CSE 473: Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Hanna Hajishirzi

Markov Decision Processes



slides adapted from
Dan Klein, Pieter Abbeel ai.berkeley.edu
And Dan Weld, Luke Zettlemoyer

Review and Outline

- Adversarial Games
  - Minimax search
  - α-β search
  - Evaluation functions
  - Multi-player, non-0-sum
- Stochastic Games
  - Expectimax

  - Markov Decision Processes
  - Reinforcement Learning

Non-Deterministic Search



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)





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



$T(s_{11}, E, \ldots$

$\ldots$

$T(s_{31}, N, s_{11}) = 0$

$\ldots$

$T(s_{31}, N, s_{32}) = 0.8$

$T(s_{31}, N, s_{21}) = 0.1$

$T(s_{31}, N, s_{41}) = 0.1$

$\ldots$

T is a Big Table!
11 X 4 x 11 = 484 entries

For now, we give this as input to the agent

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 $R(s')$



…
$R(s_{32}, N, s_{33}) = -0.01$
…
$R(s_{32}, N, s_{42}) = -1.01$
…
$R(s_{33}, E, s_{43}) = 0.99$

Cost of breathing

R is also a Big Table!

For now, we also give this to the agent

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

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



Optimal policy when R(s, a, s') = -0.4 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



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



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?
  - Think of it as a gamma chance of ending the process at every step
  - 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])



Quiz: Discounting

- Given:

a	b	c	d	e
10				1

  - Actions: East, West, and Exit (only available in exit states a, e)
  - Transitions: deterministic

- Quiz 1: For $\gamma = 1$, what is the optimal policy?

10	<-	<-	<-	1

- Quiz 2: For $\gamma = 0.1$, what is the optimal policy?

10	<-	<-	->	1

- Quiz 3: For which γ are West and East equally good when in state d?

$1\gamma = 10\gamma^3$

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)
    - Policy π depends on time left



  - Discounting: use $0 < \gamma < 1$

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

  - 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



MDP Search Trees

- Each MDP state projects an expectimax-like search tree



s is a *state*



(s,a,s’) called a *transition*

T(s,a,s’) = P(s’|s,a)

R(s,a,s’)

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



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

Values of States (Bellman Equations)

- 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:

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

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

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

Racing Search Tree



Racing Search Tree



Racing Search Tree

- We're doing way too much work with expectimax!
- Problem: States are repeated
  - Idea quantities: Only compute needed 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



[Demo – time-limited values (L8D6)]

k=0



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=1



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=2

Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=3

Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=4



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=5



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=6



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=7



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=8



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=9



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=10



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=11



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=12



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=100



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

Computing Time-Limited Values



Value Iteration



Solving MDPs



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:

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



- 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

V_1

S: 1

F: .5*2+.5*2=2

V_0

0 0 0



Assume no discount!

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

Example: Value Iteration

V_2			
V_1	2	S: .5*1+.5*1=1 F: -10	
V_0	0	0	0



Assume no discount!

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

Example: Value Iteration

V_2			
V_1	2	1	0
V_0	0	0	0



Assume no discount!

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

Example: Value Iteration

V_2

S: 1+2=3
F: .5*(2+2)+.5*(2+1)=3.5

V_1	2	1	0
V_0	0	0	0



Assume no discount!

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

Example: Value Iteration

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



Assume no discount!

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

The Bellman Equations



The Bellman Equations

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



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

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

- Thes

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

valu… in a way we'll use over and over

Value Iteration

- Bellman equations characterize the optimal values:

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

- Value iteration computes them:

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

- 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_{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



Policy Methods



Policy Evaluation



Fixed Policies

Do the optimal action



Do what π says to do



- Expectimax trees max over all actions to compute the optimal values
- If we fixed some policy π(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 π:

  $V^{\pi}(s)$ = expected total discounted rewards starting in s and following π

- 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 π?

- 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)



Recap: MDPs

- Search problems in uncertain environments
  - Model uncertainty with transition function
  - Assign utility to states. How? Using reward functions

  - Decision making and search in MDPs <-- Find a sequence of actions that maximize expected sum of rewards
    - Value of a state
    - Q-Value of a state
    - Policy for a state

The Bellman Equations

- Definition of "optimal utility" via expectimax recurrence gives one-step lookahead relationship amongst optimal utility values



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

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

- Thes

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

valu... in a way we'll use over and over



Solving MDPs

- Finding the best policy → mapping of actions to states
- So far, we have talked about two methods
  - Policy evaluation: computes the value of a **fixed** policy
  - Value iteration: computes the **optimal** values of states



Let’s think…

- Take a minute, think about value iteration and policy evaluation
  - Write down the biggest questions you have about them.

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:

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



- 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=12



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

k=100



Noise = 0.2
Discount = 0.9
Living reward = 0

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 π, find values with policy evaluation:
  - Iterate until values converge:

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

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

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

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

The Bellman Equations



Next Topic: Reinforcement Learning!