decaying learning rate as required by the convergence theorems of stochastic approximation Robbins and Monro [1951], Kushner and Yin [2003]. The advantages of zeroth-order stochastic approximation methods are that it avoids computing gradients over a very large number of parameters (which for state of




Figure 7: Zeroth-order optimization methods for generative AI are based on stochastic approximation, and average noisy values of the function to approximate gradient steps. Such methods define probabilistic coalgebras Sokolova [2011].

the art generative AI models can be in the billions or trillions of parameters), and it potentially helps avoid local minima by stochastically moving around in a very high-dimensional space. The disadvantage is that it can be significantly slower than gradient-based methods for well-behaved (convex) functions.

We can easily extend our previous definition of backpropagation as a coalgebra to capture zeroth-order optimization methods which act like stochastic dynamical systems, where there is a distribution of possible “next” states that is produced as a result of doing stochastic approximation updates.

**Definition 24. Stochastic Backpropagation** defines an  $F_{SGD}$ -coalgebra over the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Param}$ , specified by an endofunctor  $X \rightarrow F_{SGD}B(X)$  defined as

$$F_{SGD}(X) = A \times B \times \mathcal{D}(X)$$

where  $F_{SGD}$  defines the variant of backpropagation defined by stochastic gradient descent, and  $\mathcal{D}$  is the distribution functor over  $X$  that defines a distribution over possible objects  $X$  in  $\text{Param}$ . There is a vast literature on stochastic coalgebras that can be defined in terms of such distribution functors. Sokolova [2011] contains an excellent review of this literature.

## 11 Universal Properties of Coalgebras

Category theory can be viewed as the study of *universal properties* [Riehl, 2017]. To illustrate this abstract idea in the setting of URL, we can build complex universal coalgebra systems out of simpler systems, focusing for now on  $F$ -coalgebras over the category of sets. All of the standard universal constructions in the category of sets straightforwardly carry over to universal coalgebras over sets.

- The *coproduct* (or sum) of two  $F$ -coalgebras  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  is defined as follows. Let  $i_S : S \rightarrow (S + T)$  and  $i_T : T \rightarrow (S + T)$  be the injections (or monomorphisms) of the sets  $S$  and  $T$ , respectively, into their coproduct (or disjoint union)  $S + T$ . From the universal property of coproducts, defined in the previous Section, it follows that there is a unique function  $\gamma : (S + T) \rightarrow F(S + T)$  such that  $i_S$  and  $i_T$  are both homomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{i_S} & S + T \\ \downarrow \alpha_S & & \downarrow \gamma \\ F(S) & \xrightarrow{F(i_S)} & F(S + T) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T & \xrightarrow{i_T} & S + T \\
\downarrow \alpha_T & & \downarrow \gamma \\
F(R) & \xrightarrow{F(i_T)} & F(T)
\end{array}$$

- To construct the *co-equalizer* of two homomorphisms  $f : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  and  $g : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$ , we need to define a system  $(U, \alpha_U)$  and a homomorphism  $h : (T, \alpha_T) \rightarrow (U, \alpha_U)$  such that  $h \circ f = h \circ g$ , and for every homomorphism  $h' : (T, \alpha_T) \rightarrow (U', \alpha_{U'})$  such that  $h' \circ f = h' \circ g$ , there exists a unique homomorphism  $l : (U, \alpha_U) \rightarrow (U', \alpha_{U'})$  with the property that  $h'$  factors uniquely as  $h' = l \circ h$ . Since  $f$  and  $g$  are by assumption set-valued functions  $f : S \rightarrow T$  and  $g : S \rightarrow T$ , we know that there exists a coequalizer  $h : T \rightarrow U$  in the category of sets (by the property that coequalizers exist in **Sets**). If we define  $F(h) \circ \alpha_T : T \rightarrow F(U)$ , then since

$$\begin{aligned}
F(h) \circ \alpha_T \circ f &= F(h) \circ F(f) \circ \alpha_S \\
&= F(h \circ f) \circ \alpha_S \\
&= F(h \circ g) \circ \alpha_S \\
&= F(h) \circ F(g) \circ \alpha_S \\
&= F(h) \circ \alpha_T \circ g
\end{aligned}$$

and given  $h : T \rightarrow U$  is a coequalizer, there must exist a unique function  $\alpha_U : U \rightarrow F(U)$  with the property we desire.

- There is a more general way to establish the existence of coproducts, coequalizers, pullbacks, and in general colimits by defining a *forgetful functor*  $U : \text{Set}_F \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , which sends a coalgebra system to its underlying set  $U(S, \alpha_S) = S$ , and sends the  $F$ -homomorphism  $f : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  to the underlying set-valued function  $f : S \rightarrow T$ . We can apply a general result on the creation of colimits as follows:

**Theorem 4.** *The forgetful functor  $U : \text{Set}_F \rightarrow \text{Set}$  creates colimits, which means that any type of colimit in  $\text{Set}_F$  exists, and can be obtained by constructing the colimit in  $\text{Set}$  and then defining for it in a unique way an  $F$ -transition dynamics.*

- For pullbacks and limits, the situation is a bit more subtle. If  $F : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  preserves pullbacks, then pullbacks in  $\text{Set}_F$  can be constructed as follows. Let  $f : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  and  $g : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  be homomorphisms. Define the pullback of  $f$  and  $g$  in  $\text{Set}$  as follows, and extend that to get a pullback of  $F(f)$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & S \\
\downarrow \pi_2 & & \downarrow f \\
U & \xrightarrow{g} & T
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(P) & \xrightarrow{F(\pi_1)} & F(S) \\
\downarrow F(\pi_2) & & \downarrow F(f) \\
F(U) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(T)
\end{array}$$

It can be shown that the pullback of two homomorphisms is a bisimulation even in the case that  $F$  only preserves *weak* pullbacks (recall that in defining the pullback universal construction, it was necessary to assert a uniqueness condition, which is weakened to an existence condition in weak pullbacks).

### 11.1 Lambek's Theorem and Final Coalgebras

Finally, we illustrate how category theory gives rise to a novel notion of state, which generalizes the ideas explored in RL thus far. The *final* coalgebras defined by a functor that represents a monotone function over the category defined by a preorder  $(S, \leq)$ , where  $S$  is a set and  $\leq$  is a relation that is reflexive and transitive. That is,  $a \leq a, \forall a \in S$ , and if  $a \leq b$ , and  $b \leq c$ , for  $a, b, c \in S$ , then  $a \leq c$ . Note that we can consider  $(S, \leq)$  as a category, where the objects are defined as the elements of  $S$  and if  $a \leq b$ , then there is a unique arrow  $a \rightarrow b$ .

Let us define a functor  $F$  on a preordered set  $(S, \leq)$  as any monotone mapping  $F : S \rightarrow S$ , so that if  $a \leq b$ , then  $F(a) \leq F(b)$ . Now, we can define an  $F$ -algebra as any *pre-fixed point*  $x \in S$  such that  $F(x) \leq x$ . Similarly, we can define any *post-fixed point* to be any  $x \in S$  such that  $x \leq F(x)$ . Finally, we can define the *final  $F$ -coalgebra* to be the *greatest post-fixed point*  $x \leq F(x)$ , and analogously, the *initial  $F$ -algebra* to be the least pre-fixed point of  $F$ .

In this section, we give a detailed overview of the concept of *final coalgebras* in the category of coalgebras parameterized by some endofunctor  $F$ . This fundamental notion plays a central role in the application of universal coalgebras to model a diverse range of AI and ML systems. Final coalgebras generalize the concept of (greatest) fixed points in many areas of application in AI, including causal inference, game theory and network economics, optimization, and reinforcement learning among others. The final coalgebra, simply put, is just the final object in the category of coalgebras. From the universal property of final objects, it follows that for any other object in the category, there must be a unique morphism to the final object. This simple property has significant consequences in applications of the coalgebraic formalism to AI and ML, as we will see throughout this paper.

An  $F$ -system  $(P, \pi)$  is termed **final** if for another  $F$ -system  $(S, \alpha_S)$ , there exists a unique homomorphism  $f_S : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (P, \pi)$ . That is,  $(P, \pi)$  is the terminal object in the category of coalgebras  $\text{Set}_F$  defined by some set-valued endofunctor  $F$ . Since the terminal object in a category is unique up to isomorphism, any two final systems must be isomorphic.

