Learning to control

D.A.Forsyth, UIUC

Topics

- Scamper through basic reinforcement learning ideas
- Imitation learning
  - and its variants and problems
  - as structure learning

First learned steering controller




Real Road Image

" *ALVINN:*

An autonomous Land vehicle in a neural Network, Pomerleau 1989

Markov Decision Process



Assumption: agent gets to observe the state

[Drawing from Sutton and Barto, Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction, 1998]

Abbeel slides

Model

- At time 0, environment samples initial state
  - agent is in that state
- Then for t=0 till done
  - agent chooses action
  - environment samples new state conditioned on action, old state
  - environment samples reward conditioned on action, old state, new state
  - agent gets that reward and moves into new state

- Policy
  - what action to take in each state
    - this could be stochastic
- Maximise total discounted reward

Examples

- Cleaning robot
- Walking robot
- Pole balancing
- Games: tetris, backgammon
- Server management
- Shortest path problems
- Model for animals, people

Markov Decision Process (S, A, T, R, H)



Given

- S: set of states
- A: set of actions
- T: S x A x S x {0,1,…,H} → [0,1], $T_t(s,a,s') = P(s_{t+1} = s' \mid s_t = s, a_t = a)$
- R: S x A x S x {0, 1, …, H} → $\Re$ $R_t(s,a,s')$ = reward for ($s_{t+1} = s'$, $s_t = s$, $a_t = a$)
- H: horizon over which the agent will act

Goal:

- Find π : S x {0, 1, …, H} → A that maximizes expected sum of rewards, i.e.,

$$\pi^* = \arg\max_{\pi} \mathrm{E}[\sum_{t=0}^{H} R_t(S_t, A_t, S_{t+1})|\pi]$$

This is usually discounted by gamma

Abbeel slides

Canonical Example: Grid World

- The agent lives in a grid
- Walls block the agent's path
- The agent's 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
- Big rewards come at the end

And this is true for the other three; 80% of the time you go where you intended, 10% at right angles one way 10% the other





Now assume

- We know
  - T(s, a, s')
  - R(s, a, s')
- What should our policy be?

Solving MDPs

- In an MDP, we want an optimal policy $\pi^*: S \times 0{:}H \rightarrow A$
  - A policy π gives an action for each state for each time



  - An optimal policy maximizes expected sum of rewards

- Contrast: In deterministic, want an optimal plan, or sequence of actions, from start to a goal

Outline

- Optimal Control

  =

  given an MDP (S, A, T, R, γ, H)

  find the optimal policy π^*

- Exact Methods:
  - ***Value Iteration***
  - Policy Iteration

Value iteration

- Idea:
  - value of a state=expected reward of proceeding optimally from that state
  - if we knew the value of each state, choosing an action is easy
    - take the one with the best expected yield
  - cf HMM inference reasoning
- Idea:
  - we could estimate the value of a state
    - set the value of every state to something
    - now for a given state, compute the expected value of best action
      - replace value with that and continue

Value Iteration

- Algorithm:
  - Start with $V_0^*(s) = 0$ for all s.
  - For i=1, … , H

    Given V_i^*, calculate for all states s $\in$ S:

$$V_{i+1}^*(s) \leftarrow \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s,a,s') \left[R(s,a,s') + V_i^*(s') \right]$$

  - This is called a value update or Bellman update/back-up

- $V_i^*(s)$ = the expected sum of rewards accumulated when starting from state s and acting optimally for a horizon of i steps

Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1

Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1



Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1

Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1



Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1



Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1



Value Iteration in Gridworld

noise = 0.2, γ =0.9, two terminal states with R = +1 and -1



Exercise 1: Effect of discount, noise



(a) Prefer the close exit (+1), risking the cliff (-10)

(b) Prefer the close exit (+1), but avoiding the cliff (-10)

(c) Prefer the distant exit (+10), risking the cliff (-10)

(d) Prefer the distant exit (+10), avoiding the cliff (-10)

(1) γ = 0.1, noise = 0.5

(2) γ = 0.99, noise = 0

(3) γ = 0.99, noise = 0.5

(4) γ = 0.1, noise = 0

Exercise 1 Solution



(a) Prefer close exit (+1), risking the cliff (-10) --- $\gamma = 0.1$, noise = 0

