U.PORTO

FEUP FACULDADE DE ENGENHARIA
UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

Artificial Intelligence

Lecture 6:
Introduction to Reinforcement Learning

Henrique Lopes Cardoso, Luís Paulo Reis

hlc@fe.up.pt, lpreis@fe.up.pt

Machine Learning



What is Reinforcement Learning?

- **Reinforcement Learning (RL)** is focused on goal-directed learning from interaction

- RL is learning what to do – how to map situations to actions – so as to maximize a numerical reward signal
  - The learner is not told which actions to take: it must discover which actions yield the most reward by trying them
  - Typically, actions may affect not only immediate reward but also the next situation and subsequent rewards



➢ *Any* goal can be described by the maximization of expected cumulative reward

RL Problems and Rewards

- Fly stunt maneuvers in a helicopter
  - + reward for following desired trajectory
  - – reward for crashing
- Defeat the world champion at Backgammon
  - +/– reward for winning/losing a game
- Manage an investment portfolio
  - + reward for each $ in bank
- Control a power station
  - + reward for producing power
  - – reward for exceeding safety thresholds
- Make a humanoid robot walk
  - + reward for forward motion
  - – reward for falling over
- Play many different Atari games better than humans
  - +/– reward for increasing/decreasing score

RL vs (Un)Supervised Learning

- Different from supervised learning
  - In interactive problems it is impractical to obtain examples of desired behavior
  - In uncharted territory, an agent must learn from its own experience
- Different from unsupervised learning
  - In RL we try to maximize a reward signal, we do not seek to find hidden structure in collections of unlabeled data
- RL explicitly considers the *whole* problem of a goal-directed agent interacting with an uncertain environment
  - Creating a behavior model while applying it in the environment
- RL is arguably the closest form of ML to the kind of learning humans do

Learning to Play Tic-Tac-Toe



- Rule-based approach
  - Need to hardcode rules for each possible situations that might arise in a game
- Minimax
  - Assumes a particular way of playing by the opponent
- Dynamic programming can compute an optimal solution for any opponent
  - But requires as input a complete specification of that opponent (state/action probabilities)
- Can we obtain such information from experience?
  - Play many games against the opponent!

Learning to Play Tic-Tac-Toe

- States
  - Possible configurations of the board
- Actions
  - Possible moves to make
- Policy
  - Which action should I play in each state?
- Reward
  - How good was the chosen action?



Elements of RL

- Policy π
  - How should the agent behave over time?
  - A policy is a (possibly stochastic) mapping from perceived states to actions
- Reward signal r
  - Defines the goal of the RL problem
  - On each time step, the environment sends a reward to the RL agent
- Value function v
  - Specifies what is good in the long run
  - The value of a state is the total amount of reward an agent can expect to accumulate from that state onwards
- Model of the environment
  - In model-based methods, allows inferences about how the environment will behave
  - Can be used for planning (offline)

➢ We seek actions that bring about states of highest value, not highest reward, because these actions obtain the greatest amount of reward over the long run

Maze Example



Rewards: -1 per time-step
Actions: N, E, S, W
States: Agent's location

Policy: Arrows represent policy $\pi(s)$



Value Function: Numbers represent value $v_\pi(s)$



Sequential Decision Making

- Goal: select actions that maximize total future reward

- Actions may have long term consequences
- Reward may be delayed
- It may be better to sacrifice immediate reward to gain more long-term reward

- Examples:
  - A financial investment (may take months to mature)
  - Refueling a helicopter (might prevent a crash in several hours)
  - Blocking opponent moves (might help winning chances later on)

States and Observability

- The state is a function of the history of observations, actions, and rewards
  - Usually, only a summary of what has happened in the history is relevant (Markov state)
- Agent state: the agent's internal representation of what it has seen
- Fully observable environments: agent directly observes environment state
  - Markov decision process (MDP)
- Partially observable environments
  - Partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP)
  - Agent may have beliefs on possible environment states

Exploration vs Exploitation

- How can an agent find the best actions while maximizing the expected cumulative reward?

