

Goals and Preferences

Alice ... went on “Would you please tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?”

“That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,” said the Cat.

“I don’t much care where —” said Alice.

“Then it doesn’t matter which way you go,” said the Cat.

Lewis Carroll, 1832–1898
Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, 1865
Chapter 6

Learning Objectives

At the end of the class you should be able to:

- justify the use and semantics of utility
- estimate the utility of an outcome
- build a decision network for a domain
- compute the optimal policy of a decision network

Preferences

- Actions result in outcomes
- Agents have preferences over outcomes
- A rational agent will do the action that has the best outcome for them
- Sometimes agents don't know the outcomes of the actions, but they still need to compare actions
- Agents have to act.
(Doing nothing is (often) an action).

Preferences Over Outcomes

If o_1 and o_2 are outcomes

- $o_1 \succeq o_2$ means o_1 is at least as desirable as o_2 .
- $o_1 \sim o_2$ means $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $o_2 \succeq o_1$.
- $o_1 \succ o_2$ means $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $o_2 \not\succeq o_1$

Lotteries

- An agent may not know the outcomes of their actions, but only have a probability distribution of the outcomes.
- A **lottery** is a probability distribution over outcomes. It is written

$$[p_1 : o_1, p_2 : o_2, \dots, p_k : o_k]$$

where the o_i are outcomes and $p_i \geq 0$ such that

$$\sum_i p_i = 1$$

The lottery specifies that outcome o_i occurs with probability p_i .

- When we talk about outcomes, we will include lotteries.

Properties of Preferences

- **Completeness:** Agents have to act, so they must have preferences:

$$\forall o_1 \forall o_2 \quad o_1 \succeq o_2 \text{ or } o_2 \succeq o_1$$

Properties of Preferences

- **Completeness:** Agents have to act, so they must have preferences:

$$\forall o_1 \forall o_2 \quad o_1 \succeq o_2 \text{ or } o_2 \succeq o_1$$

- **Transitivity:** Preferences must be transitive:

$$\text{if } o_1 \succeq o_2 \text{ and } o_2 \succ o_3 \text{ then } o_1 \succ o_3$$

(Similarly for other mixtures of \succ and \succeq .)

Properties of Preferences

- **Completeness:** Agents have to act, so they must have preferences:

$$\forall o_1 \forall o_2 \quad o_1 \succeq o_2 \text{ or } o_2 \succeq o_1$$

- **Transitivity:** Preferences must be transitive:

$$\text{if } o_1 \succeq o_2 \text{ and } o_2 \succ o_3 \text{ then } o_1 \succ o_3$$

(Similarly for other mixtures of \succ and \succeq .)

Rationale: otherwise $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $o_2 \succ o_3$ and $o_3 \succeq o_1$.
If they are prepared to pay to get o_2 instead of o_3 ,
and are happy to have o_1 instead of o_2 ,
and are happy to have o_3 instead of o_1
→ money pump.

Properties of Preferences (cont.)

Monotonicity: An agent prefers a larger chance of getting a better outcome than a smaller chance:

- If $o_1 \succ o_2$ and $p > q$ then

$$[p : o_1, 1 - p : o_2] \succ [q : o_1, 1 - q : o_2]$$

Consequence of axioms

- Suppose $o_1 \succ o_2$ and $o_2 \succ o_3$. Consider whether the agent would prefer
 - ▶ o_2
 - ▶ the lottery $[p : o_1, 1 - p : o_3]$for different values of $p \in [0, 1]$.
- Plot which one is preferred as a function of p :



Properties of Preferences (cont.)

Continuity: Suppose $o_1 \succ o_2$ and $o_2 \succ o_3$, then there exists a $p \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$o_2 \sim [p : o_1, 1 - p : o_3]$$

Properties of Preferences (cont.)

Decomposability: (no fun in gambling). An agent is indifferent between lotteries that have same probabilities and outcomes. This includes lotteries over lotteries. For example:

$$\begin{aligned} & [p : o_1, 1 - p : [q : o_2, 1 - q : o_3]] \\ & \sim [p : o_1, (1 - p)q : o_2, (1 - p)(1 - q) : o_3] \end{aligned}$$

Properties of Preferences (cont.)

