

Artificial Intelligence



Markov Decision Processes

CS 444 – Spring 2021

Dr. Kevin Molloy

Department of Computer Science

James Madison University

Much of this lecture is taken from
Dan Klein and Pieter Abbeel AI class at UC 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 (if there is no wall there)
 - 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 rewards






Figure from Berkley AI

Grid World Actions

Deterministic Grid World




Stochastic Grid World



Markov Decision Processes

- An MDP is defined by:
 - A **set of states** $s \in S$
 - A **set of actions** $a \in A$
 - A **transition function** $T(s, a, s')$
 - Probability that a from s leads to s' , i.e., $P(s' | s, a)$
 - Also called the model or the dynamics
 - A **reward function** $R(s, a, s')$
 - Sometimes just $R(s)$ or $R(s')$
 - A **start state**
 - Maybe a **terminal state**
- MDPs are non-deterministic search problems
 - One way to solve them is with expectimax search
 - We'll have a new tool soon



Demo of GridWorld

What is Markov about MDPs?

- “Markov” generally means that given the present state, the future and the past are independent
- For Markov decision processes, “Markov” means action outcomes depend only on the current state

$$P(S_{t+1} = s' | S_t = s_t, A_t = a_t, S_{t-1} = s_{t-1}, A_{t-1}, \dots, S_0 = s_0)$$

=

$$P(S_{t+1} = s' | S_t = s_t, A_t = a_t)$$


- This is just like search, where the successor function could only depend on the current state (not the history)



Andrey Markov
(1856-1922)


Policies

- In deterministic single-agent search problems, we wanted an optimal **plan**, or sequence of actions, from start to a goal
- For MDPs, we want an optimal **policy** $\pi^*: S \rightarrow A$
 - A policy π gives an action for each state
 - An optimal policy is one that maximizes expected utility if followed
 - An explicit policy defines a reflex agent
- Expectimax didn't compute entire policies
 - It computed the action for a single state only




Optimal policy when $R(s, a, s') = -0.03$
for all non-terminals s


Optimal Policies




$$R(s) = -0.01$$



$$R(s) = -0.03$$




$$R(s) = -0.4$$




$$R(s) = -2.0$$

Example: Racing

- A robot car wants to travel far, quickly
- Three states: *Cool*, *Warm*, Overheated
- Two actions: *Slow*, *Fast*
- Going faster gets double reward




Racing Search Tree




MDP Search Trees

- Each MDP state projects an expectimax-like search tree



Utilities of Sequences

- What preferences should an agent have over reward sequences?
- More or less? $[1, 2, 2]$ or $[2, 3, 4]$
- Now or later? $[0, 0, 1]$ or $[1, 0, 0]$



Discounting

- It's reasonable to maximize the sum of rewards
- It's also reasonable to prefer rewards now to rewards later
- One solution: values of rewards decay exponentially



1

Worth Now



γ

Worth Next Step




γ^2

Worth In Two Steps

Discounting

- How to discount?
 - Each time we descend a level, we multiply in the discount once
- Why discount?
 - Sooner rewards probably do have higher utility than later rewards
 - Also helps our algorithms converge
- **Example:** discount of 0.5
 - $U([1,2,3]) = 1*1 + 0.5*2 + 0.25*3$
 - $U([1,2,3]) < U([3,2,1])$




Stationary Preferences

- Theorem: if we assume **stationary preferences**:

$$[a_1, a_2, \dots] \succ [b_1, b_2, \dots]$$

\Updownarrow

$$[r, a_1, a_2, \dots] \succ [r, b_1, b_2, \dots]$$



- Then: there are only two ways to define utilities

- Additive utility:

$$U([r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots]) = r_0 + r_1 + r_2 + \dots$$

- Discounted utility:

$$U([r_0, r_1, r_2, \dots]) = r_0 + \gamma r_1 + \gamma^2 r_2 \dots$$

Quiz: Discounting

- Given:
 - Actions: East, West, and Exit (only available in exit states a, e)
 - Transitions: deterministic
- Quiz 1: For $\gamma = 1$, what is the optimal policy?
- Quiz 2: For $\gamma = 0.1$, what is the optimal policy?
- Quiz 3: For which γ are West and East equally good when in state d?

10					1
----	--	--	--	--	---

10					1
----	--	--	--	--	---

Infinite Utilities ?


- **Problem:** What if the game lasts forever? Do we get infinite rewards?

- **Solutions:**

- Finite horizon: (similar to depth-limited search)
 - Terminate episodes after a fixed T steps (e.g. life)
 - Gives nonstationary policies (π depends on time left)
- Discounting: use $0 < \gamma < 1$


$$U([r_0, \dots r_\infty]) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t \leq R_{\max}/(1 - \gamma)$$

- Smaller γ means smaller horizon — shorter term focus
- Absorbing state: guarantee that for every policy, a terminal state will eventually be reached (like “overheated” for racing)




Recap: Defining MDPs

- Markov decision processes:
 - Set of states S
 - Start state s_0
 - Set of actions A
 - Transitions $P(s' | s, a)$ (or $T(s, a, s')$)
 - Rewards $R(s, a, s')$ (and discount γ)
- MDP quantities so far:
 - Policy = Choice of action for each state
 - Utility = sum of (discounted) rewards




Solving MDPs



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



Snapshot of Demo – Gridworld V Values




Noise = 0.2

Discount = 0.9

Living reward = 0

Snapshot of Demo – Gridworld Q Values




Values of States

- Fundamental operation: compute the (expectimax) value of a state
 - Expected utility under optimal action
 - Average sum of (discounted) rewards
 - This is just what expectimax computed!
- Recursive definition of value:


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

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


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



Racing Search Tree




Racing Search Tree






Racing Search Tree

- We're doing way too much work with expectimax!
- Problem: States are repeated
 - Idea: Only compute needed quantities once
- Problem: Tree goes on forever
 - Idea: Do a depth-limited computation, but with increasing depths until change is small
 - Note: deep parts of the tree eventually don't matter if $\gamma < 1$




Time-Limited Values

- Key idea: time-limited values
- Define $V_k(s)$ to be the optimal value of s if the game ends in k more time steps
 - Equivalently, it's what a depth- k expectimax would give from s



$k = 0$




Noise = 0.2

Discount = 0.9

Living reward = 0

$k = 1$




Noise = 0.2

Discount = 0.9

Living reward = 0

$k = 2$



$k = 3$



$k = 4$



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

$k = 11$



Noise = 0.2

Discount = 0.9

Living reward = 0


$k = 12$




$k = 100$



Computing Time-Limited Values



Value Iteration




Value Iteration

- Start with $V_0(s) = 0$: no time steps left means an expected reward sum of zero
- Given vector of $V_k(s)$ values, do one ply of expectimax from each state:


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

- Repeat until convergence
- Complexity of each iteration: $O(S^2A)$
- Theorem: will converge to unique optimal values
 - Basic idea: approximations get refined towards optimal values
 - Policy may converge long before values do



Example: Value Iteration

V_2	3.5	2.5	0
V_1	2	1	0
V_0	0	0	0




Assume no discount!

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

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_{MAX}
 - It is at worst R_{MIN}
 - But everything is discounted by γ^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



Where to go from here

- Policy-based methods

Demo of GridWorld