- Exploitation
  - Prefer actions known (or estimated) to be effective (in producing reward)
  - Higher short-term reward
- Exploration
  - Try actions not selected before
  - Improve estimates on action values (particularly in stochastic tasks)
    - Lower reward in the short run, but higher in the long run

➢ The exploration-exploitation tradeoff
  - Neither exploration nor exploitation can be pursued exclusively
  - Try a variety of actions and progressively favor those that appear to be best

Exploration vs Exploitation

- Restaurant Selection
  - Exploitation: Go to your favorite restaurant
  - Exploration: Try a new restaurant
- Online Banner Advertisements
  - Exploitation: Show the most successful advertisement
  - Exploration: Show a different advertisement
- Oil Drilling
  - Exploitation: Drill at the best known location
  - Exploration: Drill at a new location
- Game Playing
  - Exploitation: Play the move you believe is best
  - Exploration: Play an experimental move

RL Agent Taxonomy



Bandit Problems

- A simple setting with a single state

- *K*-armed bandit problem
  - There are *k* different actions
  - After each action, a numerical reward is received from a stationary probability distribution
  - Each action has a *value* – its expected or mean reward, not known by the agent: $q_*(a) = \mathbb{E}[R_t|A_t = a]$
  - The agent *estimates*, at time step t, the value of an action a: $Q_t(a)$

Bandit Problems



- Selecting *greedy* actions (whose estimated value is greatest): exploiting
- Selecting non-greedy actions: exploring
  - Improve estimates of non-greedy actions' value
- Lower reward in the short run (during *exploration*), but higher in the long run – after discovering the best actions, we can *exploit* them many times

Estimating Action Values

- Sample average:

$$Q_t(a) = \frac{\text{sum of rewards when } a \text{ taken prior to } t}{\text{number of times } a \text{ taken prior to } t} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} R_i \cdot 1_{A_i=a}}{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} 1_{A_i=a}}$$

- Update rule:

$$Q_{n+1} = Q_n + \frac{1}{n}[R_n - Q_n]$$

$$NewEstimate \leftarrow OldEstimate + StepSize[Target - OldEstimate]$$

  - The target indicates a desirable direction in which to move
  - The *step-size* parameter changes from time step to time step

- Giving more weight to recent rewards – constant *step-size* parameter:

$$Q_{n+1} = Q_n + \alpha[R_n - Q_n]$$

  where $\alpha \in (0,1]$

Action Selection

- *Greedy* action selection (always exploits): $A_t = \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, Q_t(a)$

- *ε-greedy* action selection: behave greedily most of the time, but with small probability ε select randomly from among all the actions
  - $Q_t(a)$ will converge to $q_*(a)$ if a is selected sufficiently often

- *Softmax* action selection (Boltzmann distribution):

$$\Pr\{A_t = a\} = \frac{e^{Q_t(a)/\tau}}{\sum_{b=1}^{k} e^{Q_t(b)/\tau}}$$

where τ is a temperature parameter: if high, actions will tend to be equiprobable; if low, action values matter more; if $\tau \to 0$, then we have greedy action selection

Bandit Algorithm

A simple bandit algorithm

Initialize, for $a = 1$ to k:

$Q(a) \leftarrow 0$

$N(a) \leftarrow 0$

Loop forever:

$$A \leftarrow \begin{cases} \arg\max_a Q(a) & \text{with probability } 1-\varepsilon \quad \text{(breaking ties randomly)} \\ \text{a random action} & \text{with probability } \varepsilon \end{cases}$$

$R \leftarrow bandit(A)$

$N(A) \leftarrow N(A) + 1$

$Q(A) \leftarrow Q(A) + \frac{1}{N(A)}\left[R - Q(A)\right]$

The 10-armed Testbed



averages over 2000 runs



Markov Decision Processes

- In the general setting we have many states
- Markov Decision Processes (MDP) are a classical formalization of sequential decision making
  - The environment is fully observable
  - Actions influence not just immediate rewards, but also subsequent situations (states) and thus future rewards
- In a finite MDP, there is a finite number of states, actions and rewards
- In MDPs we estimate the value $q_*(s, a)$