Exercise 1 Solution



(b) Prefer close exit (+1), avoiding the cliff (-10) -- γ = 0.1, noise = 0.5

Exercise 1 Solution



(c) Prefer distant exit (+1), risking the cliff (-10) -- γ = 0.99, noise = 0

Exercise 1 Solution



(d) Prefer distant exit (+1), avoid the cliff (-10) -- γ = 0.99, noise = 0.5

Value Iteration Convergence

Theorem. Value iteration converges. At convergence, we have found the optimal value function V* for the discounted infinite horizon problem, which satisfies the Bellman equations

$$\forall S \in S: \quad V^*(s) = \max_A \sum_{s'} T(s,a,s') \left[R(s,a,s') + \gamma V^*(s')\right]$$

- Now we know how to act for infinite horizon with discounted rewards!
  - Run value iteration till convergence.
  - This produces V*, which in turn tells us how to act, namely following:

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

- Note: the infinite horizon optimal policy is stationary, i.e., the optimal action at a state s is the same action at all times. (Efficient to store!)

But it's not really all over…

- What if:
  - there are lots of states?
  - we don't know T?
  - we don't know R?

Policy iteration

- Idea:
  - evaluate some policy
  - then make it better

Policy Evaluation

- Recall value iteration iterates:

$$V_{i+1}^{*}(s) \leftarrow \max_{a} \sum_{s'} T(s,a,s')[R(s,a,s') + \gamma V_i^{*}(s')]$$

- Policy evaluation:

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

  - At convergence:

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

Exercise 2

Consider a stochastic policy $\mu(a|s)$, where $\mu(a|s)$ is the probability of taking action a when in state s. Which of the following is the correct value iteration update to perform policy evaluation for this stochastic policy?

1. $V^{\mu}_{i+1}(s) \leftarrow \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s,a,s')(R(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{\mu}_i(s'))$
2. $V^{\mu}_{i+1}(s) \leftarrow \sum_{s'} \sum_a \mu(a|s) T(s,a,s')(R(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{\mu}_i(s'))$
3. $V^{\mu}_{i+1}(s) \leftarrow \sum_a \mu(a|s) \max_{s'} T(s,a,s')(R(s,a,s') + \gamma V^{\mu}_i(s'))$

Policy Iteration

- Alternative approach:
  - 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 faster under some conditions

Policy Evaluation Revisited

- *Idea 1:* modify Bellman updates

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

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

- Idea 2: it's just a linear system, solve with Matlab (or whatever),
  variables: $V^\pi(s)$,
  constants: T, R

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

Policy Iteration Guarantees

Policy Iteration iterates over:

- Policy evaluation: with fixed current policy π, find values with simplified Bellman updates:
  - Iterate until values converge

$$V_{i+1}^{\pi_k}(s) \leftarrow \sum_{s'} T(s, \pi_k(s), s') \left[R(s, \pi_k(s), s') + \gamma V_i^{\pi_k}(s') \right]$$

- Policy improvement: with fixed utilities, find the best action according to one-step look-ahead

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

Theorem. Policy iteration is guaranteed to converge and at convergence, the current policy and its value function are the optimal policy and the optimal value function!

Proof sketch:

(1) Guarantee to converge: In every step the policy improves. This means that a given policy can be encountered at most once. This means that after we have iterated as many times as there are different policies, i.e., (number actions)$^{(\text{number states})}$, we must be done and hence have converged.

(2) Optimal at convergence: by definition of convergence, at convergence $\pi_{k+1}(s) = \pi_k(s)$ for all states s. This means $\forall s \;\; V^{\pi_k}(s) = \max_a \sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') \left[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V_i^{\pi_k}(s') \right]$

Hence V^{π_k} satisfies the Bellman equation, which means V^{π_k} is equal to the optimal value function V*.

Definitions: Value function and Q-value function

Following a policy produces sample trajectories (or paths) $s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, a_1, r_1, \ldots$

How good is a state?

The **value function** at state s, is the expected cumulative reward from following the policy from state s:

$$V^{\pi}(s) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t r_t | s_0 = s, \pi\right]$$

How good is a state-action pair?