Substitutability: if $o_1 \sim o_2$ then the agent is indifferent between lotteries that only differ by o_1 and o_2 :

$$[p : o_1, 1 - p : o_3] \sim [p : o_2, 1 - p : o_3]$$

Alternative Axiom for Substitutability

Substitutability: if $o_1 \succeq o_2$ then the agent weakly prefers lotteries that contain o_1 instead of o_2 , everything else being equal.

That is, for any number p and outcome o_3 :

$$[p : o_1, (1 - p) : o_3] \succeq [p : o_2, (1 - p) : o_3]$$

What we would like

- We would like a measure of preference that can be combined with probabilities. So that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{value}([p : o_1, 1 - p : o_2]) \\ &= p \times \text{value}(o_1) + (1 - p) \times \text{value}(o_2) \end{aligned}$$

- Money does not act like this.
What would you prefer

\$1,000,000 or $[0.5 : \$0, 0.5 : \$2,000,000]$?

What we would like

- We would like a measure of preference that can be combined with probabilities. So that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{value}([p : o_1, 1 - p : o_2]) \\ &= p \times \text{value}(o_1) + (1 - p) \times \text{value}(o_2) \end{aligned}$$

- Money does not act like this.
What would you prefer

\$1,000,000 or $[0.5 : \$0, 0.5 : \$2,000,000]$?

- It may seem that preferences are too complex and multi-faceted to be represented by single numbers.

Theorem

If preferences follow the preceding properties, then preferences can be measured by a function

$$utility : outcomes \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

such that

- $o_1 \succeq o_2$ if and only if $utility(o_1) \geq utility(o_2)$.
- Utilities are linear with probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} & utility([p_1 : o_1, p_2 : o_2, \dots, p_k : o_k]) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \times utility(o_i) \end{aligned}$$

- If all outcomes are equally preferred,

- If all outcomes are equally preferred, set $utility(o_i) = 0$ for all outcomes o_i .
- Otherwise, suppose the best outcome is *best* and the worst outcome is *worst*.
- For any outcome o_i , define $utility(o_i)$ to be the number u_i such that

$$o_i \sim [u_i : \textit{best}, 1 - u_i : \textit{worst}]$$

This exists by

- If all outcomes are equally preferred, set $utility(o_i) = 0$ for all outcomes o_i .
- Otherwise, suppose the best outcome is *best* and the worst outcome is *worst*.
- For any outcome o_i , define $utility(o_i)$ to be the number u_i such that

$$o_i \sim [u_i : \textit{best}, 1 - u_i : \textit{worst}]$$

This exists by the Continuity property.

Proof (cont.)

- Suppose $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $utility(o_i) = u_i$, then by Substitutability,

$$[u_1 : best, 1 - u_1 : worst]$$

$$\succeq$$

Proof (cont.)

- Suppose $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $utility(o_i) = u_i$, then by Substitutability,

$$\begin{aligned} & [u_1 : best, 1 - u_1 : worst] \\ & \succeq [u_2 : best, 1 - u_2 : worst] \end{aligned}$$

Which, by completeness and monotonicity implies

Proof (cont.)

- Suppose $o_1 \succeq o_2$ and $utility(o_i) = u_i$, then by Substitutability,

$$\begin{aligned} & [u_1 : best, 1 - u_1 : worst] \\ & \succeq [u_2 : best, 1 - u_2 : worst] \end{aligned}$$

Which, by completeness and monotonicity implies $u_1 \geq u_2$.

Proof (cont.)

- Suppose $p = \text{utility}([p_1 : o_1, p_2 : o_2, \dots, p_k : o_k])$.
- Suppose $\text{utility}(o_i) = u_i$. We know:

$$o_i \sim [u_i : \text{best}, 1 - u_i : \text{worst}]$$

- By substitutability, we can replace each o_i by $[u_i : \text{best}, 1 - u_i : \text{worst}]$, so

$$\begin{aligned} p = \text{utility}(\quad & [p_1 : [u_1 : \text{best}, 1 - u_1 : \text{worst}] \\ & \dots \\ & p_k : [u_k : \text{best}, 1 - u_k : \text{worst}]])) \end{aligned}$$


- By decomposability, this is equivalent to:

$$p = utility(\begin{array}{l} [\quad p_1 u_1 + \cdots + p_k u_k \\ \quad : best, \\ \quad p_1(1 - u_1) + \cdots + p_k(1 - u_k) \\ \quad : worst] \end{array})$$

- Thus, by definition of utility,


$$p = p_1 \times u_1 + \cdots + p_k \times u_k$$

Utility as a function of money



Possible utility as a function of money

Someone who really wants a toy worth \$30, but who would also like one worth \$20:



Factored Representation of Utility

- Suppose the outcomes can be described in terms of features X_1, \dots, X_n .
- An **additive utility** is one that can be decomposed into set of factors:

$$u(X_1, \dots, X_n) = f_1(X_1) + \dots + f_n(X_n).$$

This assumes **additive independence**.

