

LEARNING SEARCH STRATEGIES FROM HUMAN
DEMONSTRATIONS

DISSERTATION (2014)

SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, DOCTORAL
PROGRAM ON MANUFACTURING SYSTEMS AND ROBOTICS

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE
(EPFL)

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

GUILLAUME DE CHAMBRIER

THESIS COMMITTEE:

Prof. Alireza Karimi, president of the jury
Prof. Aude Billard, thesis advisor
Prof. Hannes Bleuler, examiner
Prof. Jochen Steil, examiner
Prof. Ron Alterovitz, examiner

Lausanne, Switzerland
October, 2016

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation

Taking long term decisions or spontaneous reactive actions when presented with incomplete information or partial knowledge is paramount to the survival of any biological entity. Reasoning given uncertainty is a continuously occurring event throughout our livelihood. When considering long term decisions an abundance of examples come to mind; In economic investments uncertainty is, to the best of efforts, quantified and minimised. Reactive actions are just as common; When looking for the snooze button of an alarm clock, early in the morning, our hand seems to autonomously search the surrounding space, picking up sensory cues, gradually acquiring information which we utilise (or not) to guide us towards the button; Trying to connect a plug to a an occluded power socket under a desk, whilst being crouched, requires the integration of perceptions into a belief such to quantify the uncertainty which we can act upon to achieve the connection. Abilities close to these are not yet present in Artificial intelligence (AI) & robotics.

It is not yet fully understood how decisions are taken; yet alone under uncertainty. The difficulty is that two processes responsible for the synthesis of our actions, our beliefs and desires, are not directly measurable. The first attempt at modelling the humans decision making process was in mathematics & economics ([Bernoulli \(1954\)](#), [Von Neumann and Morgenstern \(1990\)](#)), where emphasis was on predicting discrete choices formulated as a gamble. It is only recently in Motion and Neuroscience that more incites have been gained.

Artificial intelligence & robotics considered early on uncertainty in decision making, where the predominant application domain was spatial navigation ([Cassandra et al. \(1996\)](#)). The problem is composed into of two parts: the construction and representation of a world model (the map) and a planner which can reason with respect to this model such to accomplish an objective. The world construction problem has attracted a large amount of research with many successfully applications in a wide spectrum of robotic domains (AUV, UAV, etc..). The planning problem is less well developed and is based on either representing the decision problem as a partially observable markov decision process (POMDP) which are notoriously difficult to solve for large scale problems, or through search

heuristics. The mapping problem can generally be solved when assuming the uncertainty is Gaussian and thus quantifiable by a few parameters and the uncertainty originates from the imprecision of the sensors. As for the planning problem solutions are feasible under the restrictive assumption of a discretization of the world, observations and actions of the robot. As a result there are very few examples where uncertainty is considered in an optimal decision make process when considering a continuous state, action and observation space.

In summary there are still open problems in decision making when considering partial observability, whilst the mapping problem has been studied under a constraining set of assumptions. In this thesis we address both problems under extreme levels of uncertainty. For the decision making side we leverage humans foresight and reasoning in a Learning from Demonstration (LfD) (Billard et al. (2008)) framework, which is used to transfer skills from an expert teacher (usually a human) to a robot. Examples include the transfer of kinematic task constraints, stiffness and impedance constraints and motion primitives, just to name a few. It has been shown, for the moment being, both humans and animals are far better at navigation than robots especially when uncertainty is present (Stankiewicz et al. (2006)). For the mapping problem we develop a Bayesian filter which is non-parametric and has no explicit representation of a joint distribution.

1.2 Contribution

In this thesis we bring to light two main ideas. The first is the transfer of human behaviour to robots in tasks where a lot of uncertainty is present, making them difficult to solve using traditional techniques. The second is a non-parametric Bayesian state space filter.

Throughout the work in this thesis we consider case studies in which vision is not available; leaving tactile and haptic information. This choice was made to induce a high level of uncertainty making it easier to study. As a consequence the tasks we consider are by nature, haptic and tactile searches.

1.2.1 LEARNING TO REASON WITH UNCERTAINTY AS HUMANS

A Markov Decision Process (MDP) allows to formulate a decision problem in terms of states, actions, a discount factor and a cost function. Given this formulation and a suitable optimisation method (dynamic programming, temporal difference, etc..) a set of optimal decision rules are returned, known as a policy. The benefit of this approach is that the policy is non-myopic and realises the importance of initial sub-optimal actions which might at first be necessary to achieve the task in the long run. A Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP), is a generalisation of an MDP to a hidden state space and

only observation are available relating to the state space. An exact solution to a POMDP is only feasible in simple toy problems (Thrun et al. (2005b)) and existing approximate solutions are tailored for discretized representation of states, actions and observations.

In this thesis we propose a Learning from Demonstration approach to solving the POMDP problem in haptic and tactile search tasks. Our hypothesis is that if we know the mental state of the human expert in terms of his believed location and observe his actions we can learn a statistical policy which mimics his behaviour. Since the human’s beliefs are not directly observable we infer them by assuming that the way we integrate behaviour is similar to a Bayesian filter. There is evidence both in cognitive and neuroscience that this is the case (Bake et al. (2011)). From the expert human demonstrations of the task we learn a cognitive model of the humans decision process by learning a generative joint distribution over his beliefs and actions. The generative distribution is then used as a control policy. By this approach we are able to have a policy which can handle uncertainty similarly to humans.

1.2.2 NON-PARAMETRIC BAYESIAN STATE SPACE FILTER

Simultaneous Localisation and Mapping (SLAM) is concerned with the development of filters to accurately and efficiently infer the state parameters (position, orientation,...) of an agent and aspects of its environment, commonly referred to as the map. It is necessary for the agent to achieve situatedness which is a precondition to planning and reasoning. The predominant usage of SLAM algorithm make the assumption that uncertainty is related to the noise in the sensor measurements. In our haptic search tasks there is no visual information and a very large amount of uncertainty. Most of the sensory feedback is negative information, a term used to denote the non event of a sensor response from the objects (aka landmarks) in question. In the absence of recurrent sightings or direct measurements of objects there are no correlations from the measurement errors which can be exploited.

In this thesis we propose a new SLAM filter, which we name Measurement Likelihood Memory Filter (MLMF), in which no assumptions are taken with respect to the shape of the uncertainty (it can be Gaussian, multi-modal, uniform, etc..) and motion noise. From the loose assumptions we stipulate regarding the marginals, we adopt a histogram parametrisation (this is considered non-parametric because a change in a parameter has a local effect). The conceptual difference between the MLMF and standard SLAM filters such as EKF is that we avoid representing the joint distribution since it would entail a shattering space and time complexity. This is achieved by keeping track of the history of measurement likelihood functions. We demonstrate that our approach gives the same filtered marginals as a histogram filter. In such a way we achieve a Bayes

filter which has both linear space and time complexity. This filter is well suited to tasks where the landmarks are not directly observable.

1.2.3 REINFORCEMENT LEARNING IN BELIEF SPACE

We propose a Reinforcement Learning framework for the task of searching and connection a power plug to a socket, with only haptic and tactile information. We previously addressed this setup by learning a generative model of the beliefs and actions with data provide by human demonstrations following the LfD approach. However, it is usually the requirement in such setups that the teach is an expert, with few notable exceptions (Rai et al. (2013)). Since we were solely learning a statistical controller, bad and good demonstrations will be mixed in together. By introducing a cost function representing the task we can explicitly have a quality metric of the provided demonstrations. In this way we can optimise the parameters of our generative model to maximise the cost function. In this LfD Reinforcement Learning setup with a very simple cost function we can have a significant improvement of our a policy.

1.3 Thesis outline

The thesis is structured accordingly to the three main contributions outlined in the previous section, and three will have their individual chapter. We first provide and background chapter situating our work in the scientific community and give a conclude with a discussion of the contributions and impact of our work.

In this chapter we review the background literature which are the pillars of this thesis, namely: *Decision Theory*, *Theory of Mind* and *Reasoning under uncertainty*. These three topics are the root nodes of their own respective fields and we do not seek to do all of them justice individually, but highlight their relevance and contribution to our work.

BACKGROUND

Planning and reasoning under uncertainty is central to robotic and artificial intelligence research and has been an active area of research for decades. Acting under uncertainty is an umbrella term which touches a wide spectrum of fields: *economics, psychology, cognitive science, neuroscience, robotics* and *artificial intelligence*. The work in this thesis relies on results and assumptions made in cognitive and neuroscience with respect to our beliefs and how we act given them. We complement these results by introducing them in a new light to the field of robotics and demonstrate how the human reasoning and belief system can be used in situations where the state space is partially observable. The second main theme our work builds on is state space estimation. The third component acting given uncertainty in robotics. We make use of results from all three fields. We provide a background overview of acting under uncertainty and situate our work within the state of the art.

This chapter unfolds as follows:

2.1 Planning and Uncertainty

2.1.1 THE PROBLEM

2.1.2 BELIEF SPACE

2.1.3 SUMMARY

[Hansen \(1998\)](#)

TREE SEARCH

$b = (\mu, \Sigma)$ [He et al. \(2008\)](#), [Prentice and Roy \(2009\)](#)

$b = (\mu, \Sigma)$

[Erez and Smart \(2010\)](#), [Brooks and Williams \(2011\)](#), [Platt et al. \(2010\)](#)

Optimal control methods represent the belief by a Gaussian function

[Martinez-Cantin et al. \(2009\)](#), [Spaan and Vlassis \(2005\)](#), [Thrun et al. \(2005a\)](#)

[Hauser \(2010\)](#)

[Ross et al. \(2008\)](#)

[He et al. \(2011\)](#)

2.2 Human and uncertainty




Figure 2.1: ad




Figure 2.2: ad

REFERENCES

- Chris Bake, Joshua. Tenenbaum, and Rebecca Saxe. Bayesian theory of mind: Modeling joint belief-desire attribution. In *Thirty-Third Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, pages 2469–2474, 2011.
- D. Bernoulli. Exposition of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk (1748). *Econometrica*, 22(1):23–36, 1954.
- A. Billard, S. Calinon, R. Dillmann, and S. Schaal. Robot programming by demonstration. In B. Siciliano and O. Khatib, editors, *Handbook of Robotics*, pages 1371–1394. Springer, Secaucus, NJ, USA, 2008.
- Alex Brooks and Stefan Williams. A monte carlo update for parametric pomdps. In Makoto Kaneko and Yoshihiko Nakamura, editors, *Robotics Research*, volume 66 of *Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics*, pages 213–223. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011. ISBN 978-3-642-14742-5. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-14743-2_19. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14743-2_19.
- A. R. Cassandra, L. P. Kaelbling, and J. A. Kurien. Acting under uncertainty: discrete bayesian models for mobile-robot navigation. In *Intelligent Robots and Systems '96, IROS 96, Proceedings of the 1996 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, volume 2, pages 963–972 vol.2, Nov 1996. doi: 10.1109/IROS.1996.571080.
- Tom Erez and William D. Smart. A scalable method for solving high-dimensional continuous pomdps using local approximation. In *Conf. on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2010.
- Eric A. Hansen. Solving pomdps by searching in policy space. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI'98*, pages 211–219, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1998. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. ISBN 1-55860-555-X. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2074094.2074119>.
- Kris Hauser. Randomized belief-space replanning in partially-observable continuous spaces. In David Hsu, Volkan Isler, Jean-Claude Latombe, and Ming C. Lin, editors, *WAFR*, volume 68 of *Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics*, pages 193–209. Springer, 2010.
- Ruijie He, S. Prentice, and N. Roy. Planning in information space for a quadrotor helicopter in a gps-denied environment. In *Robotics and Automation, 2008. ICRA 2008. IEEE International Conference on*, pages 1814–1820, May 2008. doi: 10.1109/ROBOT.2008.4543471.

- Ruijie He, Emma Brunskill, and Nicholas Roy. Efficient planning under uncertainty with macro-actions. *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 40(1):523–570, January 2011. ISSN 1076-9757. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2016945.2016959>.
- Ruben Martinez-Cantin, Nando de Freitas, Eric Brochu, Jos   Castellanos, and Arnaud Doucet. A bayesian exploration-exploitation approach for optimal online sensing and planning with a visually guided mobile robot. *Autonomous Robots*, 27(2):93–103, 2009. ISSN 0929-5593. doi: 10.1007/s10514-009-9130-2. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10514-009-9130-2>.
- R. Platt, R. Tedrake, L. Kaelbling, and T. Lozano-Perez. Belief space planning assuming maximum likelihood observations. In *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems*, Zaragoza, Spain, June 2010.
- S. Prentice and N. Roy. The belief roadmap: Efficient planning in belief space by factoring the covariance. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 8 (11-12):1448–1465, December 2009.
- Akshara Rai, Guillaume De Chambrier, and Aude Billard. Learning from failed demonstrations in unreliable systems. In *Humanoid Robots (Humanoids), 2013 13th IEEE-RAS International Conference on*, pages 410–416. IEEE, 2013.
- St  phane Ross, Joelle Pineau, St  bastien Paquet, and Brahim Chaib-draa. Online planning algorithms for pomdps. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 2008.
- Matthijs T. J. Spaan and Nikos Vlassis. Planning with continuous actions in partially observable environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3469–3474, Barcelona, Spain, 2005.
- B.J. Stankiewicz, G.E. Legge, J.S. Mansfield, and E.J. Schlicht. Lost in virtual space: Studies in human and ideal spatial navigation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*.(under review), 32(3):688–704, 2006.
- Sebastian Thrun, Wolfram Burgard, and Dieter Fox. *Probabilistic Robotics (Intelligent Robotics and Autonomous Agents)*. The MIT Press, 2005a. ISBN 0262201623.
- Sebastian Thrun, Wolfram Burgard, and Dieter Fox. *Probabilistic Robotics (Intelligent Robotics and Autonomous Agents)*. The MIT Press, 2005b.
- John Von Neumann and O. Morgenstern. *The theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton, 3 edition, 1990.