NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY SINGAPORE

# Introduction to Data Science and Artificial Intelligence

## Agent Decision Making and Reinforcement Learning

Assoc Prof Bo AN

*Research area*: artificial intelligence, computational game theory, optimization
www.ntu.edu.sg/home/boan
*Email*: boan@ntu.edu.sg
*Office*: N4-02b-55

# Lesson Outline



- Utility Theory
- Two methods for computing optimal policy
  - Value iteration
  - Policy iteration
- Temporal difference learning

# Beliefs and Uncertainty



# Maximum Expected Utility



- Expected Utility

$$EU(A \mid E) = \sum_i P(Result_i(A) \mid E, Do(A)) U(Result_i(A))$$

- Principle of Maximum Expected Utility
  - Choose action A with highest $EU(A \mid E)$

# Example

Robot

Turn Right → Hits wall (P = 0.1; U = 0)
Finds target (P = 0.9; U = 10)

Turn Left → Fall water (P = 0.3; U = 0)
Finds target (P = 0.7; U = 10)

Choose action “Turn Right”

# The Agent-Environment Interface




Agent and environment interact at discrete time steps: $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

Agent observes state at step $t$: $s_t \in S$

Produces action at step $t$: $a_t \in A(s_t)$

Gets resulting reward: $r_{t+1} \in \Re$

And resulting next state: $s_{t+1}$



# Making Complex Decisions



- Make a sequence of decisions
  - Agent's utility depends on a sequence of decisions
  - Sequential Decision Making
- Markov Property
  - Transition properties depend only on the current state, not on previous history (how that state was reached)
  - Markov Decision Processes

# Markov Decision Processes



- Components:
  - *Markov* **States** s, beginning with initial state $s_0$
  - **Actions** a
    - Each state s has actions A(s) available from it
  - **Transition model** P(s' | s, a)
    - *assumption*: the probability of going to s' from s depends only on s and a and not on any other past actions or states
  - **Reward function** R(s)
- **Policy** $\pi(s)$: the action that an agent takes in any given state
  - The "solution" to an MDP

# Game Show

- A series of questions with increasing level of difficulty and increasing payoff
- Decision: at each step, take your earnings and quit, or go for the next question
  - If you answer wrong, you lose everything



# Game Show

- Consider $50,000 question
  - Probability of guessing correctly: 1/10
  - Quit or go for the question?
- What is the expected payoff for continuing?

  0.1 * 61,100 + 0.9 * 0 = 6,110
- What is the optimal decision?



# Game Show

- What should we do in Q3?
  - Payoff for quitting: $1,100
  - Payoff for continuing: 0.5 * $11,100 = $5,550
- What about Q2?
  - $100 for quitting vs. $4,162 for continuing
- What about Q1?



# Grid World




R(s) = -0.04 for every non-terminal state

Transition model:






Source: P. Abbeel and D. Klein

# Goal: Policy








Source: P. Abbeel and D. Klein

# Grid World




Transition model:




R(s) = -0.04 for every non-terminal state

# Grid World




Optimal policy when R(s) = -0.04 for every non-terminal state

Question to think:

- Grid World is not a finite game and thus the backward induction approach cannot work. Please think about how we can compute optimal policy of the Grid World.

# Solving MDPs



- MDP components:
  - **States** s
  - **Actions** a
  - **Transition model** P(s' | s, a)
  - **Reward function** R(s)
- The solution:
  - **Policy** $\pi(s)$: mapping from states to actions
  - How to find the optimal policy?

# Maximising Expected Utility



- The optimal policy should maximise the *expected utility* over all possible state sequences produced by following that policy:

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{state sequences} \\ \text{starting from } s_0}} P(\text{sequence})U(\text{sequence})$$

- How to define the utility of a state sequence?
  - Sum of rewards of individual states
  - Problem: infinite state sequences

# Utilities of State Sequences



- Normally, we would define the utility of a state sequence as the sum of the rewards of the individual states
- **Problem:** infinite state sequences
- **Solution:** *discount* the individual state rewards by a factor $\gamma$ between 0 and 1:

$$U([s_0, s_1, s_2, \ldots]) = R(s_0) + \gamma R(s_1) + \gamma^2 R(s_2) + \ldots$$

$$= \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t) \leq \frac{R_{\max}}{1-\gamma} \qquad (0 < \gamma < 1)$$

  - Sooner rewards count more than later rewards
  - Makes sure the total utility stays bounded
  - Helps algorithms converge