- Strong assumption: contribution of each feature doesn't depend on other features.
- Many ways to represent the same utility:
 - a number can be added to one factor as long as it is subtracted from others.

Additive Utility

- An additive utility has a canonical representation:

$$u(X_1, \dots, X_n) = w_1 \times u_1(X_1) + \dots + w_n \times u_n(X_n).$$

- If $best_i$ is the best value of X_i , $u_i(X_i=best_i) = 1$.
If $worst_i$ is the worst value of X_i , $u_i(X_i=worst_i) = 0$.
- w_i are weights, $\sum_i w_i = 1$.
The weights reflect the relative importance of features.
- We can determine weights by comparing outcomes.

$$w_1 =$$

Additive Utility

- An additive utility has a canonical representation:

$$u(X_1, \dots, X_n) = w_1 \times u_1(X_1) + \dots + w_n \times u_n(X_n).$$

- If $best_i$ is the best value of X_i , $u_i(X_i=best_i) = 1$.
If $worst_i$ is the worst value of X_i , $u_i(X_i=worst_i) = 0$.
- w_i are weights, $\sum_i w_i = 1$.
The weights reflect the relative importance of features.
- We can determine weights by comparing outcomes.

$$w_1 = u(best_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) - u(worst_1, x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

for any values x_2, \dots, x_n of X_2, \dots, X_n .

General Setup for Additive Utility

Suppose there are:

- multiple **users**
- multiple **alternatives** to choose among, e.g., *hotel1,...*
- multiple **criteria** upon which to judge, e.g., *rate, location*
- utility is a function of

General Setup for Additive Utility

Suppose there are:

- multiple **users**
- multiple **alternatives** to choose among, e.g., *hotel1*, ...
- multiple **criteria** upon which to judge, e.g., *rate*, *location*
- utility is a function of users and alternatives
- $fact(crit, alt)$ is the fact about the **domain value** of criteria *crit* for alternative *alt*.
E.g., $fact(rate, hotel1)$ is the room rate for hotel#1, which is \$125 per night.
- $score(val, user, crit)$ gives the score of the domain value for user on criteria *crit*.

$$utility(user, alt) = \sum_{crit} weight(user, crit) \times score(fact(crit, alt), user, crit)$$

for *user*, alternative *alt*, criteria *crit*

Complements and Substitutes

- Often additive independence is not a good assumption.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **complements** if having both is better than the sum of the two.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **substitutes** if having both is worse than the sum of the two.

Complements and Substitutes

- Often additive independence is not a good assumption.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **complements** if having both is better than the sum of the two.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **substitutes** if having both is worse than the sum of the two.
- Example: on a holiday
 - ▶ An excursion for 6 hours North on day 3.
 - ▶ An excursion for 6 hours South on day 3.

Complements and Substitutes

- Often additive independence is not a good assumption.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **complements** if having both is better than the sum of the two.
- Values x_1 of feature X_1 and x_2 of feature X_2 are **substitutes** if having both is worse than the sum of the two.
- Example: on a holiday
 - ▶ An excursion for 6 hours North on day 3.
 - ▶ An excursion for 6 hours South on day 3.
- Example: on a holiday
 - ▶ A trip to a location 3 hours North on day 3
 - ▶ The return trip for the same day.

Generalized Additive Utility

- A generalized additive utility can be written as a sum of factors:

$$u(X_1, \dots, X_n) = f_1(\overline{X_1}) + \dots + f_k(\overline{X_k})$$

where $\overline{X_i} \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$.

- An intuitive canonical representation is difficult to find.
- It can represent complements and substitutes.

Utility and time


- Would you prefer \$1000 today or \$1000 next year?
- What price would you pay now to have an eternity of happiness?
- How can you trade off pleasures today with pleasures in the future?

Pascal's Wager (1670)

Decide whether to believe in God.

Pascal's Wager (1670)

Decide whether to believe in God.



Utility and time

- How would you compare the following sequences of rewards (per week):

A: \$1000000, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0,...

B: \$1000, \$1000, \$1000, \$1000, \$1000,...

C: \$1000, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0,...

D: \$1, \$1, \$1, \$1, \$1,...

E: \$1, \$2, \$3, \$4, \$5,...

Rewards and Values


Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time. What utility should be assigned?
“Return” or “value”

Rewards and Values

Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time. What utility should be assigned?
“Return” or “value”

- **total reward** $V = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i$
- **average reward** $V = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_1 + \dots + r_n)/n$

Average vs Accumulated Rewards



Rewards and Values

Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time.

- **discounted return** $V = r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots$
 γ is the **discount factor** $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t =$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

- How is the infinite future valued compared to immediate rewards?

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

- How is the infinite future valued compared to immediate rewards?

$$1 + \gamma + \gamma^2 + \gamma^3 + \dots = 1/(1 - \gamma)$$

$$\text{Therefore } \frac{\text{minimum reward}}{1 - \gamma} \leq V_t \leq \frac{\text{maximum reward}}{1 - \gamma}$$

- We can approximate V with the first k terms, with error:

$$V - (r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \dots + \gamma^{k-1} r_k) = \gamma^k V_{k+1}$$

Allais Paradox (1953)

What would you prefer:

A: \$1*m* — one million dollars

B: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5*m*, 0.89 : \$1*m*, 0.01 : \$0]

Allais Paradox (1953)

What would you prefer:

A: \$1m — one million dollars

B: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.89 : \$1m, 0.01 : \$0]

What would you prefer:

C: lottery [0.11 : \$1m, 0.89 : \$0]

D: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.9 : \$0]

Allais Paradox (1953)

What would you prefer:

A: \$1m — one million dollars

B: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.89 : \$1m, 0.01 : \$0]

What would you prefer:

C: lottery [0.11 : \$1m, 0.89 : \$0]

D: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.9 : \$0]

It is inconsistent with the axioms of preferences to have $A \succ B$ and $D \succ C$.

Allais Paradox (1953)

What would you prefer:

A: \$1m — one million dollars

B: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.89 : \$1m, 0.01 : \$0]

What would you prefer:

C: lottery [0.11 : \$1m, 0.89 : \$0]

D: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.9 : \$0]

It is inconsistent with the axioms of preferences to have $A \succ B$ and $D \succ C$.

A,C: lottery [0.11 : \$1m, 0.89 : X]

B,D: lottery [0.10 : \$2.5m, 0.01 : \$0, 0.89 : X]

Framing Effects [Tversky and Kahneman]

- A disease is expected to kill 600 people. Two alternative programs have been proposed:

Program A: 200 people will be saved

Program B: probability $1/3$: 600 people will be saved
probability $2/3$: no one will be saved

Which program would you favor?

Framing Effects [Tversky and Kahneman]

- A disease is expected to kill 600 people. Two alternative programs have been proposed:
 - Program C: 400 people will die
 - Program D: probability $1/3$: no one will die
probability $2/3$: 600 will die
- Which program would you favor?

Framing Effects [Tversky and Kahneman]

- A disease is expected to kill 600 people. Two alternative programs have been proposed:

Program A: 200 people will be saved

Program B: probability $1/3$: 600 people will be saved
probability $2/3$: no one will be saved

Which program would you favor?

- A disease is expected to kill 600 people. Two alternative programs have been proposed:


Program C: 400 people will die

Program D: probability $1/3$: no one will die
probability $2/3$: 600 will die

Which program would you favor?

Tversky and Kahneman: 72% chose A over B.
22% chose C over D.

Prospect Theory



- In mixed gambles, loss aversion causes extreme risk-averse choices
- In bad choices, diminishing responsibility causes risk seeking.

Reference Points

Consider Anthony and Betty:

- Anthony's current wealth is \$1 million.
- Betty's current wealth is \$4 million.

They are both offered the choice between a gamble and a sure thing:

- Gamble: equal chance to end up owning \$1 million or \$4 million.
- Sure Thing: own \$2 million

What does expected utility theory predict?

Reference Points

Consider Anthony and Betty:

- Anthony's current wealth is \$1 million.
- Betty's current wealth is \$4 million.

They are both offered the choice between a gamble and a sure thing:

- Gamble: equal chance to end up owning \$1 million or \$4 million.
- Sure Thing: own \$2 million

What does expected utility theory predict?

What does prospect theory predict?

[From D. Kahneman, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, 2011, pp. 275-276.]

Framing Effects

What do you think of Alan and Ben:

- Alan: intelligent—industrious—impulsive—critical—stubborn—envious

What do you think of Alan and Ben:

- Ben: envious—stubborn—critical—impulsive—industrious—intelligent

Framing Effects

What do you think of Alan and Ben:

- Alan: intelligent—industrious—impulsive—critical—stubborn—envious
- Ben: envious—stubborn—critical—impulsive—industrious—intelligent

[From D. Kahneman, Thinking Fast and Slow, 2011, p. 82]

Framing Effects

- Suppose you had bought tickets for the theatre for \$50. When you got to the theatre, you had lost the tickets. You have your credit card and can buy equivalent tickets for \$50. Do you buy the replacement tickets on your credit card?

Framing Effects

- Suppose you had bought tickets for the theatre for \$50. When you got to the theatre, you had lost the tickets. You have your credit card and can buy equivalent tickets for \$50. Do you buy the replacement tickets on your credit card?
- Suppose you had \$50 in your pocket to buy tickets. When you got to the theatre, you had lost the \$50. You have your credit card and can buy equivalent tickets for \$50. Do you buy the tickets on your credit card?

[From R.M. Dawes, Rational Choice in an Uncertain World, 1988.]

The Ellsberg Paradox

Two bags:

Bag 1 40 white chips, 30 yellow chips, 30 green chips

Bag 2 40 white chips, 60 chips that are yellow or green

What do you prefer:

- A: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 1
- B: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 2
- C: Receive \$1m if a white or green chip is drawn from bag 2

The Ellsberg Paradox

Two bags:

Bag 1 40 white chips, 30 yellow chips, 30 green chips

Bag 2 40 white chips, 60 chips that are yellow or green

What do you prefer:

A: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 1

B: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 2

C: Receive \$1m if a white or green chip is drawn from bag 2

What about

D: Lottery $[0.5 : B, 0.5 : C]$

The Ellsberg Paradox

Two bags:

Bag 1 40 white chips, 30 yellow chips, 30 green chips

Bag 2 40 white chips, 60 chips that are yellow or green

What do you prefer:

A: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 1

B: Receive \$1m if a white or yellow chip is drawn from bag 2

C: Receive \$1m if a white or green chip is drawn from bag 2

What about

D: Lottery $[0.5 : B, 0.5 : C]$

However A and D should give same outcome, no matter what the proportion in Bag 2.

St. Petersburg Paradox

What if there is no “best” outcome?
Are utilities unbounded?

St. Petersburg Paradox

What if there is no “best” outcome?

Are utilities unbounded?

- Suppose utilities are unbounded.
- Then for any outcome o_i there is an outcome o_{i+1} such that $u(o_{i+1}) > 2u(o_i)$.

St. Petersburg Paradox

What if there is no “best” outcome?

Are utilities unbounded?

- Suppose utilities are unbounded.
- Then for any outcome o_i there is an outcome o_{i+1} such that $u(o_{i+1}) > 2u(o_i)$.
- Would the agent prefer o_1 or the lottery $[0.5 : o_2, 0.5 : 0]$? where 0 is the worst outcome.

St. Petersburg Paradox

What if there is no “best” outcome?

Are utilities unbounded?

- Suppose utilities are unbounded.
- Then for any outcome o_i there is an outcome o_{i+1} such that $u(o_{i+1}) > 2u(o_i)$.
- Would the agent prefer o_1 or the lottery $[0.5 : o_2, 0.5 : 0]$? where 0 is the worst outcome.
- Is it rational to gamble o_1 to on a coin toss to get o_2 ?
- Is it rational to gamble o_2 to on a coin toss to get o_3 ?
- Is it rational to gamble o_3 to on a coin toss to get o_4 ?

St. Petersburg Paradox

What if there is no “best” outcome?

Are utilities unbounded?

