## <span id="page-0-0"></span>Reinforcement Learning for Revenue Management and Dynamic Pricing Supervised by Adam Page

Keelan Adams

Durham University

30/08/24







4 **EL** E



 $\rightarrow$   $\equiv$   $\rightarrow$ 

 $\equiv$ 

### <span id="page-1-0"></span>Table of Contents

#### 1 [The Methodology](#page-1-0)

[The Application](#page-6-0)





#### The Problem

- We are a hotel trying to find an **optimal pricing policy** to maximise our revenue for a particular night
- Depends on how many rooms we have already sold
- Only information we have is observing what happens when we set a chosen price

This idea can be applied to any perishable good



4 **EL** E

 $200$ 

## What is Reinforcement Learning?



- States rooms sold so far
- Actions prices
- **Rewards** revenue

The function  $Q(S, A)$  estimates the expected return taking action A from state S under a given **policy** 

We choose the value of the exploration parameter  $\epsilon$ .

 $\epsilon$ -Greedy Action Selection

With probability  $\epsilon$ : Explore - Pick a random action

With probability  $1 - \epsilon$ : **Exploit** - Pick the action maximising  $Q$  (for the state we're in)

 $\Omega$ 

イ何 ト イヨ ト イヨ トー

4 **EL** E

### Q-Learning

So how do we update  $Q(S, A)$  based on what we've seen?

$$
Q(S_{t+1}, A_{t+1}) \leftarrow \underbrace{(1-\alpha)Q(S_t, A_t)}_{\text{old estimate}} + \underbrace{\alpha\left(R_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q(S_{t+1}, a)\right)}_{\text{new observation}}
$$

Weighted by learning rate  $\alpha$ 



### <span id="page-6-0"></span>Table of Contents

#### [The Methodology](#page-1-0)







### Modelling Customers - No States

- $\bullet$  Each customer has a random willingness to pay W, which decreases with respect to price
- N customers per episode
- Assume prices (actions a) range from £1 £100



#### Modelling Customers - No States

- $\bullet$  Each customer has a random willingness to pay W, which decreases with respect to price
- N customers per episode
- Assume prices (actions a) range from £1 £100

Reward for each customer...

$$
r_i(a) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a & \text{if} \quad W > a \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad W < a \end{array} \right.
$$

Total reward...

$$
R(a) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} r_i(a)}{N}
$$



 $\rightarrow$   $\oplus$   $\rightarrow$   $\rightarrow$   $\oplus$   $\rightarrow$ 

4 **EL F** 

 $\Omega$ 

#### Results - No States



#### **Q−learning Without States, 100,000 Episodes**

100 rooms. Now not every customer who tries to book will get a room.



Figure: Expected return for taking action  $a$  (x-axis) starting from state s (y-axis)

 $\leftarrow$ 

<span id="page-11-0"></span>100 rooms. Now not every customer who tries to book will get a room.



Figure: Expected return for taking action a (x-axis) starting from state s (y-axis)

Figure: Estimates of  $Q(s, a)$  with 1,000,000 episodes - taking action a  $(x-axis)$  starting in state s (y-axis)

### <span id="page-12-0"></span>Tiered Product

Now assume there are multiple tiers of room.

Different customers will have different ways of selecting their preferred tier.

For this toy example, there are 2 tiers.



Actions:  $a = (a_1, a_2)$ ;  $a_1 =$  Tier 1 price;  $a_2 =$  Tier 2 price

Now looking at  $Q(a_1, a_2)$ 

Ignore states here... difficult to present as 4 dim[en](#page-11-0)s[io](#page-13-0)[n](#page-11-0)[al!](#page-12-0)  $AB + AB + AB + AB$ 

Keelan Adams (Durham) [Reinforcement Learning](#page-0-0) 180/08/24 11/22

<span id="page-13-0"></span>Each customer has their fixed  $W$ , goes for most expensive room within their budget

$$
r_i(a_1, a_2) = \begin{cases} a_2 & \text{if } W \ge a_2 \\ a_1 & \text{if } a_1 \le W < a_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } W < a_1 \end{cases}
$$



K ロ > K @ > K 경 > K 경 > X 경

 $\Omega$ 

#### Tiered: Customer 1 - Max Buying

Each customer has their fixed  $W$ , goes for most expensive room within their budget



Figure: Expected reward for taking action  $a_1$  (y-axis) and  $a_2$  (x-axis)

#### Tiered: Customer 1 - Max Buying

Each customer has their fixed  $W$ , goes for most expensive room within their budget



Figure: Expected reward for taking action  $a_1$  (y-axis) and  $a_2$  (x-axis)

Figure: Estimates of  $Q(a_1, a_2)$  with 100,000 episodes - taking action  $a_1$ ( $y$ -axis) and  $a_2$  ( $x$ -axis)

#### Tiered: Customer 2 - Desperate

Customer arrives in the middle of the night willing to pay anything for the room they want



#### Tiered: Customer 2 - Desperate

Customer arrives in the middle of the night willing to pay anything for the room they want



**Q−Learning Values − Q(a1,a2)**

Figure: Estimates of  $Q(a_1, a_2)$  with 100,000 episodes - taking action  $a_1$  (y-axis) and  $a_2$  (x-axis)  $\Omega$ 

Keelan Adams (Durham) [Reinforcement Learning](#page-0-0) 30/08/24 14/22

#### You're at the cinema. Which is the best deal for popcorn?



KID KID KERKER E 1990

You're at the cinema. Which is the best deal for popcorn?



The medium option is a **decoy** 

Can we get a Q-learner to pick up this pricing strategy?



イ何 ト イヨ ト イヨ トー

4 **EL** E

#### Tiered: Customer 4 - Utility Maximisation

Customer sets willingness to pay for each tier:

$$
\textbf{W}=(\textit{W}_1,\textit{W}_2)
$$

#### Customer wants to maximise (positive) difference:

$$
W_i-a_i
$$



**KORK EXTERN EL ARCH** 

#### Tiered: Customer 4 - Utility Maximisation

**Q−Learning Values − Q(a1,a2)**



Figure: Estimates of  $Q(a_1, a_2)$  with 100,000 episodes - taking action  $a_1$  (y-axis) and  $a_2$  (x-axis)



 $\left\{ \left. \right. \left. \oplus \right. \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right\} \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \right. \left. \left. \right. \left. \right. \left. \left$ 

 $\leftarrow$   $\Box$   $\rightarrow$ 

Do we really need to do joint updates of  $Q(a_1, a_2)$ ? What if we just had separate updates  $Q(a_1)$  and  $Q(a_2)$ ?



Do we really need to do joint updates of  $Q(a_1, a_2)$ ? What if we just had separate updates  $Q(a_1)$  and  $Q(a_2)$ ?



Table: Optimal actions based on joint and separate Q-learning updates

KED KARD KED KED E LORO

### <span id="page-24-0"></span>Table of Contents

#### [The Methodology](#page-1-0)

[The Application](#page-6-0)





### Function Approximation

Computing  $Q(S, A)$  for all S, A is costly for large state/action spaces (or impossible for continuous!)

Instead we estimate as a value function:

 $\hat{q}(s, a, \mathbf{w}) \approx q(s, a)$ 

We update the parameter **w**, trying to minimise the mean-squared error between our approximate  $\hat{q}$  and true  $q$ :

$$
J(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[ (q(s, a) - \hat{q}(s, \mathbf{w}))^2 \right]
$$

We adjust  $J(\mathbf{w})$  in the direction of negative gradient each episode, to find the global minimum

Keelan Adams (Durham) [Reinforcement Learning](#page-0-0) 180/08/24 20/22

**KEIN KARIK SEIN SEIN KARIK KEIN KARI** 

Alternatives to  $\epsilon$ -greedy action selection?

#### Increasing Model Complexity:

- Booking in Advance
- Multiple Night Stays
- Competition/Locational Factors

G.  $\Omega$ 

4. 重

4 **EL** E

# <span id="page-27-0"></span>Thank you for listening!