**Definition 25.** An  $F$ -coalgebra  $(A, \alpha)$  is a fixed point for  $F$ , written as  $A \simeq F(A)$  if  $\alpha$  is an isomorphism between  $A$  and  $F(A)$ . That is, not only does there exist an arrow  $A \rightarrow F(A)$  by virtue of the coalgebra  $\alpha$ , but there also exists its inverse  $\alpha^{-1} : F(A) \rightarrow A$  such that

$$\alpha \circ \alpha^{-1} = \text{id}_{F(A)} \text{ and } \alpha^{-1} \circ \alpha = \text{id}_A$$

The following lemma was shown by Lambek, and implies that the transition structure of a final coalgebra is an isomorphism.

**Theorem 5. Lambek:** A final  $F$ -coalgebra is a fixed point of the endofunctor  $F$ .

**Proof:** The proof is worth including in this paper, as it provides a classic example of the power of diagram chasing. Let  $(A, \alpha)$  be a final  $F$ -coalgebra. Since  $(F(A), F(\alpha))$  is also an  $F$ -coalgebra, there exists a unique morphism  $f : F(A) \rightarrow A$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ \downarrow F(\alpha) & & \downarrow \alpha \\ F(F(A)) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(A) \end{array}$$

However, by the property of finality, the only arrow from  $(A, \alpha)$  into itself is the identity. We know the following diagram also commutes, by virtue of the definition of coalgebra homomorphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & F(A) \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \alpha \\ F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(\alpha)} & F(F(A)) \end{array}$$

Combining the above two diagrams, it clearly follows that  $f \circ \alpha$  is the identity on object  $A$ , and it also follows that  $F(\alpha) \circ F(f)$  is the identity on  $F(A)$ . Therefore, it follows that:

$$\alpha \circ f = F(f) \circ F(\alpha) = F(f \circ \alpha) = F(\text{id}_A) = \text{id}_{F(A)} \quad \square$$

By reversing all the arrows in the above two commutative diagrams, we get the easy duality that the initial object in an  $F$ -algebra is also a fixed point.

**Theorem 6. Dual to Lambek:** The initial  $F$ -algebra  $(A, \alpha)$ , where  $\alpha : F(A) \rightarrow A$ , in the category of  $F$ -algebras is a fixed point of  $F$ .

The proof of the duality follows in the same way, based on the universal property that there is a unique morphism from the initial object in a category to any other object.

Lambek’s lemma has many implications in URL, one of which is that final coalgebras generalize the concept of a (greatest) fixed point used previously to characterize dynamic programming methods in MDPs [Bertsekas, 2005].

## 11.2 Asynchronous Distributed Computation in Universal Coalgebras

We can briefly summarize the main points of this paper by rephrasing Algorithm 1 in the general coalgebraic setting as shown below. The problem of minimization of a vector function  $F : X \rightarrow \bar{X}$  is generalized to finding a final coalgebra with a specified  $F$ -dynamics, where  $F$  is some functor in a symmetric monoidal category  $\mathcal{C}$  with tensor product  $\otimes$ .

### Algorithm 4: A Asynchronous Distributed Algorithm for Finding Final Coalgebras

**Input:** Given a functor diagram  $F : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a category of coalgebras  $\alpha_f = X \rightarrow f(X)$  that is (co)complete, meaning that it has categorical (co)products, (co)equalizers, and more generally has all finite (co)limits. This property ensures that any diagram  $F$  is “solvable” by finding its limit  $\lim_F \in \mathcal{C}$ . To concretize this abstraction, note that Algorithm 1 defined a product function  $F$ , which can be seen as the limit of the diagram  $\mathcal{J} = \bullet \bullet \cdots \bullet$ . For example, in Section 15, we showed the category  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  of action-value functions defines a topos, so that the coalgebras over  $\mathcal{C}_Q$  will in addition to having (co)limits, also have a subobject classifier and exponential objects as part of their diagrammatic vocabulary.

**Output:** A final coalgebra  $X^* \rightarrow F(X^*)$  such that  $X^* \cong F(X^*)$  (where  $\cong$  is the isomorphism in  $\mathcal{C}$ ).

1: **repeat**

2: At each time step  $t \in T$ , where  $T = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ , update some component coalgebra  $\alpha_{f_c} = X \rightarrow f_c(X)$  using an asynchronous distributed coalgebraic iteration, where  $c$  is an object in  $\mathcal{J}$ . Note that in Algorithm 1, each component function  $f_i$  corresponds to an object  $\bullet$  in the diagram  $\mathcal{J} = \bullet \bullet \cdots \bullet$ .

$$X_c \rightarrow f_c(X)$$

3: Each update of  $X$  is done in parallel by some “processor” whose “information field” is measurable (see Section 12). For example, in deep RL (Section 10, each component coalgebra is a neural network layer for which the errors at its output stage are known, and

$$X_c(t+1) = f(X_1(\tau_1^1(t)), \dots, X_{c_f}(\tau_n^i(t))), \quad \forall t \in T^i$$

where  $c_f$  is the number of elements in the information field of element  $c$ .

4: where  $T^i$  is the set of time points where  $X_f$  is updated, and  $0 \leq \tau_j^i(t) \leq t$ , and at all times  $t \notin T^i$ , we assume that

$$X_f(t+1) = X_f(t)$$

5: **if** the final coalgebra  $X^* \rightarrow F(X^*)$  is not found **then**

6: Set  $t = t + 1$ , and return to Step 2.

7: **else**

8: Set **done**  $\leftarrow$  **true**.

9: **end if**

10: **until done**.

11: Return the final coalgebra  $F(X^*) \cong X^*$  of  $F$ .

## 12 Information Fields over Coalgebras

The essence of asynchronous distributed computation in both RL and URL is to update each component coalgebra when it is possible to do so. For example, in Algorithm 1, each processor updates the component function  $f_i : X \rightarrow X$  sufficiently often so that the entire product function  $F$  converges. Applied to  $Q$ -learning, we can think of each product function  $f_i$  as the simply  $Q(x, a)$ , the state-action value. In general, if we specify an approximation architecture by a functor diagram, as in deep RL described in Section 10, each component coalgebra (e.g., a layer of a neural network, or a computing node) may not be ready to be updated until the information it needs is accessible. For deep RL, it means that backpropagation requires unrolling the updates from the last layer backwards. More general functor diagrams may require other approaches. A

very general theory of how to structure decision making in complex multi-agent settings was developed by Witsenhausen [Witsenhausen, 1975], which we generalized to the categorical setting in [Mahadevan, 2021a].

We now proceed to give a brief introduction to the Universal Decision Model (UDM) Mahadevan [2021a]. In the UDM category  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{UDM}}$ , as in any category, we are given a collection of *decision objects*  $\mathcal{D}$ , and a set of morphisms  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{UDM}}$  between UDM objects, where  $f : c \rightarrow d$  is a morphism that maps from UDM object  $c$  to  $d$ . A morphism need not exist between every pair of UDM objects. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to *locally small* UDM categories, meaning that exists only a set's worth of morphisms between any pair of UDM objects.

**Definition 26.** A *Universal Decision Model (UDM)* is defined as a category  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{UDM}}$ , where each decision object is represented as a tuple  $\langle (A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P), U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \rangle$ , where  $A$  in URL represent coalgebras,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P)$  is a probability space representing the inherent stochastic state of nature due to randomness,  $U_\alpha$  is a measurable space from which a decision  $u \in U_\alpha$  is chosen by decision object  $\alpha$ . Each element's policy in a decision object is any function  $\pi_\alpha : \prod_\beta U_\beta \rightarrow U_\alpha$  that is measurable from its information field  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ , a subfield of the overall product space  $(\prod_\alpha U_\alpha, \prod_\alpha \mathcal{F}_\alpha)$ , to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ . The policy of decision object  $\alpha$  can be any function  $\pi_\alpha : \prod_\beta U_\beta \rightarrow U_\alpha$ .

**Definition 27.** The **information field** of an element  $\alpha \in A$  in a decision object  $c$  in UDM category  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{UDM}}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \subset \mathcal{F}_A(A)$  characterizes the information available to decision object  $\alpha$  for choosing a decision  $u \in U_\alpha$ .

To ground this definition out in terms of the stochastic approximation theory of Q-learning, an information field precisely delineates what information is available to each of the parallel asynchronous distributed processors that are updating the Q-function. The information field structure yields a surprisingly rich topological space that has many important consequences for how to organize the decision makers in a complex organization into subsystems. An element  $\alpha$  in a decision object requires information from other elements or subsystems in the network. To formalize this notion, we use product decision fields and product  $\sigma$ -algebras, with their canonical projections.

**Definition 28.** Given a subset of nodes  $B \subset A$ , let  $H_B = \Omega \times \prod_{\alpha \in B} U_\alpha$  be the **product space of decisions** of nodes in the subset  $B$ , where the **product  $\sigma$ -algebra** is  $\mathcal{B} \times \prod_{\alpha \in B} \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \mathcal{F}_B(B)$ . It is common to also denote the product  $\sigma$ -algebra by the notation  $\otimes_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ . If  $C \subset B$ , then the **induced  $\sigma$ -algebra**  $\mathcal{F}_B(C)$  is a subfield of  $\mathcal{F}_B(B)$ , which can also be viewed as the inverse image of  $\mathcal{F}_C(C)$  under the canonical projection of  $H_B$  onto  $H_C$ .<sup>3</sup>

## 12.1 Bisimulation Morphisms as Open Maps

In a UDM category, the morphisms between decision objects are represented using the concept of *open maps*, as proposed in Joyal et al. [1993]. This framework is based on defining a model of computation as a category. A related notion has been proposed for probabilistic bisimulation Sokolova [2011]. One fundamental notion is *bisimulation* between machines or processes using *open maps* in categories Joyal et al. [1993]. This definition can be seen as a generalization of the simpler bisimulation relationship that exists for the category of labeled transition systems Joyal et al. [1993], which are specified as a relation of tuples  $(s, a, s')$ , which indicates a transition from state  $s$  to state  $s'$ , where  $s, s' \in S$ , and  $a \in A$ . Given a collection of labeled transition systems, each of which is represented as an object, morphisms are defined from one object to another that preserve the dynamics under the labeling function. For example, a surjective function  $f : S \rightarrow S'$  maps states in object  $X$  to corresponding states in  $Y$ , where the labels are mapped as well, with the proviso that some transitions in  $X$  may be hidden in  $Y$  (i.e., cause no transition). If a morphism exists between objects  $X$  and  $Y$ , then  $Y$  is said to be a bisimulation of  $X$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote a model of computation, where a morphism  $m : X \rightarrow Y$  is to intuitively viewed as a simulation of  $X$  in  $Y$ . Within  $\mathcal{M}$ , we choose a subcategory of "observation objects" and "observation extension" morphisms between them. We can denote this category of observations by  $\mathcal{P}$ . Given an observation object  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , and a model  $X \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $P$  is said to be an *observable behavior* of  $X$  if there is a morphism  $o : P \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We define morphisms  $m : X \rightarrow Y$  that have the property that whenever an observable behavior of  $X$  can be extended via  $f$  in  $Y$ , that extension can be matched by an extension of the observable behavior in  $X$ .

**Definition 29.** Joyal et al. [1993] A morphism  $m : X \rightarrow Y$  in a model of computation  $\mathcal{M}$  is said to be  $\mathcal{P}$ -open if whenever  $f : O_1 \rightarrow O_2$  in  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $p : O_2 \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $q : O_2 \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , the below diagram commutes, that is,  $m \circ p = q \circ f$ .

<sup>3</sup>Note that for any cartesian product of sets  $\prod_i X_i$ , we are always able to uniquely define a projection map into any component set  $X_i$ , which is a special case of the product universal property in a category.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow m \\
O_2 & \xrightarrow{q} & Y
\end{array}$$

This definition means that whenever such a “square” in  $\mathcal{M}$  commutes, the path  $f p$  in  $Y$  can be extended via  $m$  to a path  $q$  in  $Y$ , there is a “zig-zag” mediating morphism  $p'$  such that the two triangles in the diagram below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\
\downarrow f & \nearrow p' & \downarrow m \\
O_2 & \xrightarrow{q} & Y
\end{array}$$

commute, namely  $p = p' f$  and  $q = m p'$ . We now define the abstract definition of *bisimulation* as follows:

**Definition 30.** *Two models  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  are said to be  $\mathcal{P}$ -bisimilar (in  $\mathcal{M}$ ) if there exists a span of open maps from a common object  $Z$ :*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& Z & \\
\swarrow m & & \searrow m' \\
X & & Y
\end{array}$$

Note that if the category  $\mathcal{M}$  has pullbacks, then the  $\sim_{\mathcal{P}}$  is an equivalence relation, which induces a quotient mapping. Furthermore, pullbacks of open map bisimulation mappings are themselves bisimulation mappings. Many of the bisimulation mappings studied for MDPs and PSRs are special cases of the more general formalism above.

## 12.2 Bisimulation in UDMs

We introduce the concept of bisimulation morphisms between UDM objects, which builds on a longstanding theme in computer science on using category theory to understand machine behavior. One fundamental notion is *bisimulation* between machines or processes using *open maps* in categories Joyal et al. [1993].

**Definition 31.** *The **bisimulation** relationship between two UDM objects  $M = \langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, (U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}) \rangle$  and  $M' = \langle A', (\Omega', \mathcal{B}', (U'_\alpha, \mathcal{F}'_\alpha, \mathcal{I}'_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A'}) \rangle$ , denoted as  $M \twoheadrightarrow M'$ , is defined as is defined by a tuple of surjections as follows:*

- A surjection  $f : A \twoheadrightarrow A'$  that maps elements in  $A$  to corresponding elements in  $A'$ . As  $f$  is surjective, it induces an equivalence class in  $A$  such that  $x \sim y, x, y \in A$  if and only if  $f(x) = f(y)$ .
- A surjection  $g : H \twoheadrightarrow H'$ , where  $H = \Omega \times \prod_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha$ , with the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B} \times \prod_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ , and  $H' = \Omega' \times \prod_{\alpha \in A'} U'_\alpha$ , with the corresponding  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}' \times \prod_{\alpha \in A'} \mathcal{F}'_\alpha$ .

This definition can be seen as a generalization of the simpler bisimulation relationship that exists for the category of labeled transition systems Joyal et al. [1993], which are specified as a relation of tuples  $(s, a, s')$ , which indicates a transition from state  $s$  to state  $s'$ , where  $s, s' \in S$ , and  $a \in A$ . Given a collection of labeled transition systems, each of which is represented as an object, morphisms are defined from one object to another that preserve the dynamics under the labeling function. For example, a surjective function  $f : S \rightarrow S'$  maps states in object  $X$  to corresponding states in  $Y$ , where the labels are mapped as well, with the proviso that some transitions in  $X$  may be hidden in  $Y$  (i.e., cause no transition). If a morphism exists between objects  $X$  and  $Y$ , then  $Y$  is said to be a bisimulation of  $X$ . The state-dependent action recoding in the MDP homomorphism definition is captured by the equivalent surjection  $g$  that maps the product space  $H$  with its associated  $\sigma$ -algebra to  $H'$  with its corresponding  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Note that the general framework of bisimulations applied to universal coalgebras also applies here, and in fact, we could rephrase the above definitions in terms of universal coalgebras as well. We can specialize the definition in a number of ways, depending on the exact form chosen for the surjection  $g$  between product spaces  $H$  and  $H'$ . Since the surjection  $f$  maps decision makers into equivalence classes, each decision maker in model  $M'$  corresponds to an equivalence class of decision makers in model  $M$ . Thus, we need to collapse their corresponding information fields. We can define the information field of an equivalence class of agents

$[\alpha]_f$ , meaning all  $\beta$  such that  $f(\beta) = f(\alpha)$ , by recalling that an information field is a subfield of the product field, and as it is a lattice, we can use the join operation, as defined below:

**Definition 32.** The **quotient information field** of a collection of agents  $[\alpha]_f$  is defined as the join of the information fields of each agent:

$$\mathcal{I}_{[\alpha]} = \bigvee_{\beta \in [\alpha]_f} \mathcal{I}_\alpha \quad (16)$$

### 12.3 Observation Objects in UDM

We now briefly discuss observation objects in a UDM. Observation objects, as mentioned above, represent observable trace behavior of a decision object. We first define observation functions that underlie information fields.

**Definition 33.** For a UDM object  $M = \langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, (U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}) \rangle$  over a finite  $\sigma$ -algebra, the observations  $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$  taking values in a measurable space  $(Z_i, \mathcal{Z}_i)$ , where  $Z_i = \eta_i(\omega, U_1, \dots, U_{|A|})$  is an **observation generation map** function such that  $\sigma(Z_{1:k})$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra contained in  $\mathcal{B} \otimes \prod_\alpha \mathcal{F}_\alpha$  with respect to which the observation maps  $\eta_i$  are measurable functions. We say the observations  $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$  generate the information field  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  if

$$\sigma(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) = \mathcal{I}_\alpha \quad (17)$$

We can then define an observation object associated with a UDM decision object as one equipped with an observation generation map that can generate the various information fields in the decision object.

**Definition 34.** A **UDM observation object**  $O = \langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, (U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \eta_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}) \rangle$  is such that each information field  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  can be generated from the associated observation generation map  $\eta_\alpha$ .

We can define an observation morphism between an observation object  $O$  and a decision object  $M$  to be one such that  $O$  represents an observable behavior of  $M$ , and extend the notion of  $\mathcal{P}$ -open morphisms from Definition 29 above.

### 12.4 Solvability of UDM objects

Each decision maker  $\alpha$  in a UDM object has associated with it a control law or policy  $\pi_\alpha : H \rightarrow U_\alpha$ , which is measurable from its information field  $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$  to  $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ , the measurable space associated with its decision space  $U_\alpha$ . Essentially, this means that any pre-image of  $\pi_\alpha^{-1}(E)$ , for any measurable subset  $E \subset \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ , is also measurable on its information field, that is  $\pi_\alpha^{-1}(E) \subset \mathcal{I}_\alpha$ . For any subsystem in the cloud computing network, the overall policy space  $\pi_B = \prod_{\alpha \in B} \pi_\alpha$  is given by the product space of all individual control laws.

**Definition 35.** A UDM object  $\langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P), (U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \rangle$  is said to be **solvable** if for every state of nature  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and every control law  $\pi \in \prod_A$ , the set of simultaneous equations given below has one and only one solution  $u \in U$ .

$$u_\alpha = \pi_\alpha(h) \equiv \pi_\alpha(\omega, u) \quad (18)$$

Here,  $\pi_\alpha$  can be viewed as a projection from the joint decision  $h$  taken by the entire ensemble of decision makers in the intrinsic model. A UDM category  $\mathcal{C}_{UDM}$  is solvable if every object in it is solvable.

Intuitively, the solvability criterion states that a UDM object represents a solvable decision problem if each agent in the object can successfully compute its response, given access to its information field, and that its response is uniquely determined for every state of nature. It is easy to construct unsolvable decision objects. Consider a simple network with two elements  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , each of whose information fields includes the measurable space of the other. In this case, neither element can compute its function without knowing the other's response, hence both are waiting for the other to compute their response, and a deadlock ensues.

Given the notion of solvability above, we can now define solution objects in a UDM.

**Definition 36.** A **UDM solution object**  $\langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P), (U_\alpha, \pi_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, \mathcal{I}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \rangle$  is defined as one for which for every state of nature  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the control law  $\pi_\alpha$  uniquely defines a fixed point solution  $u_\alpha = \pi_\alpha(h) \equiv \pi_\alpha(\omega, u)$  to the associated decision object.

We can straightforwardly define morphisms between solution objects and decision objects. To understand the causality condition, it is crucial to organize the decision makers into a partial order, such that for every total ordering that can be constructed from the partial ordering, the agents can successfully compute their functions based on the computations of agents that preceded them in the ordering.

Images, Text documents,  
Probability Distributions...




Figure 8: The convergence of many algorithms in RL is usually analyzed using distances between objects in a *metric space*. Interpreting distances categorically leads to powerful ways to reason about convergence of RL in generalized metric spaces.

**Definition 37.** A UDM object  $\langle A, (\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P), (U_\alpha, \mathcal{F}_\alpha, I_\alpha) \rangle$  is said to be **causal** if there exists at least one function  $\phi : H \rightarrow S$ , where  $S$  is the set of total orderings of computing elements in  $A$ , satisfying the property that for any partial stage of the computation  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and any ordered set  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$  of distinct elements from  $A$ , the set  $E \subset H$  on which  $\phi(h)$  begins with the same ordering  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$  satisfies the following causality condition:

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha_k}, E \cap F \in \mathcal{F}(\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}\}) \quad (19)$$

In other words, if at every step of the process, the  $k^{\text{th}}$  decision making element  $\alpha_k$  can successfully compute its response based on the information fields of the past  $k - 1$  elements, the system is then considered causal. These definitions are what is missing from previous analyses of stochastic approximation in asynchronous distributed models, and we can use these to more fully develop a theory of asynchronous iterative computation of final coalgebras in universal coalgebras.

### 13 The Metric Yoneda Lemma: Coinductive Inference in Generalized Metric Spaces

In this section, we want to use a specific form of the Yoneda Lemma, called the *metric Yoneda Lemma* [Bonsangue et al., 1998] to derive a form of coinductive inference in generalized metric spaces. These are based on a generalized notion of distance that combines familiar spaces, such as preorders and usual metric spaces, where the typical axioms of a distance metric are relaxed. The advantage of the metric Yoneda Lemma is that it can be shown that notions such as completion of a metric space arise from the metric Yoneda Lemma.

Figure 8 illustrates a common motif in analyzing the convergence of many RL algorithms [Tsitsiklis, 1993, Borkar, 2008]: define the problem in terms of computing distances between a group of objects in a (generalized) metric space. Examples of objects include points in  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space, probability distributions, text documents represented as strings of tokens, and images represented as matrices.

#### 13.1 Generalized Metric Spaces as Categories

**Definition 38.** A generalized metric space  $(X, d)$  is a set  $X$  of objects, and a non-negative function  $X(-, -) : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  that satisfies the following properties:

1.  $X(x, x) = 0$ : distance between the same object and itself is 0.

2.  $X(x, z) \leq X(x, y) + X(y, z)$ : the famous triangle inequality posits that the distance between two objects cannot exceed the sum of distances between each of them and some other intermediate third object.

In particular, generalized metric spaces are not required to be *symmetric*, or satisfy the property that if the distance between two objects  $x$  and  $y$  is 0 implies  $x$  must be identical to  $y$ , or finally that distances must be finite. These additional three properties listed below are what defines the usual notion of a *metric* space:

1. If  $X(x, y) = 0$  and  $X(y, x) = 0$  then  $x = y$ .
2.  $X(x, y) = X(y, x)$ .
3.  $X(x, y) < \infty$ .

Here are some examples of generalized metric spaces:

1. Any preorder  $(P, \leq)$  such that all  $p, q, r \in P$ , if  $p \leq q$  and  $q \leq r$ , then,  $p \leq r$ , and  $p \leq p$ , where

$$P(p, q) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } p \leq q \\ \infty & \text{if } p \not\leq q \end{array} \right\}$$

2. The set of strings  $\Sigma^*$  over some alphabet defined as the set  $\Sigma$  where the distance between two strings  $u$  and  $v$  is defined as

$$\Sigma^*(u, v) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } u \text{ is a prefix of } v \\ 2^{-n} & \text{otherwise where } n \text{ is the longest common prefix of } u \text{ and } v \end{array} \right\}$$

3. The set of non-negative distances  $[0, \infty]$  where the distance between two objects  $u$  and  $v$  is defined as

$$[0, \infty](u, v) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } u \geq v \\ v - u & \text{otherwise where } r < s \end{array} \right\}$$

4. The powerset  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  of all subsets of a standard metric space, where the distance between two subsets  $V, W \subseteq X$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}(X)(V, W) = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 \mid \forall v \in V, \exists w \in W, X(v, w) \leq \epsilon\}$$

which is often referred to as the *non-symmetric Hausdorff distance*.

Generalized metric spaces can be shown to be  $[0, \infty]$ -enriched categories as the collection of all morphisms between any two objects itself defines a category. In particular, the category  $[0, \infty]$  is a complete and co-complete symmetric monoidal category. It is a category because objects are the non-negative real numbers, including  $\infty$ , and for two objects  $r$  and  $s$  in  $[0, \infty]$ , there is an arrow from  $r$  to  $s$  if and only if  $r \leq s$ . It is complete and co-complete because all equalizers and co-equalizers exist as there is at most one arrow between any two objects. The categorical product  $r \sqcap s$  of two objects  $r$  and  $s$  is simply  $\max\{r, s\}$ , and the categorical coproduct  $r \sqcup s$  is simply  $\min\{r, s\}$ . More generally, products are defined by supremums, and coproducts are defined by infimums. Finally, the *monoidal* structure is induced by defining the tensoring of two objects through "addition":

$$+ : [0, \infty] \times [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

where  $r + s$  is simply their sum, and where as usual  $r + \infty = \infty + r = \infty$ .

The category  $[0, \infty]$  is also a *compact closed* category, which turns out to be a fundamentally important property, and can be simply explained in this case as follows. We can define an "internal hom functor"  $[0, \infty](-, -)$  between any two objects  $r$  and  $s$  in  $[0, \infty]$  the distance  $[0, \infty]$  as defined above, and the *co pre-sheaf*  $[0, \infty](t, -)$  is *right adjoint* to  $t + -$  for any  $t \in [0, \infty]$ .

**Theorem 7.** For all  $r, s$  and  $t \in [0, \infty]$ ,

$$t + s \geq r \text{ if and only if } s \geq [0, \infty](t, r)$$

We will explain the significance of compact closed categories for reasoning about AI and ML systems in more detail later, but in particular, we note that reasoning about feedback requires using compact closed categories to represent “dual” objects that are diagrammatically represented by arrows that run in the “reverse” direction from right to left (in addition to the usual convention of information flowing from left to right from inputs to outputs in any process model).

We can also define a category of generalized metric spaces, where each generalized metric space itself as an object, and for the morphism between generalized metric spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , we can choose a *non-expansive function*  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  which has the *contraction property*, namely

$$Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq c \cdot X(x, y)$$

where  $0 < c < 1$  is assumed to be some real number that lies in the unit interval. The category of generalized metric spaces will turn out to be of crucial importance in this book as we will use a central result in category theory – the Yoneda Lemma – to give a new interpretation to distances.

### 13.2 The Metric Yoneda Lemma

Finally, let us state a “metric” version of the Yoneda Lemma specifically for the case of  $[0, \infty]$ -enriched categories in generalized metric spaces:

**Theorem 8. (Yoneda Lemma for generalized metric spaces):** *Let  $X$  be a generalized metric space. For any  $x \in X$ , let*

$$X(-, x) : X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow [0, \infty], \quad y \mapsto X(y, x)$$

Intuitively, what the generalized metric version of the Yoneda Lemma is stating is that it is possible to represent an element of a generalized metric space by its co-presheaf, exactly analogous to what we saw above in the previous section for causal inference! If we use the notation

$$\hat{X} = [0, \infty]^{X^{\text{op}}}$$

to indicate the set of all non-expansive functions from  $X^{\text{op}}$  to  $[0, \infty]$ , then the Yoneda embedding defined by  $y \mapsto X(y, x)$  is in fact a non-expansive function, and itself an element of  $\hat{X}$ ! Thus, it follows from the general Yoneda Lemma that for any other element  $\phi$  in  $\hat{X}$ ,

$$\hat{X}(X(-, x), \phi) = \phi(x)$$

Another fundamental result is that the Yoneda embedding for generalized metric spaces is an *isometry*. Again, this is exactly analogous to what we saw above for causal inference, which we denoted as the causal reproducing property.

**Theorem 9.** *The Yoneda embedding  $y : X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ , defined for  $x \in X$  by  $y(x) = X(-, x)$  is isometric, that is, for all  $x, x' \in X$ , we have:*

$$X(x, x') = \hat{X}(y(x), y(x')) = \hat{X}(X(-, x), X(-, x'))$$

### 13.3 Applying the Metric Yoneda Lemma in URL

Let us briefly explain the significance of the metric Yoneda Lemma in URL. As we described earlier in Section 1, the principle of metric coinduction states that any eventually contractive operator has a fixed point, namely a final coalgebra. Crucial to that theorem is the notion of contraction, which was specified in regular metric spaces. The metric Yoneda Lemma shows us how to generalize previous work to coinduction in generalized metric spaces, because it tells us how to construct isometric embeddings. We can apply the metric Yoneda Lemma to analyze Algorithm 4 in generalized metric spaces, which we postpone to future work.

## 14 Topos Theory in URL: Complete Categories with Exponentials and Subobjects

We now generalize the product construction in Algorithm 1 to categories where we have not only products, but also (co)limits, exponential objects, and subobject classifiers. These constructions will give us a rich language to specify diagrams, which can then provide recipes for building URL algorithms and architectures.

To concretize these abstractions, let us explore defining a category over all value functions  $C_V$ . A topos [Johnstone, 2014] is a “set-like” category which generalizes all common operations on sets. Thus, the generalization of subset is a subobject classifier in a topos. To help build some intuition, consider how to define subsets without “looking inside” a set. Essentially, a subset  $S$  of some larger set  $T$  can be viewed as a “monic arrow”, that is, an injective (or 1-1) function  $f : S \hookrightarrow T$ . We first introduce some basic categorical concepts, including diagrams as functors, and universal constructions, such as (co)limits.

### 14.1 Diagrams in URL

We introduce the concept of diagrams in URL. A *diagram of shape*  $J$  over category  $C$  is defined as the functor  $F : J \rightarrow C$ . In the typical case where RL involves a sequence of decision steps, the indexing category  $J$  might be defined as  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \dots$ , and where the category  $C$  could be one of the RL categories illustrated in Section 7. Here are some canonical diagrams that carry special meaning when interpreted in terms of MDP or PSR homomorphisms. You can interpret each  $\bullet$  is mapped into an MDP or PSR, and each arrow as an MDP or PSR homomorphism.


1. **Pullback diagram:** The pullback diagram is defined as  $J = \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet$ .
2. **Pushforward diagram:** The pushforward diagram is defined as  $J = \bullet \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ .
3. **Equalizer diagram:** The equalizer diagram is defined as  $J = \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightrightarrows \bullet$ .
4. **Co-Equalizer diagram:** The co-equalizer diagram is defined as  $J = \bullet \rightrightarrows \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ .

In general, it can be shown that any diagram can be built as a combination of such elementary building blocks. Of course, it remains to be seen whether these diagrams are actually “solvable”. We will prove that in many cases of interest, all these diagrams are solvable, e.g., such as in the category of sets,  $C_{\text{Sets}}$ , as well as in other categories, such as topological spaces, groups etc. To understand how to solve a diagram, we need to introduce the concept of (co)limits and universal properties. That requires defining *natural transformations*.

### 14.2 Limits and Colimits

For any object  $c \in C$  and any diagram of shape  $J$ , the *constant functor*  $c : J \rightarrow C$  maps every object  $j$  of  $J$  to  $c$  and every morphism  $f$  in  $J$  to the identity morphisms  $1_c$ . We can define a constant functor embedding as the collection of constant functors  $\Delta : C \rightarrow C^J$  that send each object  $c$  in  $C$  to the constant functor at  $c$  and each morphism  $f : c \rightarrow c'$  to the constant natural transformation, that is, the natural transformation whose every component is defined to be the morphism  $f$ .

**Definition 39.** A **cone over** a diagram  $F : J \rightarrow C$  with the **summit** or **apex**  $c \in C$  is a natural transformation  $\lambda : c \Rightarrow F$  whose domain is the constant functor at  $c$ . The components  $(\lambda_j : c \rightarrow Fj)_{j \in J}$  of the natural transformation can be viewed as its **legs**. Dually, a **cone under**  $F$  with **nadir**  $c$  is a natural transformation  $\lambda : F \Rightarrow c$  whose legs are the components  $(\lambda_j : Fj \rightarrow c)_{j \in J}$ .



Cones under a diagram are referred to usually as *cocones*. Using the concept of cones and cocones, we can now formally define the concept of limits and colimits more precisely.

**Definition 40.** For any diagram  $F : J \rightarrow C$ , there is a functor  $\text{Cone}(-, F) : C^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , which sends  $c \in C$  to the set of cones over  $F$  with apex  $c$ . Using the Yoneda Lemma (see Supplementary Materials), a **limit** of  $F$  is defined as an object  $\lim F \in C$  together with a natural transformation  $\lambda : \lim F \rightarrow F$ , which can be called the **universal cone** defining the

natural isomorphism  $C(-, \lim F) \simeq \text{Cone}(-, F)$ . Dually, for colimits, we can define a functor  $\text{Cone}(F, -) : C \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  that maps object  $c \in C$  to the set of cones under  $F$  with nadir  $c$ . A **colimit** of  $F$  is a representation for  $\text{Cone}(F, -)$ . Once again, using the Yoneda Lemma, a colimit is defined by an object  $\text{Colim}F \in C$  together with a natural transformation  $\lambda : F \rightarrow \text{colim}F$ , which defines the **colimit cone** as the natural isomorphism  $C(\text{colim}F, -) \simeq \text{Cone}(F, -)$ .

