# Shale gas

A decision tree example

Andrew J. Sims

July 2020

#### Introduction

Kamiński et al (2018, Fig 7) provide an example of a decision tree with multiple decision nodes, including some that are descendants of another decision node. This vignette illustrates how rdecision can be used to model a complex decision tree, using the example from Figure 7 of Kamiński et al (2018).

#### The problem

Kamiński et al (2018) state the problem as follows:

Consider an investor owning a plot of land, possibly (a priori probability amounting to 70%) hiding shale gas layers. The plot can be sold immediately (800, all prices in \$'000). The investor can build a gas extraction unit for a cost of 300. If gas is found, the profit will amount to 2,500 (if not there will be no profit, and no possibility of selling the land). Geological tests can be performed for a cost of 50, and will produce either a positive or negative signal. The sensitivity amounts to 90% and the specificity amounts to 70%. The installation can be built after the test or the land may be sold for 1000 (600) after a positive (negative) test result.

# Creating the model

The model, comprising three decision nodes, four chance nodes, nine leaf nodes and 15 edges, is constructed as follows. Costs, benefits and probabilities are associated with each edge, which must be an Action or a Reaction object.

```
# nodes

d1 <- DecisionNode$new("d1")

d2 <- DecisionNode$new("d2")

d3 <- DecisionNode$new("d3")

c1 <- ChanceNode$new("c1")

c2 <- ChanceNode$new("c2")

c3 <- ChanceNode$new("c3")

c4 <- ChanceNode$new("c4")

t1 <- LeafNode$new("t1")

t2 <- LeafNode$new("t2")

t3 <- LeafNode$new("t2")

t3 <- LeafNode$new("t4")

t5 <- LeafNode$new("t5")

t6 <- LeafNode$new("t6")
```

```
t7 <- LeafNode$new("t7")
t8 <- LeafNode$new("t8")
t9 <- LeafNode$new("t9")
# probabilities
p.sens <- 0.9
p.spec <- 0.7
p.gas <- 0.7
p.nogas <- 1-p.gas
p.ptest <- p.sens*p.gas + (1-p.spec)*p.nogas</pre>
p.ntest <- (1-p.sens)*p.gas + p.spec*p.nogas</pre>
p.gas.ptest <- p.sens*p.gas / p.ptest</pre>
p.gas.ntest <- (1-p.sens)*p.gas / p.ntest</pre>
# edges
E <- list(
  Action$new(d1,t1,"sell",benefit=800),
  Action$new(d1,c1,"dig",cost=300),
  Reaction$new(c1,t2,p=p.gas,benefit=2500,label="gas"),
  Reaction$new(c1,t3,p=p.nogas,label="no gas"),
  Action$new(d1,c2,"test",cost=50),
  Reaction$new(c2,d2,p=p.ntest,label="negative"),
  Action$new(d2,t4,"sell",benefit=600),
  Action$new(d2,c3,"dig",cost=300),
  Reaction$new(c3,t5,p=p.gas.ntest,benefit=2500,label="gas"),
  Reaction$new(c3,t6,p=(1-p.gas.ntest),label="no gas"),
  Reaction$new(c2,d3,p=p.ptest,label="positive"),
  Action$new(d3,t7,"sell",benefit=1000),
  Action$new(d3,c4,"dig",cost=300),
  Reaction$new(c4,t8,p=p.gas.ptest,benefit=2500,label="gas"),
  Reaction$new(c4,t9,p=(1-p.gas.ptest),label="no gas")
)
# tree
V \leftarrow list(d1,d2,d3, c1,c2,c3,c4, t1,t2,t3,t4,t5,t6,t7,t8,t9)
DT<-DecisionTree$new(V,E)
```

The decision tree can be drawn using the draw method of DecisionTree:

| n  | X    | У |
|----|------|---|
| 1  | 13.5 | 0 |
| 2  | 12.0 | 2 |
| 3  | 24.0 | 2 |
| 4  | 3.0  | 1 |
| 5  | 18.0 | 1 |
| 6  | 9.0  | 3 |
| 7  | 21.0 | 3 |
| 8  | 24.0 | 1 |
| 9  | 0.0  | 2 |
| 10 | 6.0  | 2 |
| 11 | 15.0 | 3 |
| 12 | 6.0  | 4 |
| 13 | 12.0 | 4 |
| 14 | 27.0 | 3 |
| 15 | 18.0 | 4 |
| 16 | 24.0 | 4 |
|    |      |   |

27

## Evaluating the strategies

There are a total of 12 possible strategies (3 choices from node  $\mathtt{d1} \times 2$  choices at node  $\mathtt{d2} \times 2$  choices at node  $\mathtt{d3}$ ). But some of these are not unique. For example if the choice at node  $\mathtt{d1}$  is "sell," the choices at nodes  $\mathtt{d2}$  and  $\mathtt{d3}$  (4 possible combinations) are unimportant; all four such strategies are identical. In identifying strategies, **rdecision** discards non-unique strategies, and uses the labels of an arbitrarily chosen strategy within each identical group as the identifier for the strategy; i.e. "sell/sell/sell" also represents the identical "sell/sell/dig," "sell/dig/sell" and "sell/dig/dig."

Similarly, four strategies with choice "dig" at node d1 are identical. Removing the six repeated strategies leaves a total of six possible strategies to evaluate.

Unique strategies are identified by rdecision automatically. Method evaluate calculates the expected cost, benefit and utility of each traversable path for each strategy, and aggregates by strategy. The results for the gas problem are computed as follows. Payoff is defined as benefit minus cost.

```
# find optimal strategies
RES <- DT$evaluate()
RES$Payoff <- RES$Benefit-RES$Cost</pre>
```

This gives the following payoff for each unique strategy:

| d1                   | d2   | d3   | $\operatorname{Cost}$ | Benefit | Payoff |
|----------------------|------|------|-----------------------|---------|--------|
| sell                 | sell | sell | 0                     | 800     | 800    |
| $\operatorname{dig}$ | sell | sell | 300                   | 1750    | 1450   |

| $\overline{d1}$       | d2                   | d3                   | Cost | Benefit | Payoff |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------|---------|--------|
| test                  | sell                 | sell                 | 50   | 888     | 838    |
| $\operatorname{test}$ | $\operatorname{dig}$ | sell                 | 134  | 895     | 761    |
| $\operatorname{test}$ | sell                 | $\operatorname{dig}$ | 266  | 1743    | 1477   |
| $\operatorname{test}$ | $\operatorname{dig}$ | $\operatorname{dig}$ | 350  | 1750    | 1400   |

The optimal strategy is test/sell/dig, i.e. test, sell if negative and dig otherwise. The expected payoff from this strategy is 1477.

### References

Kamiński, Bogumil, Michal Jakubczyk, and Przemyslaw Szufel. 2018. "A Framework for Sensitivity Analysis of Decision Trees." Central European Journal of Operational Research 26: 135–59. https://doi.org/10.007/s10100-017-0479-6.