MOPS Model-Based Learning nPk = n! Rewards of discounted uply Round: Trunsitions: # (S,a,5' R(s,a,s')U([ro, ... ro])= 2 rtrt & Rmax #(5,a) n(c= n!, Model Free Learning Value Iteration Passive Reinforcement V0(5) =0 $V_{k+1}(s) = \max_{\alpha} \sum_{s'} T(s,\alpha,s') [R(s,\alpha,s') + \gamma V_k(s')]$ Drect Eval -fix plicy Th repeat until convergence 0(52A) - Truck utility & count of transitions - compute est, val whatitylvisids Bell own Equations v*(s) = max Q*(s,u) optimal val of a state TD Learing sample = R(s, π(s), s')+ y V"(s') Q*(s,a)= 5 T(s,a,s')[R(s,a,s')+ x V*(s')] Update: YT(5)= (1-d) YT(5) + (d) sample optimal value of (s,a) is expected val of an VT(s) = VT(s) + ol sample - VT(s)) agent utility after taking a firm s and acting ystimally 0-Learning (off-policy learning) Blig Evaluation QKHI (S,a) = 5 T(S,a,s') [R(S,a,s')+r max QK(S',a') O(52) per iteration VoT(s)=0 $V_{k+1}^{\pi}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau(s, \pi(s), s') \left[R(s, \pi(s), s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s') \right]$ Leain Uli, a) values as you go sample = R(sa,s')+ rmax Q(s',a') Policy Extraction $\mathcal{Q}(s,a) = (1-d)\mathcal{Q}(s,a) + (d)$ [sample] T*(5) = arymax S.T(s,a,s') [R(s,a,s')+}V*(s')] Q-val Iteration QK+1 (S,W)= ST(S,Q,S') [R(S,Q,S')++ max Qk(S,Q')] Hirry Iteration $V_{k+1}^{T_{\ell}}(s) = \sum_{s'} T(s, \pi_{\ell}(s), s') \left[R(s, \pi_{\ell}(s), s') + \gamma_{k}^{T_{\ell}}(s') \right]$ Approximate &-learing - feature bused representation improvement. Theta(s) = arymax 5, T(s,a,s') [R(s,a,s')+7VTE(s')] - use V & Q as linear value functions (U(s,a)= W, f, (s,a) + wzfzls,a)+ ... + Whfn(s,a) Probability $P(A|B) = \frac{P(A) \cdot P(B|A)}{P(B)} = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)} =$ Transitions = (S,a,r,s') difference = $[r + r \max_{a'} Q(s', a')] - Q(s, a)$ Junt: PlA,B)= P(B) P(A1B) ()(s,a) = Q(s,a) + & [difference] Exact Q's P(x1,x2, ... Xn) = TT P(x2 | x, ... X = 1) Wi= Wi + & Edifference Ifils,a) Approx. Q's Buyes Net E-greedy can calculate any pub using chain rule - prub 05 E E 1 oct rundonly and explore ul prub E - act : we (1-E) whom puting Interence Variable etimination - large & is mostly random 1. Jun (multidy) factors involving X Exploration for 2. Sum out X factors are unnumetized Mudified O-updak: Q(s,a) = aR(s,a,s')+ ymax f(Q(s'a') P(AIB) = P(A) × P(BIA) N (5, w1) -(u,n)= u+ k encouraged to explore states less P(A) & P(BIA) + P(A) *P(BIA) visited softmax output is between O and 1 Buckporp hi=file) hi=files z=hihz (total sums to (Prob distribution) of - hather + high

csp. Search Problems a = B iff in every wild where a is consists of the, B is also true - State space - all possible states variables - Successor In: takes in state, action domains and computes cost and successor state construints N var. domain size of >0(dN) assignment To prove : model checking - start state: initial state unary sonly on I variable Theorem proving -search for a sequence of proof steps binary = construint bit two var. - goal test: test if state is youl Backtmeking search: leading from d to B Manhattan distance = 1x1-x21+1Y1-y21 -fix var order & assyn vuls a>β=7β=7元 Admissibility: 4n, 0 < h(n) < h*(n) - don 4 assign proviously assigned values a⇒B= TaVB g(n): total backmard cost comp. by UCS (one cost) - If no value, backtrack a NBE NBB ABOX) almospath prune the domains of uncerh(n): estimated forward with 7(anb)= 72V7B prune the domains of unassigned TLAVB) = TX NTB of(n)+h(n): total cost used by are 2N(BUT) = (2NB) V(2N7) consistency: YA, C, h(A)-h(c) < cost(A, c) variables that share constraint w dv (Bny) = (avb) n (dvy) & docreuses H(G)=0 to be admissible & consistent I. Eary Termination; return consistency => admissibility h(A) < cost(A, c)+h(c) are consistency as sun as satisfied X-> Y is consistent iff for every Uninance: hathe if An, haln) > he(n) 2. Pure symbols = only X in the tail there's some Y drows up positive or roy. which could be assigned who vislating can be assigned immediately Search -DF3 = explores deepest node, LIFO stuck brouching depth a constraint. 3. Unit clause: clause who just one literal ora If X loses a value, rerythans of X -detects failure earlier than formend checking disjunction of one complete: no, can get caught in cycles Time: worst case O(bm)
optimal: no space: O(bm) BFS: Selects shallowest node. FIFO queue O(n2d3) can be reduced to O(n2d2) fulses. complete yes, it sol'n exists Time O(bs), solution at depth s If kB contains A and A= B, ne can inter B MRV = chose variable not fenest valid optimal: no, clossn't account for cust. space: 0(65)
optimal if all edges = 1 If KB untains AAB remaining values UCS: selects lowest cost. Heap based par cost we ran inter A or B ILCY: select volve that prures the least values from domains of unassigned wis If KB contains A complete types, if sol'n exists time: O(b cx/E) and B we can inter ANB K-consistency optimal: yes, as long as positive edges Space: Olb -guarantees for any set of knodes c'optimal path cost in csp, an assignment to any k-1 nucles E are cost of ct guarantees kth node will have one considert value Informed Search Greedy: selects lowest heuristic node, same as us, but forward cost instead of bookward k=2 = are consistency huper k -> hunder to compute · complete: No optimal ino, bud heuristic A* : selects lowest estimated total cost to gual, PW using back & forward complete. Yes optimal: yes (if consistent & admissible) For Ak optimal - can be solved in O(nd²) from O(od²)

Tree search

Tree search

Tree search

Tree search Tree-structured aph south

and notes to set, never expand a state twice graph milliple times - formund pass assymment - who backtack cutset conditioning Graph Sourch find smallest subset of vars Forward chaining proof in constraint graph at removal makes a tree. i. From (7) Enlo, y/By inter Abut ... $O((n-c)d^2)$ (remove cares) hounes deterministic = actions determined From (1) & y infer that .. O (d (n-c)d2) total time Stochastic: actus juntom local search (Herative improvement) Backerent Chaining proof minimux:0(bm) 1. Goul HE B+ T. From (8), two row subguils - selects var that violates most constants and neset to value that violates the least constinants Alpha-Beth Phinning Time Comp. ((5 mis) - not optimal or complete a) Gouls HEyl YNON Min 6) Goal: H+06 B+7