Figure 9 illustrates the limit of a more complex diagram referred as a *pullback*, whose diagram is written abstractly as  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet$ . Note in Figure 9, the functor maps the diagram  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet$  to actual objects in the category  $\mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{Z} \xleftarrow{f} \mathcal{X}$ . The universal property of the pullback square with the objects  $U, X, Y$  and  $Z$  implies that the composite mappings  $g \circ f'$  must equal  $g' \circ f$ . In this example, the morphisms  $f$  and  $g$  represent a *pullback pair*, as they share a common co-domain  $Z$ . The pair of morphisms  $f', g'$  emanating from  $U$  define a *cone*, because the pullback square “commutes” appropriately. Thus, the pullback of the pair of morphisms  $f, g$  with the common co-domain  $Z$  is the pair of morphisms  $f', g'$  with common domain  $U$ . Furthermore, to satisfy the universal property, given another pair of morphisms  $x, y$  with common domain  $T$ , there must exist another morphism  $k : T \rightarrow U$  that “factorizes”  $x, y$  appropriately, so that the composite morphisms  $f' k = y$  and  $g' k = x$ . Here,  $T$  and  $U$  are referred to as *cones*, where  $U$  is the limit of the set of all cones “above”  $Z$ . If we reverse arrow directions appropriately, we get the corresponding notion of pushforward.




Figure 9: Universal property of pullback mappings.

### 14.3 Category of Action-Value Functions is (co)Complete

To illustrate diagrammatic reasoning in URL, we now prove that the category  $C_Q$  is complete, that is, it contains all limits and colimits. Hence, all architecture diagrams are “solvable”, meaning that there is an action-value function that defines an object “closest” to the diagram with respect to the morphisms coming into or out of the diagram. Our proof hinges on two key properties: in the category  $C_{\text{Set}}$  of sets, all diagrams are solvable, that is limits and colimits exist. Where possible, we reduce the problem of showing a property to that of the category  $C_{\text{Set}}$ .

**Theorem 10.** *The category  $C_Q$  is (co) complete, meaning it contains all limits and colimits.*

**Proof:** Formally, this result requires showing that all diagrams, such as pullbacks  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \leftarrow \bullet$ , pushouts  $\bullet \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ , (co)equalizer diagrams of the form  $\bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightrightarrows \bullet$  and  $\bullet \rightrightarrows \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$ , respectively, are solvable. For brevity, we will just illustrate the argument for pullback diagrams, and the other arguments are similar. Consider the cube shown in Figure 11. Here,  $f, g$ , and  $h$  are three value functions, each mapping some state into some real number. So, for example, the bottom face of the cube is a commutative diagram, meaning that  $i \circ f = g \circ j$  holds. Similarly, the arrows  $p$ , from  $I''$  to  $I'$ , and arrow  $q$  from  $O''$  to  $O'$  ensure the right face of the cube is a commutative diagram. The arrow from  $P$  to  $Q$  exists because looking at the front face of the cube,  $Q$  is the pullback of  $i$  and  $q$ , which must exist because we are in the category of sets  $C_{\text{Set}}$ , which has all pullbacks. Similarly, the back face of the cube is a pullback of  $j$  and  $p$ , which is again a pullback in  $C_{\text{Set}}$ . Summarizing,  $\langle u, v \rangle$  and  $\langle m, n \rangle$  are the pullbacks of  $\langle i, j \rangle$  and  $\langle p, q \rangle$ . The proof that  $C_V$  has all pushouts (limits) is similar.  $\square$

## 15 Category of Action Value Functions form a Topos

We now show that the category  $C_Q$  is not just (co)complete, but they have other properties that make them into a category called a topos [MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk, 1994, Johnstone, 2014] that is a “set-like” category with very special properties, which we will explore in the rest of the paper. A topos generalizes all common operations on sets. The concept of subset is generalized to a *subobject classifier* in a topos. To help build some intuition, consider how to define subsets without “looking inside” a set. Essentially, a subset  $S$  of some larger set  $T$  can be viewed as a “monic arrow”, that is, an injective (or 1-1) function  $f : S \hookrightarrow T$ .

**Definition 41.** [MacLane and leke Moerdijk, 1994] An **elementary topos** is a category  $C$  that has all (i) limits and colimits, (ii) has exponential objects, and (iii) a subobject classifier.

For example, the category of sets forms a topos. Limits exist because one can define Cartesian products of sets, and colimits correspond to forming set unions. Exponential objects correspond to the set of all functions between two sets. Finally, the subobject classifier is simply the subset function, which induces a boolean-valued characteristic function. A few of the many alternative definitions are to combine (i) and (iii) by the condition that  $C$  is *Cartesian closed*; another reformulation is to replace condition (i) by the condition that  $C$  has a terminal object and pullbacks; and similarly, condition (ii) can be replaced by saying  $C$  has an initial object and coequalizers of all maps between coproducts. These are all different ways of characterizing a topos in terms of its universal properties.

**Definition 42.** In a category  $C$  with finite limits, a **subobject classifier** is a  $C$ -object  $\Omega$ , and a  $C$ -arrow  $\mathbf{true} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \Omega$ , such that to every other monic arrow  $S \hookrightarrow X$  in  $C$ , there is a unique arrow  $\phi$  that forms the following pullback square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow m & & \downarrow \mathbf{true} \\ X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \Omega \end{array}$$

This commutative diagram is a classic example of how to state a universal property: it enforces a condition that every monic arrow  $m$  (i.e., every  $1 - 1$  function) that maps a "sub"-object  $S$  to an object  $X$  must be characterizable in terms of a "pullback", a particular type of universal property that is a special type of a limit. In the special case of the category of sets, it is relatively easy to show that subobject classifiers are simply the characteristic (Boolean-valued) function  $\phi$  that defines subsets. In general, as we show below, the subobject classifier  $\Omega$  for causal models is not Boolean-valued, and requires using intuitionistic logic through a Heyting algebra. This definition can be rephrased as saying that the subobject functor is representable. In other words, a subobject of an object  $x$  in a category  $C$  is an equivalence class of monic arrows  $m : S \hookrightarrow x$ .

**Theorem 11.** The category  $C_Q$  of value functions forms a topos.

**Proof:** The proof essentially involves checking each of the conditions in the above definition of a topos. We will focus on the construction of the subobject classifier and of exponential objects below, since we have already shown above in Theorem 10 that the category  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$  has all (co)limits. We prove each of these constructions in the next two sections.  $\square$

### 15.1 Subobject Classifiers for the category $C_Q$ of action-value functions

First, we need to define what a "subobject" is in the category  $C_Q$  of action-value functions. Note that action-value functions  $f : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $g : S' \times A' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  each map state-action pairs  $s, a$ , and  $s', a'$  into real numbers. Here, let us assume that the value function  $f$  is a *sub-function* of the value function  $g$ . We can denote that by defining a commutative diagram as shown below. Note here that  $i$  and  $j$  are monic arrows. Also,  $O$  and  $O'$  denote the set of possible values of the state-action pairs defined by sets  $S \times A$  and  $S' \times A'$ , respectively.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S \times A & \xrightarrow{i} & S' \times A' \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ O & \xrightarrow{j} & O' \end{array}$$

Let us examine Figure 10 to understand the design of subobject classifiers for the category  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ . An element  $x \in S' \times A'$ , which is a particular state-action pair, can be classified in three ways by defining a (non-Boolean!) characteristic function  $\psi$ :

1.  $x \in S \times A$  – here we set  $\psi(x) = \mathbf{1}$ .
2.  $x \notin S \times A$  but  $g(x) \in O'$  – here we set  $\psi(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ .




Figure 10: The subobject classifier  $\Omega$  for the topos category  $C_Q$  of action-value functions.




Figure 11: The subobject classifier  $\Omega$  for the topos category  $C_Q$  of action-value functions is defined as the bottom face of the cube.

3.  $x \notin S \times A$  and  $g(x) \notin O$  – we denote this by  $\psi(x) = \mathbf{0}$ .

The subobject classifier is illustrated as the bottom face of the cube shown in Figure 11:

- $\mathbf{true}(0) = t'(0) = \mathbf{1}$
- $\mathbf{t} : \{0, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{1}\} \rightarrow \{0, \mathbf{1}\}$ , where  $\mathbf{t}(0) = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{t}(\frac{1}{2}) = \mathbf{1}$ .
- $\chi_O$  is the characteristic function of the output set  $O$ .
- The base of the cube in Figure 11 displays the subobject classifier  $\mathbf{T} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \Omega$ , where  $\mathbf{T} = \langle t', \mathbf{true} \rangle$  that maps  $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{id}_{\{0\}}$  to  $\Omega = \mathbf{t} : \{0, \frac{1}{2}, \mathbf{1}\} \rightarrow \{0, \mathbf{1}\}$ .

This proves that the subobject classifier exists for the category  $C_V$  of value functions, and it is not Boolean, but has three values of “truth”, corresponding to the three types of classifications of monic arrows (in regular set theory, subobject classifiers are Boolean: either an element of a parent set is in a subset, or it is not).

## 15.2 Exponential Objects in the Category $C_Q$

To complete the proof of Theorem 11, we need to prove also that the category  $C_Q$  has “exponential objects”. Given action value functions  $f : S \rightarrow O$ , and  $g : S' \rightarrow O'$ , where  $S, S'$  refer to state-action sets, and  $O, O'$  refer

to subsets of Euclidean space (real numbers), we define the *exponentiated value function*  $g^f : E \rightarrow F$ , where  $F = O'^O$  is the regular exponential object in the category  $C_{\text{Set}}$  (i.e., all functions from the set  $O$  to  $O'$ ), and  $E$  is the collection of all arrows from the value function  $f$  to value function  $g$  in the category  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ , which can be written more precisely as

$$E = \{\langle h, k \rangle \mid h, k \text{ are arrows in the diagram below}\}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \xrightarrow{h} & S' \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ O & \xrightarrow{k} & O' \end{array}$$

and  $g^f(\langle h, k \rangle) = k$ . First, we define the “product” object of  $g^f$  and  $f$  in the category  $C_{\mathcal{V}}$  as the product map  $g^f \times f : E \times I \rightarrow F \times O$ . To show that we have defined a genuine exponential object, we need to demonstrate an “evaluation” map  $g^f \times f \rightarrow g$ . The evaluation arrow from  $g^f \times f$  to  $g$  is the pair  $\langle u, v \rangle$  defined by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E \times I & \xrightarrow{u} & I' \\ \downarrow g^f \times f & & \downarrow g \\ F \times O & \xrightarrow{k} & O'' \end{array}$$

Here,  $v$  is the usual evaluation arrow in the category  $C_{\text{Set}}$  of sets, and  $u$  maps  $\langle \langle h, k \rangle, x \rangle$  to output  $h(x)$ .

### 15.3 More General Topos Categories in URL

For simplicity, we worked through the details of the proof that the category  $C_Q$  of action-value functions forms a topos, but a similar proof can be constructed for a variety of other categories for URL. For example, if we consider the MDP and PSR homomorphisms defined in Section 7, we can define a topos category  $C_{MDP}$  and a topos category  $C_{PSR}$  as well, where we need to follow the same procedure described above for constructing subobject classifiers and exponential objects. MDP subobjects would correspond to parts of another MDP, which have been the topic of extensive work in hierarchical RL [Barto and Mahadevan, 2003].

## 16 Summary and Future Work

In this paper, we described Universal Reinforcement Learning (URL), a categorial generalization of RL, which builds on abstractions from the study of coinduction on non-well-founded sets and universal coalgebras, topos theory, and categorial models of asynchronous parallel distributed computation. In the first half of the paper, we illustrated how categories and functors can be defined in the basic RL framework. We modeled the space of algorithms for MDPs or PSRs as a functor category, where the co-domain category forms a topos, which admits all (co)limits, possesses a subobject classifier, and has exponential objects. In the second half of the paper, we described a broad family of universal coalgebras, extending the dynamic system models studied previously in RL. We introduced the core problem of finding the final coalgebra, and reviewed Lambek’s theorem. Some suggested directions for future work are described below.

1. *Stochastic approximation as Kan extensions*: One popular approach for analyzing the convergence of RL algorithms is through the use of *martingales*. Recent advances in categorial probability theory have shown that the Martingale Convergence Theorem can be viewed as a type of Kan extension [Belle, 2023]. The application of Kan extensions to RL is an area that is worth investigating in more detail.
2. *Primal-dual space RL*: We restricted our analysis of URL to the simplest setting where no function approximation was involved. We proposed a broad framework of proximal RL [Mahadevan et al., 2014] previously, and it would be worth exploring a proximal URL framework as well.
3. *Deep URL*: We briefly showed in Section 10 how to model deep RL as a functor, building on the work of [Fong et al., 2019]. Much more needs to be done here in exploring the compositional structure of deep URL.

## References

- Peter Aczel. *Non-Well-Founded Sets*. CSLI Lecture Notes, Palo Alto, CA, USA, 1988.
- Peter Aczel and Nax Mendler. A final coalgebra theorem. In David H. Pitt, David E. Rydeheard, Peter Dybjer, Andrew M. Pitts, and Axel Poigné, editors, *Category Theory and Computer Science*, pages 357–365, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-46740-3.
- Andrew G. Barto and Sridhar Mahadevan. Recent advances in hierarchical reinforcement learning. *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, 13(4):341–379, October 2003. ISSN 0924-6703. doi: 10.1023/A:1025696116075. URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025696116075>.
- Jonathan Mock Beck. Triples, algebras, and cohomology. *Reprints in Theory and Application of Categories*, 2: 1–59, 2003. URL <http://www.tac.mta.ca/tac/reprints/articles/2/tr2.pdf>.
- J. L. Bell. *Toposes and Local Set Theories*. Dover, 1988.
- Ruben Van Belle. *Kan extensions in probability theory*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2023. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.7488/era/4153>.
- Y. Bengio. Learning deep architectures for AI. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2(1):1–127, 2009.
- Dimitri Bertsekas. *Reinforcement Learning and Optimal Control*. Athena Scientific, 2019.
- Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Dynamic programming and optimal control, 3rd Edition*. Athena Scientific, 2005. ISBN 1886529264. URL <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/314894080>.
- Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. *Parallel and Distributed Computation: Numerical Methods*. Athena Scientific, 1997. ISBN 1886529019.
- M.M. Bonsangue, F. van Breugel, and J.J.M.M. Rutten. Generalized metric spaces: Completion, topology, and powerdomains via the yoneda embedding. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 193(1):1–51, 1998. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(97\)00042-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00042-X). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030439759700042X>.
- Vivek S. Borkar. *Stochastic Approximation: A Dynamical Systems Viewpoint*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Pablo Samuel Castro and Doina Precup. Using bisimulation for policy transfer in mdps. In Maria Fox and David Poole, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2010, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, July 11-15, 2010*, pages 1065–1070. AAAI Press, 2010. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V24I1.7751. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v24i1.7751>.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanbiao Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12948>.