Agent-Environment Interface



- Dynamics of the MDP:

$$p(s', r|s, a) = \Pr\{S_t = s', R_t = r \mid S_{t-1} = s, A_{t-1} = a\}$$

  - The probability of each possible value for s' and r depends only on the immediately preceding state s and action a
  - The state must include all relevant information about the past agent-environment interaction – Markov property

Example: Recycling Robot

- A robot has to decide whether it should (1) actively search for empty soda cans, (2) wait for someone to bring it a can, or (3) go to home base and recharge
- Searching is better (higher **probability** of getting a can) but runs down battery; if out of battery, the robot has to be rescued
- Decisions made on the basis of current energy level: high, low
- **Reward** is mostly **zero**, **positive** when getting a can, and **negative** if out of battery

$$\mathcal{S} = \{high, low\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(high) = \{search, wait\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(low) = \{search, wait, recharge\}$$

$$r_{search} > r_{wait}$$

s	a	s'	$p(s' \mid s, a)$	$r(s, a, s')$
high	search	high	α	r_{search}
high	search	low	$1 - \alpha$	r_{search}
low	search	high	$1 - \beta$	-3
low	search	low	β	r_{search}
high	wait	high	1	r_{wait}
high	wait	low	0	-
low	wait	high	0	-
low	wait	low	1	r_{wait}
low	recharge	high	1	0
low	recharge	low	0	-

Example: Recycling Robot

- Transition graph



Goals and Rewards

- A reward signal is used to define the goal of the agent



  - Learning to walk: reward on each time step proportional to the robot's forward motion
  - Learning to escape from a maze: reward -1 for any state prior to escape (encourage escaping as quickly as possible)
  - Learning to find empty soda cans for recycling: reward of 0 most of the time, +1 for each can collected
  - Learning to play checkers or chess: reward +1 for winning, -1 for losing, and 0 for drawing and nonterminal positions

Goals and Rewards

- Provide rewards in such a way that by maximizing them the agent will also achieve our goal
  - The agent's goal is to maximize the cumulative reward it receives in the long run

- It is critical that the rewards we set up truly indicate what we want accomplished

→The reward signal is a way of communicating to the robot *what* you want it to achieve, not *how* – it is ***not*** meant to encode prior knowledge (it is part of the environment, not the agent!)

Returns and Discounting

- Agent wants to maximize expected return

$$G_t = R_{t+1} + R_{t+2} + R_{t+3} + \cdots + R_T$$

- Adding discounting: agent wants to maximize expected discounted return

$$G_t = R_{t+1} + \gamma R_{t+2} + \gamma^2 R_{t+3} + \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1} = R_{t+1} + \gamma G_{t+1}$$

  - $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ is the discount rate: the present value of future rewards
    - The value of receiving reward R after $k+1$ steps is $\gamma^k R$
    - The agent values immediate reward above delayed reward
      - If $\gamma = 0$ the agent is "myopic" (only immediate reward matters)
      - As γ approaches 1, the agent becomes more farsighted (strongly considers future rewards)

  - G_t is now finite (if $\gamma < 1$), even if summing an infinite number of terms
    - For instance, if reward is always +1: $G_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k = \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$

Why Discounting Makes Sense

- Mathematically convenient
- Avoids infinite returns in cyclic Markov processes (e.g., in continuing control tasks)

- Uncertainty about the future (for a same state, future rewards may vary)
- If the reward is financial, immediate rewards may earn more interest than delayed rewards
- Animal/human behaviour shows preference for immediate reward

- It is sometimes possible to use undiscounted Markov reward processes ($\gamma = 1$), e.g. if all sequences terminate

Example: Pole Balancing

- Move a cart so as to keep a pole from falling over
  - Failure if the pole falls past a given angle or if the cart runs off the track
  - The pole is reset to vertical after each failure



- Episodic task: repeated attempts to balance the pole
  - reward +1 except when failure:
    return is the number of steps until failure

- Continuing task, using discounting:
  - reward –1 on each failure and 0 otherwise
  - return is $-\gamma^K$, where K is the number of steps before failure

Value Functions

- Most RL algorithms involve estimating value functions
  - How good (in terms of expected return) is it to be in a given state?
  - How good is it to perform a given action in a given state?