- Suppose utilities are unbounded.
- Then for any outcome o_i there is an outcome o_{i+1} such that $u(o_{i+1}) > 2u(o_i)$.
- Would the agent prefer o_1 or the lottery $[0.5 : o_2, 0.5 : 0]$? where 0 is the worst outcome.
- Is it rational to gamble o_1 to on a coin toss to get o_2 ?
- Is it rational to gamble o_2 to on a coin toss to get o_3 ?
- Is it rational to gamble o_3 to on a coin toss to get o_4 ?
- What will eventually happen?

Predictor Paradox

Two boxes:

Box 1: contains \$10,000

Box 2: contains either \$0 or \$1m

- You can either choose both boxes or just box 2.

Predictor Paradox

Two boxes:

Box 1: contains \$10,000

Box 2: contains either \$0 or \$1m

- You can either choose both boxes or just box 2.
- The “predictor” has put \$1m in box 2 if he thinks you will take box 2 and \$0 in box 2 if he thinks you will take both.
- The predictor has been correct in previous predictions.
- Do you take both boxes or just box 2?

Making Decisions Under Uncertainty

What an agent should do depends on:

- The agent's **ability** — what options are available to it.
- The agent's **beliefs** — the ways the world could be, given the agent's knowledge.
Sensing updates the agent's beliefs.
- The agent's **preferences** — what the agent wants and tradeoffs when there are risks.


Decision theory specifies how to trade off the desirability and probabilities of the possible outcomes for competing actions.

Decision Variables

- **Decision variables** are like random variables that an agent gets to choose a value for.
- A possible world specifies a value for each decision variable and each random variable.
- For each assignment of values to all decision variables, the measure of the set of worlds satisfying that assignment sum to 1.
- The probability of a proposition is undefined unless the agent condition on the values of all decision variables.

Decision Tree for Delivery Robot

The robot can choose to wear pads to protect itself or not.
The robot can choose to go the short way past the stairs or a long way that reduces the chance of an accident.
There is one random variable of whether there is an accident.



Expected Values

- The expected value of a function of possible worlds is its average value, weighting possible worlds by their probability.
- Suppose $f(\omega)$ is the value of function f on world ω .
 - ▶ The **expected value** of f is

$$\mathcal{E}(f) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\omega) \times f(\omega).$$

- ▶ The **conditional expected value** of f given e is

$$\mathcal{E}(f|e) = \sum_{\omega \models e} P(\omega|e) \times f(\omega).$$

Single decisions


- In a single decision variable, the agent can choose $D = d_i$ for any $d_i \in \text{dom}(D)$.
- The **expected utility** of decision $D = d_i$ is $\mathcal{E}(u|D = d_i)$ where $u(\omega)$ is the utility of world ω .
- An **optimal single decision** is a decision $D = d_{\max}$ whose expected utility is maximal:

$$\mathcal{E}(u|D = d_{\max}) = \max_{d_i \in \text{dom}(D)} \mathcal{E}(u|D = d_i).$$

Single-stage decision networks

Extend belief networks with:

- **Decision nodes**, that the agent chooses the value for. Domain is the set of possible actions. Drawn as rectangle.
- **Utility node**, the parents are the variables on which the utility depends. Drawn as a diamond.



This shows explicitly which nodes affect whether there is an accident.

Finding an optimal decision

- Suppose the random variables are X_1, \dots, X_n , and utility depends on X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}

$$\mathcal{E}(u|D) =$$

Finding an optimal decision

- Suppose the random variables are X_1, \dots, X_n , and utility depends on X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(u|D) &= \sum_{X_1, \dots, X_n} P(X_1, \dots, X_n|D) \times u(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \\ &= \sum_{X_1, \dots, X_n}\end{aligned}$$

Finding an optimal decision

- Suppose the random variables are X_1, \dots, X_n , and utility depends on X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(u|D) &= \sum_{X_1, \dots, X_n} P(X_1, \dots, X_n|D) \times u(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \\ &= \sum_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i | \text{parents}(X_i)) \times u(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k})\end{aligned}$$

To find an optimal decision:

- ▶ Create a factor for each conditional probability and for the utility
- ▶ Sum out all of the random variables
- ▶ This creates a factor on D that gives the expected utility for each D
- ▶ Choose the D with the maximum value in the factor.

