

Agent-Based Models in Practice

EES 4760/5760

Agent-Based and Individual-Based Computational Modeling

Jonathan Gilligan

Class #23: Tuesday November 12 2019

Ways to use models

Ways to use models

1. Detailed predictions
2. Theory-building
3. What-if analysis

Detailed Predictions

Detailed Predictions

- Develop model:
 - Theory-driven
 - Use existing theory
 - Data-driven
 - Need *lots* of observations/data
 - Look for patterns in data
 - Describe patterns mathematically
- Calibrate model
 - Mathematical theory has parameters
 - Adjust parameters to make model agree with past observations
- Validate & Verify

Validation & Verification

- **Cross-validation** (for comparing theories):
 - Divide data into k parts: $1 \dots k$
 - Each part has a turn as test set":
 - Fit model parameters to the other parts
 - Compare predictions to test set.
 - Choose model that performs best over the k comparisons.
- **Hold-out testing** (for estimating predictive accuracy):
 - Divide data into *hold-out* and *training* data:
 - Divide *training* data into k parts
 - Use *cross-validation* to choose best model
 - Calibrate best model on full *training* set
 - Test predictions against *hold-out* set to estimate predictive power

Theory-Building

Theory-Building

- Similar to detailed prediction
 - Detailed prediction often uses very complicated models to capture all the relevant details of the real world
 - Theory-building often uses simplified models to capture just the most important aspects of what makes the real-world system tick.

What-if analysis

What-if analysis

- Does not necessarily need data
- Start with simple theory or hypothesis
- Explore implications

Robust Policy Analysis

- How to make policy under extreme uncertainty:
 - R. Lempert: [Making policy for the next 100 years](#)
 - planning for climate change, technological revolutions, etc.
 - You can't predict what will happen
 - Division:
 - *policy variables* (things you can control),
 - *external variables* (things you can't control).
 - Use ***lots*** of model runs (BehaviorSpace goes nuts)
 - Which sets of *policy variables* avoid catastrophic outcomes across the widest range of *external variables*?

Realistic Expectations


Realistic Expectations

- Most ABM work ***does not*** aspire to make detailed predictions
- Much focuses on either theory-building or what-if analysis

Example of Detailed Predictions: 2014 Ebola Epidemic

2014 Ebola Outbreak

- Ebola hemorrhagic fever is highly infectious through contact with blood or other bodily fluids
 - It also spreads from contact with infected fruit bats and non-human primates
 - 40–50% of infected people die
- Outbreak began in spring 2014 in Guinea
- By summer:
 - Spread to Sierra Leone and Liberia with additional cases in Mali, Nigeria, and Senegal




- 100 new cases per week
- In July, U.S. Government asked computational biologists to develop models of outbreak.

Agent-Based Modeling of Ebola Outbreak

- Goals of model:
 - Determine how bad the outbreak will become
 - Provide guidance on number and location of field hospitals
 - Develop plan to field-test experimental vaccine
- Challenges
 - Simple equations can predict general properties of disease spread
 - Spread of Ebola also depended on:
 - Detailed geography and transportation networks
 - Human behavior and social/familial relationships
 - These required agent-based models
- Relief agencies needed answers in *weeks*

Schematic structure of model




Parameterizing and Calibrating the Model

- The models needed detailed data that was hard to get
 - At first the team had a high-school student doing a summer internship get up early every morning to look up data on the Facebook page of the Sierra Leone public health ministry
 - An undergraduate student intern would enter the data into a computer.
 - Later, they assigned a graduate student to work full time on gathering and entering the data.
- The models were tracking millions of people. They needed powerful supercomputers to run.
- This initial modeling let them forecast that if the epidemic was not controlled, there would be between 500,000 and 1,400,000 cases by January 2015.
- This was the decisive factor in President Obama's decision to send U.S. military to help.

What-If Modeling for Policy Guidance

- The next steps were to use the model to guide policy decisions in responding to the epidemic.
 - By October, health workers were providing better data and the model was doing well at tracking the spread of the epidemic.
 - One Friday in October, the government asked the modelers to tell them where to put mobile hospitals.
 - Cargo planes would be taking off Monday morning
 - This required predicting not just the size of the epidemic, but the detailed locations of where sick people would be over the next several weeks and months.
 - The team worked all weekend and produced the necessary predictions.

Model Predictions



The Role of Human Behavior

- Another important aspect of the spread of the disease is behavioral:
 - Traditional mourning practices include washing and touching the body of the deceased.
 - This spreads infection
 - Agent-based models predicted that changing these behaviors would dramatically reduce the spread of disease.
 - Public health experts were skeptical that people would change their behaviors
 - In the end, people *did* change behavior to adopt quarantine and safer burial practices.
- The epidemic ended in January 2016.
 - The final toll was 28,000 cases and 11,000 deaths
 - This was far less than would likely have occurred if the epidemic had gone untreated.

Vaccine Testing

- At the time of the epidemic, there was a new experimental vaccine for Ebola, but it had not been tested on people.
- The agent-based models were used to design the field tests.
- Question: How fast would the disease spread?
 - Would it be necessary to vaccinate everyone in the area?
 - Or could health workers use a “ring” strategy?
 - Vaccinate only the people who had first- or second-degree contact with a victim.
 - The model said that a ring strategy would work.
- The vaccine was tested and proved up to 100% effective at preventing Ebola.
- Agent-based models played several important roles in guiding the international response.

