

CS534 - HW 5

Keith Chester

Due date: July 19th 2022

Problem 1

In this problem, we will discuss key concepts in reinforcement learning as we've covered in lectures and reading.

Part 1

In this part we will discuss the differences between Model-based Reinforcement Learning (MBRL) and Model-free Reinforcement Learning (MFRL). First, let's clarify key differences between the two approaches.

- Model-based reinforcement learning learns a model of its environment over time and thus has an idea of the probability of the reward for certain actions prior to taking it. A chess playing agent, for instance, understands the probability of success of a given move prior to taking it. This is because the agent learns an understanding and representation of its environment during training.
- By contrast, Model-free reinforcement learning explores more, lives "more in the moment" by considering its actions at each step. While this means that you may end up creating an agent that avoids optimal performance (chasing highest probability moves of a high reward from the start) it is more robust to interruptions. For example - a (poorly made) robot with reinforcement learning driving its behaviour; a MBRL agent would take maximum reward paths, which may mean in a dynamic environment running into a pedestrian. By contrast the MFRL agent would consider each individual moment/state, and could more easily deal with interruptions such as pesky humans.
- MBRL agents tend to learn quicker and result in better performance - they tend to isolate and train upon the key signals in an environment in which to improve their performance and resulting rewards. MFRL agents do train slower, but are better suited for chaotic dynamic environments or tasks that require ample exploration.

Let's look at some real world examples of each.

For MBRL, we can look at the very famous AlphaGo, an AI that trained to super-human capability at the game of Go and beat the world's reigning champion handily. This agent combined Monte-Carlo Tree Search and a model based reinforcement learning agent where it learned to explore moves. Outside the opening database and tree search utility, it was free to learn the rules of the game itself. Eventually it built a super model that would determine moves with the highest probability of success. (Link: <https://www.deepmind.com/research/highlighted-research/alphago>)

For MFRL, we look towards more modern games - specifically success with Atari games. With advancements in computer vision and deep learning thanks to the introduction of the convolutional neural network, we've begun to see agents that can take visual input and directly derive actions from a more literal "observation" of the environment than some reduced representation of the environment. These agents can directly see all the pixels that a human player would see, and be fed directly a win/loss or video game score based on its performance. Here the agent must explore and react to its environment at the moment in time. While it is unable to fully predict what might be thrown at it, it will react to it with skill. These agents have been used to demonstrate that a singular model architecture and training approach can learn many games. (Link: <https://www.endtoend.ai/envs/gym/atari/>)

Part 2

Now we'll discuss the differences between Passive Reinforcement Learning (PRL) and Active Reinforcement Learning (ARL). We'll again begin by clarifying some key differences between the two approaches.

-

Problem 2

Given the following simple documents:

- Document 1 - "The cat chased a rat"
- Document 2 - "A big rat chased the big dog"

...generate the two document vectors by using several methods.

Bag of words

| Document | the | cat | chased | a | rat | big | dog |
|------------|-----|-----|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|
| Document 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Document 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Bag of 2-grams

| Document | the cat | cat chased | chased a | a rat | a big | big rat | rat chased | chased the | the big | big dog |
|------------|---------|------------|----------|-------|-------|---------|------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Document 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Document 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Bag of 3-grams

| Doc | the cat chased | cat chased a | chased a rat | a big rat | big rat chased | chased the big | the big dog |
|-------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Doc 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Doc 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

TF-IDF

...where we will be using the following equation:

$$w_{i,j} = tf_{i,j} \times \log \frac{N}{df_i} \quad (1)$$

...where $tf_{i,j}$ is the number of occurrences of i in j , df_i is the number of documents containing i , and N is the total number of documents.

| Document | the | cat | chased | a | rat | big | dog |
|------------|-----|-------|--------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Document 1 | 0.0 | 0.060 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Document 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.086 | 0.043 |

...with the only non-zero calculations being for cat, big, and dog, respectively:

$$cat \rightarrow \frac{1}{5} \times \log \frac{2}{1} = 0.060 \quad (2)$$

$$big \rightarrow \frac{2}{7} \times \log \frac{2}{1} = 0.086 \quad (3)$$

$$dog \rightarrow \frac{1}{7} \times \log \frac{2}{1} = 0.043 \quad (4)$$

Part A

Now we aim to compute the cosine of similarity using each of the above text vectorization methods. To do this, we are solving the equation of:

$$\text{similarity}(doc_1, doc_2) = \cos(\theta) = \frac{doc_1 doc_2}{|doc_1||doc_2|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i^2}} \quad (5)$$

First we shall look at bag of words:

$$A \cdot B = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i = (1 * 1) + (1 * 0) + (1 * 1) + (1 * 1) + (1 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) = 4 \quad (6)$$

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2} = \sqrt{1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 0 + 0} = \sqrt{5} = 2.24 \quad (7)$$

$$\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i^2} = \sqrt{1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1} = \sqrt{6} = 2.45 \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i^2}} = \frac{4}{2.24 \cdot 2.45} = 0.73 \quad (9)$$

Then we move onto the cosine of similarity for our 2-gram approach.

$$A \cdot B = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i = (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) = 0 \quad (10)$$

Since we know the numerator will be 0, we can stop here - the similarity will be 0. Moving onto our 3-gram:

$$A \cdot B = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i = (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (1 * 0) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) + (0 * 1) = 0 \quad (11)$$

Once again we see no similarity due to lack of overlap from the 3-gram approach.

Finally we shall look at cosine of similarity for our TF-IDF vectorization: