


# CS 188: Artificial Intelligence


## Markov Decision Processes II



Instructors: Dan Klein and Pieter Abbeel --- University of California, Berkeley

# Example: Grid World

- A maze-like problem
  - The agent lives in a grid
  - Walls block the agent's path
- Noisy movement: actions do not always go as planned
  - 80% of the time, the action North takes the agent North
  - 10% of the time, North takes the agent West; 10% East
  - If there is a wall in the direction the agent would have been taken, the agent stays put
- The agent receives rewards each time step
  - Small “living” reward each step (can be negative)
  - Big rewards come at the end (good or bad)
- Goal: maximize sum of (discounted) rewards




# Recap: MDPs

- Markov decision processes:

- States S
- Actions A
- Transitions  $P(s' | s, a)$  (or  $T(s, a, s')$ )
- Rewards  $R(s, a, s')$  (and discount  $\gamma$ )
- Start state  $s_0$


- Quantities:

- Policy = map of states to actions
- Utility = sum of discounted rewards
- Values = expected future utility from a state (max node)
- Q-Values = expected future utility from a q-state (chance node)



# Optimal Quantities


- The value (utility) of a state  $s$ :  
 $V^*(s)$  = expected utility starting in  $s$  and acting optimally
- The value (utility) of a q-state  $(s,a)$ :  
 $Q^*(s,a)$  = expected utility starting out having taken action  $a$  from state  $s$  and (thereafter) acting optimally
- The optimal policy:  
 $\pi^*(s)$  = optimal action from state  $s$




# Gridworld Values $V^*$



# Gridworld: Q\*



# The Bellman Equations



How to be optimal:

Step 1: Take correct first action

Step 2: Keep being optimal


# The Bellman Equations

- Definition of “optimal utility” via expectimax recurrence gives a simple one-step lookahead relationship amongst optimal utility values

$$V^*(s) = \max_a Q^*(s, a)$$

$$Q^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s')]$$

$$V^*(s) = \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s')]$$



- These are the Bellman equations, and they characterize optimal values in a way we'll use over and over

# Value Iteration


- Bellman equations **characterize** the optimal values:

$$V^*(s) = \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s')]$$

- Value iteration **computes** them:


$$V_{k+1}(s) \leftarrow \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V_k(s')]$$

- Value iteration is just a fixed point solution method
  - ... though the  $V_k$  vectors are also interpretable as time-limited values




# Convergence\*

- How do we know the  $V_k$  vectors are going to converge?
- Case 1: If the tree has maximum depth  $M$ , then  $V_M$  holds the actual untruncated values
- Case 2: If the discount is less than 1
  - Sketch: For any state  $V_k$  and  $V_{k+1}$  can be viewed as depth  $k+1$  expectimax results in nearly identical search trees
  - The difference is that on the bottom layer,  $V_{k+1}$  has actual rewards while  $V_k$  has zeros
  - That last layer is at best all  $R_{\text{MAX}}$
  - It is at worst  $R_{\text{MIN}}$
  - But everything is discounted by  $\gamma^k$  that far out
  - So  $V_k$  and  $V_{k+1}$  are at most  $\gamma^k \max|R|$  different
  - So as  $k$  increases, the values converge




# Policy Methods

---




# Policy Evaluation

---




# Fixed Policies

Do the optimal action



Do what  $\pi$  says to do




- Expectimax trees max over all actions to compute the optimal values
- If we fixed some policy  $\pi(s)$ , then the tree would be simpler – only one action per state
  - ... though the tree's value would depend on which policy we fixed

# Utilities for a Fixed Policy


- Another basic operation: compute the utility of a state  $s$  under a fixed (generally non-optimal) policy
- Define the utility of a state  $s$ , under a fixed policy  $\pi$ :  
 $V^\pi(s)$  = expected total discounted rewards starting in  $s$  and following  $\pi$
- Recursive relation (one-step look-ahead / Bellman equation):

$$V^\pi(s) = \sum_{s'} T(s, \pi(s), s')[R(s, \pi(s), s') + \gamma V^\pi(s')]$$




# Example: Policy Evaluation

Always Go Right



Always Go Forward



# Example: Policy Evaluation

Always Go Right



Always Go Forward




# Policy Evaluation

- How do we calculate the V's for a fixed policy  $\pi$ ?
- Idea 1: Turn recursive Bellman equations into updates (like value iteration)


$$V_0^\pi(s) = 0$$

$$V_{k+1}^\pi(s) \leftarrow \sum_{s'} T(s, \pi(s), s')[R(s, \pi(s), s') + \gamma V_k^\pi(s')]$$



- Efficiency:  $O(S^2)$  per iteration
- Idea 2: Without the maxes, the Bellman equations are just a linear system
  - Solve with Matlab (or your favorite linear system solver)

# Policy Extraction



# Computing Actions from Values

- Let's imagine we have the optimal values  $V^*(s)$
- How should we act?
  - It's not obvious!
- We need to do a mini-expectimax (one step)



$$\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s')]$$

- This is called **policy extraction**, since it gets the policy implied by the values


# Computing Actions from Q-Values

- Let's imagine we have the optimal q-values:

- How should we act?