# Utilities of States



- Expected utility obtained by policy $\pi$ starting in state s:

$$U^{\pi}(s) = \sum_{\substack{\text{state sequences} \\ \text{starting from s}}} P(\text{sequence})U(\text{sequence})$$

- The “true” utility of a state, denoted U(s), is the expected sum of discounted rewards if the agent executes an *optimal* policy starting in state s
- Reminiscent of minimax values of states…

# Finding the Utilities of States




- What is the expected utility of taking action **a** in state **s**?

$$\sum_{s'} P(s'|s,a)U(s')$$

- How do we choose the optimal action?

$$\pi^*(s) = \arg\max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s'|s,a)U(s')$$

- What is the recursive expression for U(s) in terms of the utilities of its successor states?

$$U(s) = R(s) + \gamma \max_a \sum_{s'} P(s'|s,a)U(s')$$

# The Bellman Equation

- Recursive relationship between the utilities of successive states:

$$U(s) = R(s) + \gamma \max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s' | s, a) U(s')$$



# The Bellman Equation



- Recursive relationship between the utilities of successive states:

$$U(s) = R(s) + \gamma \max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s' \mid s, a) U(s')$$

- For *N* states, we get *N* equations in *N* unknowns
  - Solving them solves the MDP
  - We could try to solve them through expectimax search, but that would run into trouble with infinite sequences
  - Instead, we solve them algebraically
  - Two methods: **value iteration** and **policy iteration**

# Method 1: Value Iteration

- Start out with every $U(s) = 0$
- Iterate until convergence
  - During the $i$th iteration, update the utility of each state according to this rule:

$$U_{i+1}(s) \leftarrow R(s) + \gamma \max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s' \mid s, a) U_i(s')$$

- In the limit of infinitely many iterations, guaranteed to find the correct utility values
  - In practice, don't need an infinite number of iterations…

# Value Iteration

- What effect does the update have?

$$U_{i+1}(s) \leftarrow R(s) + \gamma \max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s' \mid s, a) U_i(s')$$



# Method 2: Policy Iteration

- Start with some initial policy $\pi_0$ and alternate between the following steps:
  - **Policy evaluation:** calculate $U^{\pi_i}(s)$ for every state $s$
  - **Policy improvement:** calculate a new policy $\pi_{i+1}$ based on the updated utilities

$$\pi^{i+1}(s) = \arg\max_{a \in A(s)} \sum_{s'} P(s' \mid s, a) U^{\pi_i}(s')$$

Question to think:

- Both value iteration and policy iteration require the knowledge of the transition model P(s' | s, a). Can we learn a good policy if we don't know the transition model P(s' | s, a)?

# TD(Temporal difference) Prediction

**Policy Evaluation (the prediction problem)**:

for a given policy *p*, compute the state-value function $V^{\pi}$

The simplest TD method, TD(0):

$$V(s_t) \leftarrow V(s_t) + \alpha\left[r_{t+1} + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)\right]$$

**target**: an estimate of the return

# Simplest TD Method

$$V(s_t) \leftarrow V(s_t) + \alpha\left[r_{t+1} + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t)\right]$$



# Advantages of TD Learning

- TD methods do not require a model of the environment, only experience
- TD methods can be fully incremental
  - You can learn before knowing the final outcome
    - Less memory
    - Less peak computation
  - You can learn without the final outcome
    - From incomplete sequences

# Further Reading [AAAI'18: http://www.ntu.edu.sg/home/boan/papers/AAAI18_Malmo.pdf]



We Won 2017 Microsoft Collaborative AI Challenge

- Collaborative AI
  - *How can AI agents learn to recognise someone's intent (that is, what they are trying to achieve)?*
  - *How can AI agents learn what behaviours are helpful when working toward a common goal?*
  - *How can they coordinate or communicate with another agent to agree on a shared strategy for problem-solving?*

# Further Reading [AAAI'18: http://www.ntu.edu.sg/home/boan/papers/AAAI18_Malmo.pdf]

- Microsoft Malmo Collaborative AI Challenge
  - *Collaborative mini-game, based on an extension "stag hunt"*
  - *Uncertainty of pig movement*
  - *Unknown type of the other agent*
  - *Detection noise (frequency 25%)*
- Our team HogRider won the challenge (out of more than 80 teams from 26 countries)
  - *learning + game theoretic reasoning + sequential decision making + optimisation*