- Bellman Equation: the value function can be recursively decomposed into two parts
  - Immediate reward R_{t+1}
  - Discounted value of successor state $\gamma v(S_{t+1})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
v(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left[G_t \mid S_t = s\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma R_{t+2} + \gamma^2 R_{t+3} + \ldots \mid S_t = s\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma \left(R_{t+2} + \gamma R_{t+3} + \ldots\right) \mid S_t = s\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma G_{t+1} \mid S_t = s\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[R_{t+1} + \gamma v(S_{t+1}) \mid S_t = s\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Policies and Value Functions

- Future rewards depend on the choice of actions
  - Value functions are defined with respect to policies (ways of acting)
  - Policy: a mapping from states to probabilities of selecting each possible action
    - $\pi(a|s) = \Pr(A_t = a|S_t = s)$

- State-value function $v_\pi(s)$
  - Expected return when starting in s and following π thereafter
  - $v_\pi(s) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[G_t|S_t = s]$

- Action-value function $q_\pi(s, a)$
  - Expected return when taking action a in state s, and following π thereafter
  - $q_\pi(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_\pi[G_t|S_t = s, A_t = a]$

Bellman Equation

- Bellman equation for $v_\pi(s)$: looking ahead from a state to its possible successor states



Backup diagram for v_π

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_\pi(s) &\doteq \mathbb{E}_\pi[G_t \mid S_t = s] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\pi[R_{t+1} + \gamma G_{t+1} \mid S_t = s] \\
&= \sum_a \pi(a|s) \sum_{s'} \sum_r p(s', r \,|\, s, a) \Big[r + \gamma \mathbb{E}_\pi[G_{t+1} | S_{t+1} = s'] \Big] \\
&= \sum_a \pi(a|s) \sum_{s', r} p(s', r \,|\, s, a) \Big[r + \gamma v_\pi(s') \Big], \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{S}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Averages over all the possibilities, weighting each by its probability of occurring

Bellman Equation

- Bellman equation for $q_\pi(s,a)$: looking ahead from a state-action pair to its possible successor states



q_π backup diagram

$$
\begin{aligned}
q_\pi(s,a) &\doteq \mathbb{E}_\pi[G_t|S_t=s,A_t=a] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\pi[R_{t+1}+\gamma G_{t+1}|S_t=s,A_t=a] \\
&= \sum_{s',r} p(s',r|s,a)[r+\gamma \sum_{a'} \pi(a'|s')q_\pi(s',a')]
\end{aligned}
$$

- Averages over all the possibilities, weighting each by its probability of occurring

Example

- Example: using a random policy, with $\gamma = 0.9$:



Gridworld

Actions

- Off-grid actions have no effect, with $r = -1$
- Any action from A gets to A', with $r = +10$
- Any action from B gets to B', with $r = +5$

3.3	8.8	4.4	5.3	1.5
1.5	3.0	2.3	1.9	0.5
0.1	0.7	0.7	0.4	-0.4
-1.0	-0.4	-0.4	-0.6	-1.2
-1.9	-1.3	-1.2	-1.4	-2.0

v_π

Optimal Policy and Value Function

- Optimal state-value function
  - The maximum value function over all policies

$$v_*(s) = \max_\pi v_\pi(s)\,, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$



- Optimal action-value function
  - The maximum action-value function over all policies

$$q_*(s,a) = \max_\pi q_\pi(s,a), \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$$



- Once we know v_* or q_*, the optimal policy π_* is greedy
  - The expected return is greater than any other policy

Optimal Policy and Value Function



Gridworld

Actions

22.0	24.4	22.0	19.4	17.5
19.8	22.0	19.8	17.8	16.0
17.8	19.8	17.8	16.0	14.4
16.0	17.8	16.0	14.4	13.0
14.4	16.0	14.4	13.0	11.7

v_*



π_*

Policy Evaluation via DP

- Policy evaluation: computing the state-value function v_π for an arbitrary policy π