The **Q-value function** at state s and action a, is the expected cumulative reward from taking action a in state s and then following the policy:

$$Q^{\pi}(s, a) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t r_t | s_0 = s, a_0 = a, \pi\right]$$

Bellman equation

The optimal Q-value function Q* is the maximum expected cumulative reward achievable from a given (state, action) pair:

$$Q^*(s,a) = \max_\pi \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t\geq 0} \gamma^t r_t | s_0 = s, a_0 = a, \pi\right]$$

Q* satisfies the following **Bellman equation**:

$$Q^*(s,a) = \mathbb{E}_{s'\sim\mathcal{E}}\left[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s',a') | s, a\right]$$

Intuition: if the optimal state-action values for the next time-step Q*(s',a') are known, then the optimal strategy is to take the action that maximizes the expected value of $r + \gamma Q^*(s',a')$

The optimal policy π^* corresponds to taking the best action in any state as specified by Q*

Solving for the optimal policy

Value iteration algorithm: Use Bellman equation as an iterative update

$$Q_{i+1}(s,a) = \mathbb{E}\left[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q_i(s',a') | s,a\right]$$

Q_i will converge to Q* as i -> infinity

What's the problem with this?
Not scalable. Must compute Q(s,a) for every state-action pair. If state is e.g. current game state pixels, computationally infeasible to compute for entire state space!

Solution: use a function approximator to estimate Q(s,a). E.g. a neural network!

Solving for the optimal policy: Q-learning

Remember: want to find a Q-function that satisfies the Bellman Equation:

$$Q^*(s,a) = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{E}} \left[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q^*(s',a') | s, a \right]$$

Forward Pass

Loss function: $L_i(\theta_i) = \mathbb{E}_{s,a \sim \rho(\cdot)} \left[(y_i - Q(s,a;\theta_i))^2 \right]$

where $y_i = \mathbb{E}_{s' \sim \mathcal{E}} \left[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s',a';\theta_{i-1}) | s, a \right]$

Iteratively try to make the Q-value close to the target value (y_i) it should have, if Q-function corresponds to optimal Q* (and optimal policy π^*)

Backward Pass

Gradient update (with respect to Q-function parameters θ):

$$\nabla_{\theta_i} L_i(\theta_i) = \mathbb{E}_{s,a \sim \rho(\cdot); s' \sim \mathcal{E}} \left[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s',a';\theta_{i-1}) - Q(s,a;\theta_i)) \nabla_{\theta_i} Q(s,a;\theta_i) \right]$$

Training the Q-network: Experience Replay

Learning from batches of consecutive samples is problematic:

- Samples are correlated => inefficient learning
- Current Q-network parameters determines next training samples (e.g. if maximizing action is to move left, training samples will be dominated by samples from left-hand size) => can lead to bad feedback loops

Address these problems using **experience replay**

- Continually update a **replay memory** table of transitions (s_t, a_t, r_t, s_{t+1}) as game (experience) episodes are played
- Train Q-network on random minibatches of transitions from the replay memory, instead of consecutive samples

Each transition can also contribute to multiple weight updates
=> greater data efficiency

Policy Gradients

What is a problem with Q-learning?
The Q-function can be very complicated!

Example: a robot grasping an object has a very high-dimensional state => hard to learn exact value of every (state, action) pair

But the policy can be much simpler: just close your hand
Can we learn a policy directly, e.g. finding the best policy from a collection of policies?

Policy Gradients

Formally, let's define a class of parametrized policies: $\Pi = \{\pi_\theta, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$

For each policy, define its value:

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t \geq 0} \gamma^t r_t | \pi_\theta\right]$$

We want to find the optimal policy $\theta^* = \arg\max_\theta J(\theta)$

How can we do this?

Gradient ascent on policy parameters!

REINFORCE algorithm

Mathematically, we can write:

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p(\tau;\theta)} \left[r(\tau) \right]$$
$$= \int_{\tau} r(\tau) p(\tau;\theta) \mathrm{d}\tau$$

Where r(τ) is the reward of a trajectory $\tau = (s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, \ldots)$

REINFORCE algorithm

Expected reward: $$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p(\tau;\theta)}\left[r(\tau)\right] = \int_{\tau} r(\tau)p(\tau;\theta)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Now let's differentiate this: $$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \int_{\tau} r(\tau)\nabla_\theta p(\tau;\theta)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Intractable! Gradient of an expectation is problematic when p depends on θ

However, we can use a nice trick: $$\nabla_\theta p(\tau;\theta) = p(\tau;\theta)\frac{\nabla_\theta p(\tau;\theta)}{p(\tau;\theta)} = p(\tau;\theta)\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta)$$

If we inject this back:

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \int_{\tau} \left(r(\tau)\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta)\right) p(\tau;\theta)\mathrm{d}\tau$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p(\tau;\theta)}\left[r(\tau)\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta)\right]$$

Can estimate with Monte Carlo sampling

REINFORCE algorithm

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) = \int_\tau \left(r(\tau)\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta)\right) p(\tau;\theta)\mathrm{d}\tau$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_{\tau\sim p(\tau;\theta)}\left[r(\tau)\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta)\right]$$

Can we compute those quantities without knowing the transition probabilities?