- Frank M. V. Feys, Helle Hvid Hansen, and Lawrence S. Moss. Long-term values in markov decision processes, (co)algebraically. In *Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science: 14th IFIP WG 1.3 International Workshop, CMCS 2018, Colocated with ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14–15, 2018, Revised Selected Papers*, page 78–99, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2018. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 978-3-030-00388-3. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-00389-0\_6. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00389-0\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00389-0_6).
- Brendan Fong, David I. Spivak, and Rémy Tuyéras. Backprop as functor: A compositional perspective on supervised learning. In *34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-27, 2019*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/LICS.2019.8785665. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785665>.
- Tobias Fritz. A synthetic approach to markov kernels, conditional independence and theorems on sufficient statistics. *Advances in Mathematics*, 370:107239, August 2020. ISSN 0001-8708. doi: 10.1016/j.aim.2020.107239. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2020.107239>.
- E Mark Gold. Language identification in the limit. *Information and Control*, 10(5):447–474, 1967. ISSN 0019-9958. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(67\)91165-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(67)91165-5). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019995867911655>.
- Robert Goldblatt. *Topoi: The Categorical Analysis of Logic*. Dover Press, 2006.
- Chris Heunen and Jamie Vicary. *Categories for Quantum Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, November 2019. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780198739623.001.0001.
- R. A. Howard. *Dynamic Programming and Markov Processes*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1960.
- Bart Jacobs. *Introduction to Coalgebra: Towards Mathematics of States and Observation*, volume 59 of *Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2016. ISBN 9781316823187. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316823187. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316823187>.
- Peter T Johnstone. *Sketches of an elephant: a Topos theory compendium*. Oxford logic guides. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, NY, 2002. URL <https://cds.cern.ch/record/592033>.
- Peter T Johnstone. *Topos Theory*. Dover Publications, 2014.
- André Joyal, Mogens Nielsen, and Glynn Winskel. Bisimulation and open maps. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '93), Montreal, Canada, June 19-23, 1993*, pages 418–427. IEEE Computer Society, 1993. doi: 10.1109/LICS.1993.287566. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1993.287566>.
- Daniel Kan. Adjoint functors. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 87(2):294–329, 1958. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1993102>.
- Dexter Kozen and Nicholas Ruzzo. Applications of metric coinduction. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 5(3), 2009. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0908.2793>.
- H. Kushner and G.G. Yin. *Stochastic Approximation and Recursive Algorithms and Applications*. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer New York, 2003. ISBN 9780387008943. URL [https://books.google.com/books?id=\\_0bIieuUJGkC](https://books.google.com/books?id=_0bIieuUJGkC).
- J. Liu, J. Chen, and J. Ye. Large-scale sparse logistic regression. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 547–556. ACM, 2009.
- Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic a First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1992. ISBN 9781461209270 1461209277. URL <http://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-4612-0927-0>.
- Saunders MacLane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5.
- Saunders MacLane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory*. Springer, 1994.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Proto-value functions: developmental reinforcement learning. In Luc De Raedt and Stefan Wrobel, editors, *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference (ICML 2005), Bonn, Germany, August 7-11, 2005*, volume 119 of *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, pages 553–560. ACM, 2005. doi: 10.1145/1102351.1102421. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1102351.1102421>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Universal decision models. *CoRR*, abs/2110.15431, 2021a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.15431>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Universal imitation games. *CoRR*, abs/2110.15431, 2021b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.15431>.

- Sridhar Mahadevan. Universal causality. *Entropy*, 25(4):574, 2023. doi: 10.3390/E25040574. URL <https://doi.org/10.3390/e25040574>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Gaia: Categorical foundations of generative ai, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.18732>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Universal imitation games, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.01540>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. A higher algebraic k-theory of causality. *Entropy*, In Press 2025a. doi: 10.20944/preprints202501.1242.v1. URL <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202501.1242.v1>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet: Categorical homotopy theory for large language models, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10018>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan. Topos causal models, 2025c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.08295>.
- Sridhar Mahadevan, Bo Liu, Philip Thomas, Will Dabney, Steve Giguere, Nicholas Jacek, Ian Gemp, and Ji Liu. Proximal reinforcement learning: A new theory of sequential decision making in primal-dual spaces, 2014.
- J.P. May. *A Concise Course in Algebraic Topology*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, 1999. ISBN 9780226511832. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=g8SG03R1bpgC>.
- J.L. Nazareth and R.B. Kulkarni. Linear programming formulations of markov decision processes. *Operations Research Letters*, 5(1):13–16, 1986. ISSN 0167-6377. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6377\(86\)90094-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6377(86)90094-5). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0167637786900945>.
- Martin L. Puterman. Chapter 8 markov decision processes. In *Stochastic Models*, volume 2 of *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, pages 331–434. Elsevier, 1990. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-0507\(05\)80172-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-0507(05)80172-0). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0927050705801720>.
- Balaraman Ravindran and Andrew G. Barto. SMDP homomorphisms: An algebraic approach to abstraction in semi-markov decision processes. In Georg Gottlob and Toby Walsh, editors, *IJCAI-03, Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Acapulco, Mexico, August 9-15, 2003*, pages 1011–1018. Morgan Kaufmann, 2003. URL <http://ijcai.org/Proceedings/03/Papers/145.pdf>.
- Sahand Rezaei-Shoshtari, Rosie Zhao, Prakash Panangaden, David Meger, and Doina Precup. Continuous MDP homomorphisms and homomorphic policy gradient. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/7f44f98e5e70dea605d0c5baca231c58-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/7f44f98e5e70dea605d0c5baca231c58-Abstract-Conference.html).
- B. Richter. *From Categories to Homotopy Theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2020. ISBN 9781108479622. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=pnzUDwAAQBAJ>.
- E. Riehl. *Category Theory in Context*. Aurora: Dover Modern Math Originals. Dover Publications, 2017. ISBN 9780486820804. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=6B9MDgAAQBAJ>.
- Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A Stochastic Approximation Method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(3):400 – 407, 1951. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729586. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729586>.
- Sherry Shanshan Ruan, Gheorghe Comanici, Prakash Panangaden, and Doina Precup. Representation discovery for mdps using bisimulation metrics. In Blai Bonet and Sven Koenig, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, January 25-30, 2015, Austin, Texas, USA*, pages 3578–3584. AAAI Press, 2015. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V29I1.9701. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v29i1.9701>.
- J. J. M. M. Rutten. A coinductive calculus of streams. *Mathematical Structures in Comp. Sci.*, 15(1):93–147, February 2005. ISSN 0960-1295. doi: 10.1017/S0960129504004517. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129504004517>.
- J.J.M.M. Rutten. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 249(1):3 – 80, 2000. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00056-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00056-6). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397500000566>. Modern Algebra.
- Arthur L. Samuel. Some studies in machine learning using the game of checkers. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 3(3):210–229, July 1959.

- Satinder P. Singh, Michael R. James, and Matthew R. Rudary. Predictive state representations: A new theory for modeling dynamical systems. In David Maxwell Chickering and Joseph Y. Halpern, editors, *UAI '04, Proceedings of the 20th Conference in Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Banff, Canada, July 7-11, 2004*, pages 512–518. AUAI Press, 2004. URL [https://dslpitt.org/uai/displayArticleDetails.jsp?mmnu=1&smnu=2&article\\_id=1148&proceeding\\_id=20](https://dslpitt.org/uai/displayArticleDetails.jsp?mmnu=1&smnu=2&article_id=1148&proceeding_id=20).
- Ana Sokolova. Probabilistic systems coalgebraically: A survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(38):5095–5110, 2011. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2011.05.008>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397511003902>. CMCS Tenth Anniversary Meeting.
- R.J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference. part i. *Information and Control*, 7(1):1–22, 1964. ISSN 0019-9958. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(64\)90223-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(64)90223-2). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019995864902232>.
- Vishal Soni and Satinder Singh. Abstraction in predictive state representations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 22-26, 2007, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada*, pages 639–644. AAAI Press, 2007. URL <http://www.aaai.org/Library/AAAI/2007/aaai07-101.php>.
- Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement learning - an introduction*. Adaptive computation and machine learning. MIT Press, 1998. ISBN 978-0-262-19398-6. URL <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/37293240>.
- Gerald Tesauro. Programming backgammon using self-teaching neural nets. *Artificial Intelligence*, 134(1):181–199, 2002. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702\(01\)00110-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(01)00110-2). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370201001102>.
- J.N. Tsitsiklis. Asynchronous stochastic approximation and q-learning. In *Proceedings of 32nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 395–400 vol.1, 1993. doi: 10.1109/CDC.1993.325119.
- Leslie G. Valiant. A theory of the learnable. *Commun. ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984. doi: 10.1145/1968.1972. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/1968.1972>.
- Vladimir Vapnik. An overview of statistical learning theory. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 10(5):988–999, 1999. doi: 10.1109/72.788640. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/72.788640>.
- Chelsea C. White and Douglas J. White. Markov decision processes. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 39(1):1–16, 1989. ISSN 0377-2217. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(89\)90348-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(89)90348-2). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0377221789903482>.
- H. S. Witsenhausen. The intrinsic model for discrete stochastic control: Some open problems. In A. Bensoussan and J. L. Lions, editors, *Control Theory, Numerical Methods and Computer Systems Modelling*, pages 322–335. Berlin, Heidelberg, 1975. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- N. Yoneda. On ext and exact sequences. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, Sect. I 8:507–576, 1960.