- Turning Bellman equation into an update:

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_{k+1}(s) &\doteq \mathbb{E}_\pi[R_{t+1} + \gamma v_k(S_{t+1}) \mid S_t = s] \\
&= \sum_a \pi(a|s) \sum_{s',r} p(s', r \mid s, a) \Big[r + \gamma v_k(s') \Big]
\end{aligned}
$$



Backup diagram for v_π

- Iterative solution method: dynamic programming
  - We can maintain two arrays
    - One for the old values $v_k(s)$, one for the new values $v_{k+1}(s)$
  - Or make changes "in place", using a single array (faster convergence)

Iterative Policy Evaluation

Iterative Policy Evaluation, for estimating $V \approx v_\pi$

Input π, the policy to be evaluated
Algorithm parameter: a small threshold $\theta > 0$ determining accuracy of estimation
Initialize $V(s)$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}^+$, arbitrarily except that $V(terminal) = 0$

Loop:
  $\Delta \leftarrow 0$
  Loop for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$:
    $v \leftarrow V(s)$
    $V(s) \leftarrow \sum_a \pi(a|s) \sum_{s',r} p(s', r \,|\, s, a) \left[r + \gamma V(s') \right]$
    $\Delta \leftarrow \max(\Delta, |v - V(s)|)$
until $\Delta < \theta$

Example Grid World



- A bot is required to traverse a grid of 4×4 dimensions to reach its goal (1 or 16)
- Deterministic actions $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{up}, \text{down}, \text{right}, \text{left}\}$
- There are 2 terminal states (1 and 16) and 14 non-terminal states (2 to 15)
- Each step is associated with a reward of -1
- Consider a **random policy**: $\pi(a|s) = 0.25, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}$
- Initialize v_1 for the random policy with all 0s

Example Grid World: Policy Evaluation

- Step 1

1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_1(6) &= \sum_{a\in\{u,d,l,r\}} \pi(a|6) \sum_{s',r} p(s',r|6,a)[r+\gamma v_0(s')] \\
&= \sum_{a\in\{u,d,l,r\}} \underbrace{\pi(a|6)}_{=0.25\ \forall a} \sum_{s'} p(s'|6,a)[\underbrace{r}_{=-1} + \underbrace{\gamma v_0(s')}_{=0\ \forall s'}] \\
&= 0.25 * \{-p(2|6,u) - p(10|6,d) - p(5|6,l) - p(7|6,r)\} \\
&= 0.25 * \{-1-1-1-1\} \\
&= -1 \\
&\Rightarrow v_1(6) = -1
\end{aligned}
$$

- For non-terminal states, $v_1(s) = -1$

- For terminal states, $p(s'|s,a) = 0$
  - And hence $v_k(1) = v_k(6) = 0$, for all k

$v_1 =$

0.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.0

Example Grid World: Policy Evaluation

- Step 2, with discount factor $\gamma = 1$

$$v_2(6) = \sum_{a \in \{u,d,l,r\}} \underbrace{\pi(a|6)}_{=0.25\ \forall a} \sum_{s'} p(s'|6,a)[\underbrace{r}_{=-1} + \gamma \underbrace{v_1(s')}_{=\begin{cases}-1, s' \in S \\ 0, s' \in S^+ \setminus S\end{cases}}]$$

$$= 0.25 * \{p(2|6,u)[-1-\gamma] + p(10|6,d)[-1-\gamma] + p(5|6,l)[-1-\gamma] + p(7|6,r)[-1-\gamma]\}$$

$$\overset{\gamma=1}{=} 0.25 * \{-2-2-2-2\}$$

$$= -2$$

- For all red states, $v_2(s) = -2$



- For the other states (2, 5, 12, 15):

$$v_2(2) = \sum_{a \in \{u,d,l,r\}} \underbrace{\pi(a|2)}_{=0.25\ \forall a} \sum_{s'} p(s'|2,a)[\underbrace{r}_{=-1} + \gamma \underbrace{v_1(s')}_{=\begin{cases}-1, s' \in S \\ 0, s' \in S^+ \setminus S\end{cases}}]$$