We have: $p(\tau;\theta) = \prod_{t\geq 0} p(s_{t+1}|s_t,a_t)\pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$

Thus: $\log p(\tau;\theta) = \sum_{t\geq 0} \log p(s_{t+1}|s_t,a_t) + \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$

And when differentiating: $\nabla_\theta \log p(\tau;\theta) = \sum_{t\geq 0} \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$

Doesn't depend on transition probabilities!

Therefore when sampling a trajectory τ, we can estimate J(θ) with

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t\geq 0} r(\tau)\nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$$

Intuition

Gradient estimator: $$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} r(\tau) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t | s_t)$$

Interpretation:

- If r(τ) is high, push up the probabilities of the actions seen
- If r(τ) is low, push down the probabilities of the actions seen

Might seem simplistic to say that if a trajectory is good then all its actions were good. But in expectation, it averages out!

However, this also suffers from high variance because credit assignment is really hard. Can we help the estimator?

Variance reduction

Gradient estimator: $\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} r(\tau) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$

First idea: Push up probabilities of an action seen, only by the cumulative future reward from that state

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} \left(\sum_{t' \geq t} r_{t'} \right) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$$

Second idea: Use discount factor γ to ignore delayed effects

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} \left(\sum_{t' \geq t} \gamma^{t'-t} r_{t'} \right) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$$

Variance reduction: Baseline

Problem: The raw value of a trajectory isn't necessarily meaningful. For example, if rewards are all positive, you keep pushing up probabilities of actions.

What is important then? Whether a reward is better or worse than what you expect to get

Idea: Introduce a baseline function dependent on the state.
Concretely, estimator is now:

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} \left(\sum_{t' \geq t} \gamma^{t'-t} r_{t'} - b(s_t) \right) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t|s_t)$$

How to choose the baseline?

$$\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} \left(\sum_{t' \geq t} \gamma^{t'-t} r_{t'} - b(s_t) \right) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t | s_t)$$

A simple baseline: constant moving average of rewards experienced so far from all trajectories

Variance reduction techniques seen so far are typically used in “Vanilla REINFORCE”

How to choose the baseline?

A better baseline: Want to push up the probability of an action from a state, if this action was better than the **expected value of what we should get from that state**.

Q: What does this remind you of?

A: Q-function and value function!

Intuitively, we are happy with an action a_t in a state s_t if $Q^{\pi}(s_t, a_t) - V^{\pi}(s_t)$ is large. On the contrary, we are unhappy with an action if it's small.

Using this, we get the estimator: $\nabla_\theta J(\theta) \approx \sum_{t \geq 0} (Q^{\pi_\theta}(s_t, a_t) - V^{\pi_\theta}(s_t)) \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t | s_t)$

Actor-Critic Algorithm

Problem: we don't know Q and V. Can we learn them?

Yes, using Q-learning! We can combine Policy Gradients and Q-learning by training both an **actor** (the policy) and a **critic** (the Q-function).

- The actor decides which action to take, and the critic tells the actor how good its action was and how it should adjust
- Also alleviates the task of the critic as it only has to learn the values of (state, action) pairs generated by the policy
- Can also incorporate Q-learning tricks e.g. experience replay
- **Remark:** we can define by the **advantage function** how much an action was better than expected

$$A^{\pi}(s,a) = Q^{\pi}(s,a) - V^{\pi}(s)$$

Why so many RL algorithms?

- Different tradeoffs
  - Sample efficiency
  - Stability & ease of use
- Different assumptions
  - Stochastic or deterministic?
  - Continuous or discrete?
  - Episodic or infinite horizon?
- Different things are easy or hard in different settings
  - Easier to represent the policy?
  - Easier to represent the model?



Levine, ND

Blog post entitled: “Why deep reinforcement learning doesn’t work”

https://www.alexirpan.com/2018/02/14/rl-hard.html