Example Research Model

Example Research Model

J.J. Jordan *et al.*, “Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness,”
Nature **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

- Cooperation and Cheating
 - Common situation:
 - Everyone is better off if everyone cooperates than if everyone cheats.
 - Once everyone else has chosen their action, any individual is better off cheating than cooperating.
 - *Nash equilibrium*: Everyone making the best choice for himself produces the worst outcome for everyone.
 - Opposite of the “invisible hand” in economics.

Prisoner's Dilemma

	B Cooperates	B Defects
A Cooperates	5, 5	0, 7
A Defects	7, 0	1, 1

- No matter what player A does, player B is better off defecting
- No matter what player B does, player A is better off defecting
- If both players defect, both are worse off than if both cooperated.

Tragedy of the commons

- Ten farmers share a pasture.
- A pasture can support 100 cows.
- If $N_{\text{cows}} \leq 100$, each cow produces \$1,000 worth of milk per month.
- If $N_{\text{cows}} > 100$, each cow produces

$$\$1,000 \times \left(1 - \frac{(N_{\text{cows}} - 100)}{100} \right)$$

worth of milk per month.

- Each farmer has 10 cows, each farmer earns \$10,000 per month.
- One farmer adds 1 cow: total 101.
 - Each cow produces $\$1000 \times (1 - (101 - 100)/100) = \990 .
 - First farmer earns $(11 \times \$990 = \$10,890)$,
 - Everyone else earns \$9,900.
- Each farmer adds 1 cow: total 110.
 - Each cow produces \$900. Each farmer earns \$9,900.

Iterated games

- If only playing once, best strategy is to cheat, because it is rational for everyone else to cheat.
- If playing multiple turns, threat of punishment in future rounds promotes cooperation.
- It is generally costly to punish people.
- If someone cheats against you, it's often worthwhile to punish them.
- If you see someone cheating against another person and you aren't affected, is it worth your while to punish the cheater, even if it costs you?
- Does tragedy of commons inhibit people from punishing?

Game Theory

- Punishment sends a signal:
 - Deters cheaters.
 - Signals that you are trustworthy.

Game

Game

- Player has two roles: **Signaler** and **Chooser**
- **Signaler** can be either *Trustworthy* or *Exploitative*.
- Two kinds of signals: *Helping* or *Punishing* a third party.
- Two stages:
 1. **Signalers** can pay costs to send signals.
 2. **Choosers** decide whether to accept **Signalers** as partners.
- Cost of signaling can be either small (s) or large (ℓ)

J.J. Jordan *et al.*, "Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness," *Nature* **530**, 473 (2016). doi:[10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

Payoffs


- Payoffs after second stage are:

	Trustworthy Signaller	Exploitative Signaller
Chooser Accepts	m, r	$-e, r$
Chooser Rejects	$0, 0$	$0, 0$

- m is benefit of mutual cooperation,
- r is reward for being trustworthy,
- e is harm from exploitation.

J.J. Jordan *et al.*, "Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness," *Nature* **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

Rational strategies




Agent-based model

Agent-based model

- Signaler randomly chosen to be Trustworthy or Exploitative.
- Chooser does not know Signaler type
- Evolution of strategies:
 - Each agent plays a certain number of turns (a generation)
 - Agents have probability of reproducing based on earnings from game.
 - Offspring inherit strategy with some random “mutations”

J.J. Jordan *et al.*, “Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness,” *Nature* **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

Outcome of evolution



Human Game

Human Game

- Amazon Mechanical Turk (Internet)
- Human players assigned to one of three games:
 1. Signaler can only punish.
 2. Signaler can only help.
 3. Signaler can help and punish.


J.J. Jordan *et al.*, "Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness," *Nature* **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

Trust Game

- To check whether signals are interpreted accurately by Chooser agents, run a second game:
 - Chooser gets some money M .
 - Chooses how much to *send* to Signaler (x).
 - Money sent to Signaler is tripled (Signaler get $3x$)
 - Signaler decides how much of the $3x$ to *return* to Chooser.


J.J. Jordan *et al.*, "Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness," Nature **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)

Perception of signaling:




- Chooser shows trust by sending more money to Signalers who punish and who help.
- Helping is a more powerful signal to Chooser than punishing.
- This matches theory of rational behavior.

Actual signaliing



- Signalers who punish are more trustworthy: return more money to Chooser.
- Helping is indeed a more accurate signal of trustworthiness.

Signaler Choice



- Signaler is less likely to punish when helping is an option.

Conclusions

- Evolved strategies of agents match both pure theory (rational strategy) and experimental results.
- It is advantageous for third parties to carry out costly punishments when the punishments can signal trustworthiness to others in the community.
- When there are less costly or more effective ways to signal trustworthiness, third parties are less likely to punish.

J.J. Jordan *et al.*, "Third-party punishment as a costly signal of trustworthiness," *Nature* **530**, 473 (2016). [doi:10.1038/nature16981](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16981)