- Completely trivial to decide!


$$\pi^*(s) = \arg \max_a Q^*(s, a)$$



- Important lesson: actions are easier to select from q-values than values!

# Policy Iteration

---




# Problems with Value Iteration

- Value iteration repeats the Bellman updates:

$$V_{k+1}(s) \leftarrow \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V_k(s')]$$

- Problem 1: It's slow –  $O(S^2A)$  per iteration
- Problem 2: The “max” at each state rarely changes
- Problem 3: The policy often converges long before the values




$k=0$



**VALUES AFTER 0 ITERATIONS**

Noise = 0.2  
Discount = 0.9  
Living reward = 0

$k=1$



$k=2$



**k=3**



k=4



VALUES AFTER 4 ITERATIONS

Noise = 0.2  
Discount = 0.9  
Living reward = 0

k=5



# k=6



**k=7**



**k=8**



k=9



# k=10



Noise = 0.2

Discount = 0.9

Living reward = 0

**k=11**



**k=12**



# k=100



# Policy Iteration

---

- Alternative approach for optimal values:
  - Step 1: Policy evaluation: calculate utilities for some fixed policy (not optimal utilities!) until convergence
  - Step 2: Policy improvement: update policy using one-step look-ahead with resulting converged (but not optimal!) utilities as future values
  - Repeat steps until policy converges
- This is policy iteration
  - It's still optimal!
  - Can converge (much) faster under some conditions

# Policy Iteration

---

- Evaluation: For fixed current policy  $\pi$ , find values with policy evaluation:
  - Iterate until values converge:

$$V_{k+1}^{\pi_i}(s) \leftarrow \sum_{s'} T(s, \pi_i(s), s') [R(s, \pi_i(s), s') + \gamma V_k^{\pi_i}(s')]$$

- Improvement: For fixed values, get a better policy using policy extraction
  - One-step look-ahead:

$$\pi_{i+1}(s) = \arg \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi_i}(s')]$$

# Comparison

---

- Both value iteration and policy iteration compute the same thing (all optimal values)
- In value iteration:
  - Every iteration updates both the values and (implicitly) the policy
  - We don't track the policy, but taking the max over actions implicitly recomputes it
- In policy iteration:
  - We do several passes that update utilities with fixed policy (each pass is fast because we consider only one action, not all of them)
  - After the policy is evaluated, a new policy is chosen (slow like a value iteration pass)
  - The new policy will be better (or we're done)
- Both are dynamic programs for solving MDPs


# Summary: MDP Algorithms

---

- So you want to...
  - Compute optimal values: use value iteration or policy iteration
  - Compute values for a particular policy: use policy evaluation
  - Turn your values into a policy: use policy extraction (one-step lookahead)
- These all look the same!
  - They basically are – they are all variations of Bellman updates
  - They all use one-step lookahead expectimax fragments
  - They differ only in whether we plug in a fixed policy or max over actions


# Double Bandits

---



# Double-Bandit MDP

- Actions: *Blue, Red*
- States: *Win, Lose*



*No discount  
100 time steps  
Both states have  
the same value*


# Offline Planning

- Solving MDPs is offline planning

- You determine all quantities through computation
- You need to know the details of the MDP
- You do not actually play the game!

*No discount  
100 time steps  
Both states have  
the same value*

	Value
Play Red	150
Play Blue	100



# Let's Play!

---




\$2 \$2 \$0 \$2 \$2

\$2 \$2 \$0 \$0 \$0


# Online Planning

- Rules changed! Red's win chance is different.



# Let's Play!

---



\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2	\$0
\$2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

# What Just Happened?

- That wasn't planning, it was learning!
  - Specifically, reinforcement learning
  - There was an MDP, but you couldn't solve it with just computation
  - You needed to actually act to figure it out
- Important ideas in reinforcement learning that came up
  - Exploration: you have to try unknown actions to get information
  - Exploitation: eventually, you have to use what you know
  - Regret: even if you learn intelligently, you make mistakes
  - Sampling: because of chance, you have to try things repeatedly
  - Difficulty: learning can be much harder than solving a known MDP



# Next Time: Reinforcement Learning!

---