Probability Prior Samphing Decision Networks Chain: P(AIB) = P(A)P(BIA) Sps (x1, .. xn) = $EU(ale) = \sum P(X_1, ... \times nle) U(a_1 X_1, ..., Y_n)$ Taj. TI P(XI Parents (XI)) P(B) Joint: P(A, B) = P(A) P(BIA) highest utility is MEU = P(X1, 12, Xn) Query war Evidence Ex: EU ()eavel bad) = & P(wlbad) ((leave, w) sample procedure consistent P(Q1...Q12 |e1...e12) Hidden vars Eu(takel bod) = & (wl bad) U(take, w) Inference by enumeration (compute everything) MEU (F=bud) = mux EU (albad) Bayes Net VPI -> how much max expected utility - acyclic graph of nodes node Parents garned from info - and dist for each node P(XI A, ... An) Similar to - can calculate any probusing chain rule Buyes Net VPL(E'|e) = MEU(e,E') - MEU(e) $P(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i | parents(X_i))$ Markon Mule 1 = 5, P(e'1e) MEU(e,e') - Transistan model P(Xt/Xt-1) Inference Nariable elimination - Stationary Assumption = transitan pubs are same NPI (F) = MEU(F) - MEU(B) 1. Juin factors involving X - X++1 75 indep. Xo, ..., X+-1 given Xt z. Sum out X Properties of VPI tactors are unnormalized P(X0, 1.1, X+1) = P(X6) TI+ P(X+1X+-1) numegativity: YE', e VPI(E'le)>0 Sampling nunadditivity: NPI (Fs, Ekle) + VPI (Esle) + VPI (Ekle) Rejection sampling reject samples that don't match evadence If we know both gives more into than just one Markov Blunket: consist of a VPI(B,C) > VPI(B)+VPI(C) Likelihood weighting variable's parents, children, If B= (then VPI(B, W < VPI(B) + VPI(C) set evidence vor and weight - 1 one gives just as much into as other multiply weight by sampled variables children other parents Order-Independence that affect evidence variables $VPI(E_j, E_k | e) = VPI(E_j | e) + VPI(E_k | e, E_j) = VPI(E_k | e) + VPI(E_j | e, E_k)$ - P(TI+C,+e), set w;=1 Probability -sample t Belief dist, - W5=W3. P(+c/t), of seeingthe Mini Forward algorithm B(w.) = P(Wilfi, 1, fi) evidence wil k louf nodes, neights 0(2) $Pr(W_{i+1}) = \sum_{w \in V} Pr(W_i, W_{i+1})$ belief = Prob Wi given evidence -set evidence, then random assign rest $= \sum_{w_{\overline{i}}} \Pr(w_{\overline{i+1}}|w_{\overline{i}}) \Pr(w_{\overline{i}})$ = P(wilfie) - pick one, clear and resomple w/ assigned vors B'(wi) = P(Wilfi, ..., fil) evidence upto - resample P(-a)+c,+b) Stationary (sume as mini furuard) = P(Wolf, 10-1) X from P(X/markov-blunket(x)) P(We+1) = P(We) D-separation Forward Alg B'(W1+1) = \$\frac{\pi}{\pi_{\tau}} P(W1+1 | WI) B(W1) = & P(WHIIWE) P(WE) 1. shade observed 2. Enumerate path X-Y P(W00+1)=P(W00) 3. If all triples on path active, active B(Wi+1) & Pr (fi+1 | Wi+1) B'(Wi+1) Vertibi Aly 4. If no active path, X, Y are and indep. $B(w_{t+1}) \propto Pr(f_{t+1}|w_{t+1}) \leq Pr(w_{t+1}|w_t) B(w_t)$ me [xt] = maxxiit-1 P(Xiit, elit) Active Inactive = max P(et1xt) P(xt1xt-1) max P(x1:t-1,e1:t-1) Time elapse:
X1:t-2 delermine 1 0->0->0 0->0->0 determine B'(W7+1) from B(WI) = P(etlyt) max P(Ytl/Yt-1) mt-1 [Yt-1] Obsupdate: Name Bayes B(WEL) from B'(WEL) prediction(fi,..., fn) = arymax P(Y=y | Fi=fi,... Fv=fn) Initial distribution P(Xo) = arymax p(Y=y) If P(Fi=filt=y) Laplace Smoothing TrunsHun model: P(Xe/Xe-1) PMLE(X)= count(X) P(Y, F, =f,,, Fr=fn) = [P(Y=y, F, =f,, , Fv=fn)] serour model: P(EtlXt) and indep evidence [P(Y=yn, Fi=fi, in Fx=fn] Just = Plyo,x,...,XT,ET) PLAP, K(x) = count(x)+k Likelihood (i,id) = P(X))T(+=):T P(X+|X+-1)P(F+|X+) log (L(0)) = log (7 Po(xz)) 2(0)= Po(X1, ... Xn) FILL WOLW, PLAP, K(X/y) = count(X,y) +K ٧= 2,..., N WELL (WO,..., WF-2, F1,... if no thata, pub just a factor so can be taken out 1(0) = 1 Po(xz) countly) + KIXI FT-13/ WI-1 of derivative ∀i= 2,...,n; Fi 11 (Wo,...Wi-1, Fl,...) $P(x) = \frac{1}{|x|}$ To 2(0) = 0 (gradient) Fi-1/1Wi Fi are observations

Max likelihood geom dist

P(FE=11Y=ham) corresponds to counting the # of homemails in which word appears and dividing it by the total that ham emails

Particle simulation

observe weights

resample: sample we wints by using neights to create distributions for samples.

Assign particle per new distribution

Time-elopse update: bused off aurent particle assignment, use prob of next timestep as

distribution and assign based off a new sample Observation update incalculate weight of each particle given new evidence

2. calc total weight for each state (it needed) 3.7f sums to 0, reinitialize

4. else normalize and resample particles as above

Each particle is moved by sampling its next porting from the transition model

x' = sample (P(x'|x))

Fix observation, similar to likelihood neighting

Mx)=P(elx)

f(x) & P(e1X)f'(X)

Resumple: rather than trucking veighted samples, we resample N times, choose from our weighted sample distribution equivalent to renormalizing the distribution

Perception

activation w(x) = Swift(x) = w'.f(x)

olassify(x): {+ if activation(x)>0

Brnany Perception Alg

1. Init all weights to 0

2. For each trainsample, f(x) and true class labe |

YKE (-1, +1) do.

y= closerfy (x) = { +1 if oct. = w f(x)>0

compare predicted label to true label it y = yx, do nothing

elseupdate

wew+y*.fx)

Multi-class Perception

$$W_0 = [-2 \ 2 \ 1]$$
 $f(x) = [-2 \ 3 \ 1]$

$$W_1 = CO 347$$

 $W_2 = [1.4-2]$ So=11 S₁=13 S₂=8

- if s, not correct, subtract feature from S, would predict SI -add feature to correct weight

POMOPS

State S, Actions A, Trunsition func P(5) S, a), Remards K, Observations O, obs func P(ols) (or O(s,o))

keW

g(z)=max(0, 2)

g'(2)= {0, 0+harvise

Frantient Ascent

d = learning rate init W

for iter = 1,2, .-

wt wtax Vg(w)

Significations of for Hyperbolic Tungent 2 g(7)=e2-e g(z) = 1+e== "

g'(z)= g(z) (1-g(z)) g'(z)= 1-g(z)2

f(x) = g(h(x)) f'(x) = g'(h(x))h'(x)

Deckin Tree

Split on node w/ most into gained 4 all positive or all regative