$$= 0.25 * \{p(2|2,u)[-1-\gamma] + p(6|2,d)[-1-\gamma] + p(1|2,l)[-1-\gamma*0] + p(3|2,r)[-1-\gamma]\}$$

$$\overset{\gamma=1}{=} 0.25 * \{-2-2-1-2\}$$

$$= -1.75$$

$$\Rightarrow v_2(2) = -1.75$$

$v_2 =$

0.0	-1.7	-2.0	-2.0
-1.7	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0
-2.0	-2.0	-2.0	-1.7
-2.0	-2.0	-1.7	0.0

Example Grid World: Policy Evaluation



Random policy

$k = 0$

0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

$k = 1$

0.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0
-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.0

$k = 2$

0.0	-1.7	-2.0	-2.0
-1.7	-2.0	-2.0	-2.0
-2.0	-2.0	-2.0	-1.7
-2.0	-2.0	-1.7	0.0

$k = 3$

0.0	-2.4	-2.9	-3.0
-2.4	-2.9	-3.0	-2.9
-2.9	-3.0	-2.9	-2.4
-3.0	-2.9	-2.4	0.0

$\cdots$

$k = 10$

0.0	-6.1	-8.4	-9.0
-6.1	-7.7	-8.4	-8.4
-8.4	-8.4	-7.7	-6.1
-9.0	-8.4	-6.1	0.0

$\cdots$

$k = \infty$

0.0	-14.	-20.	-22.
-14.	-18.	-20.	-20.
-20.	-20.	-18.	-14.
-22.	-20.	-14.	0.0

$\leftarrow v_\pi$



Optimal policy

Approximation

- Solving the Bellman optimality equation is equivalent to exhaustive search
  - Impractical for large state spaces

- RL methods can be understood as approximately solving it, using actual experienced transitions in place of knowledge of the expected transitions
  - Model-free approaches

- Optimal policies are computationally costly to find – we can only approximate
  - In tasks with small, finite state sets: tabular methods
  - Otherwise: function approximation using a more compact parameterized function representation (e.g., using neural networks)

→The online nature of RL allows us to *put more effort into learning to make decisions for frequently encountered states*

Model-Free RL



- In model-free methods, we are not given the MDP
  - I.e., we do not assume complete knowledge of the environment
  - We learn directly from *actual* experience, by interacting with the environment

- Two main approaches:
  - Monte Carlo learning
    - Average returns from full sample sequences of states, actions, and rewards (episodic MDPs)
  - Temporal-Difference learning
    - Update estimates based in part on other learned estimates, without waiting for a final outcome
  - TD(λ)
    - Unifies both approaches

Temporal-Difference Learning

- TD methods update estimates based on immediately observed reward and state
- Update rule:

$$V(S_t) \leftarrow V(S_t) + \alpha[R_{t+1} + \gamma V(S_{t+1}) - V(S_t)]$$

- Because TD bases its update in part on an existing estimate (incomplete episodes), it is a *bootstrapping* method

Tabular TD(0) for estimating v_π

Input: the policy π to be evaluated
Algorithm parameter: step size $\alpha \in (0, 1]$
Initialize $V(s)$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}^+$, arbitrarily except that $V(terminal) = 0$

Loop for each episode:
  Initialize S
  Loop for each step of episode:
    $A \leftarrow$ action given by π for S
    Take action A, observe R, S'
    $V(S) \leftarrow V(S) + \alpha[R + \gamma V(S') - V(S)]$
    $S \leftarrow S'$
  until S is terminal



TD(0)

Temporal-Difference Learning

- TD vs Dynamic Programming methods
  - TD methods do not require a model of the environment's dynamics (rewards and next-state probability distributions)
- TD vs Monte Carlo methods
  - TD methods are naturally implemented in an online, fully incremental fashion, while MC methods must wait until the end of an episode
    - Useful if episodes are very long, or in continuing tasks (that have no episodes at all)
- TD combines the sampling of Monte Carlo with the bootstrapping of DP
- Usually, TD methods converge faster than MC methods on stochastic tasks

Monte-Carlo Backup

$$V(S_t) \leftarrow V(S_t) + \alpha\,(G_t - V(S_t))$$



Temporal-Difference Backup

$$V(S_t) \leftarrow V(S_t) + \alpha\left(R_{t+1} + \gamma V(S_{t+1}) - V(S_t)\right)$$



Dynamic Programming Backup

$$V(S_t) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[R_{t+1} + \gamma V(S_{t+1}) \right]$$



Sarsa: On-policy TD Control



- Update rule:

$$Q(S_t, A_t) \leftarrow Q(S_t, A_t) + \alpha[R_{t+1} + \gamma Q(S_{t+1}, A_{t+1}) - Q(S_t, A_t)]$$

  - This rule uses every element of the quintuple of events $(S_t, A_t, R_{t+1}, S_{t+1}, A_{t+1})$

Sarsa (on-policy TD control) for estimating $Q \approx q_*$

Algorithm parameters: step size $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, small $\varepsilon > 0$
Initialize $Q(s, a)$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}^+, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)$, arbitrarily except that $Q(terminal, \cdot) = 0$

Loop for each episode:
  Initialize S
  Choose A from S using policy derived from Q (e.g., ε-greedy)
  Loop for each step of episode:
    Take action A, observe R, S'
    Choose A' from S' using policy derived from Q (e.g., ε-greedy)
    $Q(S, A) \leftarrow Q(S, A) + \alpha\big[R + \gamma Q(S', A') - Q(S, A)\big]$
    $S \leftarrow S'$; $A \leftarrow A'$;
  until S is terminal


Sarsa

- Converges to optimal policy and action-value function if all state-action pairs are visited infinitely and policy converges to greedy (*e.g.* using ε-greedy with $\varepsilon = 1/t$)

Sarsa on the Windy Gridworld

- In the middle region the resultant next states are shifted upward by a “wind”
- Reward = -1 until goal G is reached



- Undiscounted ($\gamma = 1$)
- $\varepsilon = 0.1, \alpha = 0.5$
- Initial values $Q(s, a) = 0$

Q-learning: Off-policy TD Control

- Update rule:

$$Q(S_t, A_t) \leftarrow Q(S_t, A_t) + \alpha \left[R_{t+1} + \gamma \max_a Q(S_{t+1}, a) - Q(S_t, A_t) \right]$$

  - The target policy π is greedy w.r.t. $Q(S, A)$

Q-learning (off-policy TD control) for estimating $\pi \approx \pi_*$

Algorithm parameters: step size $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, small $\varepsilon > 0$
Initialize $Q(s, a)$, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}^+, a \in \mathcal{A}(s)$, arbitrarily except that $Q(terminal, \cdot) = 0$

Loop for each episode:
  Initialize S
  Loop for each step of episode:
    Choose A from S using policy derived from Q (e.g., ε-greedy)
    Take action A, observe R, S'
    $Q(S, A) \leftarrow Q(S, A) + \alpha[R + \gamma \max_a Q(S', a) - Q(S, A)]$
    $S \leftarrow S'$
  until S is terminal



Q-learning

- The learned action-value function Q directly approximates q_*, independently of the policy being followed

Cliff Walking



- Sarsa and Q-learning with ε-greedy action selection ($\varepsilon = 0.1$)
  - Q-learning learns values for the optimal policy
  - Sarsa takes action selection into account and learns the longer but safer path
  - Given exploration, Q-learning occasionally falls off the cliff, hence the lower online performance
- If ε is gradually reduced, both methods converge to the optimal policy

Quiz: The Toothpick Game

- 10 toothpicks
- 2 players take 1, 2 or 3 in turn
- Avoid last toothpick
  - $r(0) = +1 \qquad r(1) = -1 \qquad r(n) = 0, n > 1$

- Using Q-learning with $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.9$, which values of $Q(s, a)$ change in each of the following episodes? (Consider only self-actions, shown in **bold**.)
  - Actions: **2**-1-**2**-3-**1**-1 (States: **10**-8-**7**-5-**2**-1-**0**)
  - Actions: **2**-2-**1**-3-**1**-1 (States: **10**-8-**6**-5-**2**-1-**0**)
  - Actions: **1**-3-**1**-3-**1**-1 (States: **10**-9-**6**-5-**2**-1-**0**)



- After such updates, does the agent win when starting in state 10 and following a greedy policy, assuming the opponent always takes as much toothpicks as it can?

RL Algorithms

Algorithm	Description	Policy	Action Space	State Space
Monte Carlo	Every visit to Monte Carlo	Either	Discrete	Discrete
Q-learning	State–action–reward–state	Off-policy	Discrete	Discrete
SARSA	State–action–reward–state–action	On-policy	Discrete	Discrete
Q-learning - Lambda	Q-learning with eligibility traces	Off-policy	Discrete	Discrete
SARSA - Lambda	SARSA with eligibility traces	On-policy	Discrete	Discrete
DQN [Mnih et al., 2013]	Deep Q Network	Off-policy	Discrete	Continuous
DDPG [Lillicrap et al., 2016]	Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient	Off-policy	Continuous	Continuous
A3C [Mnih et al., 2016]	Asynchronous Advantage Actor-Critic	On-policy	Continuous	Continuous
NAF [Gu et al., 2016]	Q-Learning with Normalized Advantage Functions	Off-policy	Continuous	Continuous
TRPO [Schulman et al., 2015]	Trust Region Policy Optimization	On-policy	Continuous	Continuous
PPO [Schulman et al., 2017]	Proximal Policy Optimization	On-policy	Continuous	Continuous
TD3 [Fujimoto et al., 2018]	Twin Delayed Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient	Off-policy	Continuous	Continuous
SAC [Haarnoja et al., 2018]	Soft Actor-Critic	Off-policy	Continuous	Continuous

RL in Games

- TD-Gammon [Tesauro, 1995]
  - Neural Network trained with self-play reinforcement learning



- Atari 2600 Games [DeepMind, 2013]
  - Learn control policies directly from high-dimensional sensory input using reinforcement learning
  - Q Learning with function approximation (a ConvNet)
  - Input is raw pixels and output is a value function estimating future rewards



RL in Games

- AlphaGo [Google DeepMind, 2016]
  - Convolutional Neural Networks trained with human expert data
  - Policy gradients with MCTS
  - Deep Reinforcement Learning with fictitious self-play





- Poker: Heads-Up Limit Texas Hold'em – NFSP [UCL, 2016]
  - Deep Reinforcement Learning with fictitious self-play
  - No prior knowledge



OpenAI Gym

- OpenAI Gym is a toolkit for developing and comparing RL algorithms
- The gym library is a collection of test problems with a shared interface — environments — that you can use to work out your RL algorithms
  - See also Gymnasium

(a) Toy Text

(b) Atari

(c) Controls

(d) MuJoCo

(e) Doom

(f) Minecraft

Stable Baselines

- OpenAI Baselines is a set of high-quality implementations of RL algorithms
- Stable Baselines 3
  - Stable baselines 3 is for RL what scikit-learn is for ML
  - Tutorial: Reinforcement Learning in Python with Stable Baselines 3



Unity ML-Agents

- With Unity Machine Learning Agents (ML-Agents), you teach intelligent agents through a combination of deep reinforcement learning and imitation learning



Further Reading

- Sutton, R. S. and Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement Learning – An Introduction*, 2nd ed., The MIT Press: Chap. 1-3, 6, 13

- UCL Course on RL (David Silver)

- Tutorial Videos for Deep RL:
  - A friendly introduction to deep reinforcement learning, Q-networks and policy gradients
  - An introduction to Reinforcement Learning
  - Policy Gradient methods and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO)

Conclusions

- RL enables to learn intelligent behavior in complex environments
- Large number of algorithms and approaches
- Amazing results in vintage Atari Games
- Stunning results of AlphaGo and AlphaZero
- Very promising results in Robotics
- Very fast evolution in the last few years
- Impact in diverse areas, from games to robotics to language models (e.g., ChatGPT)