Example Initial Factors

Which Way	Accident	Value
long	true	0.01
long	false	0.99
short	true	0.2
short	false	0.8

Which Way	Accident	Wear Pads	Value
long	true	true	30
long	true	false	0
long	false	true	75
long	false	false	80
short	true	true	35
short	true	false	3
short	false	true	95
short	false	false	100

After summing out Accident

Which Way	Wear Pads	Value
long	true	74.55
long	false	79.2
short	true	83.0
short	false	80.6

Decision Networks

- flat or modular or hierarchical
- explicit states or features or individuals and relations
- static or finite stage or indefinite stage or infinite stage
- fully observable or partially observable
- deterministic or stochastic dynamics
- goals or complex preferences
- single agent or multiple agents
- knowledge is given or knowledge is learned
- perfect rationality or bounded rationality

Sequential Decisions

- An intelligent agent doesn't carry out a multi-step plan ignoring information it receives between actions.
- A more typical scenario is where the agent:
observes, acts, observes, acts, . . .
- Subsequent actions can depend on what is observed.
What is observed depends on previous actions.
- Often the sole reason for carrying out an action is to
provide information for future actions.
For example: diagnostic tests, spying.

Sequential decision problems

- A **sequential decision problem** consists of a sequence of decision variables D_1, \dots, D_n .
- Each D_i has an **information set** of variables $parents(D_i)$, whose value will be known at the time decision D_i is made.

Decisions Networks

A **decision network** is a graphical representation of a finite sequential decision problem, with 3 types of nodes:



- A **random variable** is drawn as an ellipse. Arcs into the node represent probabilistic dependence.




- A **decision variable** is drawn as a rectangle. Arcs into the node represent information available when the decision is made.




- A **utility** node is drawn as a diamond. Arcs into the node represent variables that the utility depends on.

Umbrella Decision Network



You don't get to observe the weather when you have to decide whether to take your umbrella. You do get to observe the forecast.

Decision Network for the Alarm Problem



A **No-forgetting decision network** is a decision network where:

- The decision nodes are totally ordered. This is the order the actions will be taken.
- All decision nodes that come before D_i are parents of decision node D_i . Thus the agent remembers its previous actions.
- Any parent of a decision node is a parent of subsequent decision nodes. Thus the agent remembers its previous observations.

What should an agent do?

- What an agent should do at any time depends on what it will do in the future.
- What an agent does in the future depends on what it did before.

- A policy specifies what an agent should do under each circumstance.
- A **policy** is a sequence $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ of **decision functions**

$$\delta_i : \text{dom}(\text{parents}(D_i)) \rightarrow \text{dom}(D_i).$$

This policy means that when the agent has observed $O \in \text{dom}(\text{parents}(D_i))$, it will do $\delta_i(O)$.

Expected Utility of a Policy

- Possible world ω **satisfies** policy δ , written $\omega \models \delta$ if the world assigns the value to each decision node that the policy specifies.
- The **expected utility of policy δ** is

$$\mathcal{E}(u|\delta) = \sum_{\omega \models \delta} u(\omega) \times P(\omega),$$

- An **optimal policy** is one with the highest expected utility.

Finding an optimal policy

- Create a factor for each conditional probability table and a factor for the utility.

Finding an optimal policy

- Create a factor for each conditional probability table and a factor for the utility.
- Repeat:
 - ▶ Sum out random variables that are not parents of a decision node.
 - ▶ Select a variable D that is only in a factor f with (some of) its parents.
 - ▶ Eliminate D by maximizing. This returns:
 - ▶ an optimal decision function for D : $\arg \max_D f$
 - ▶ a new factor: $\max_D f$
- until there are no more decision nodes.
- Sum out the remaining random variables. Multiply the factors: this is the expected utility of an optimal policy.

Initial factors for the Umbrella Decision

Weather	Value
norain	0.7
rain	0.3

Weather	Fcast	Value
norain	sunny	0.7
norain	cloudy	0.2
norain	rainy	0.1
rain	sunny	0.15
rain	cloudy	0.25
rain	rainy	0.6

Weather	Umb	Value
norain	take	20
norain	leave	100
rain	take	70
rain	leave	0

Eliminating By Maximizing

f :

Fcast	Umb	Val
sunny	take	12.95
sunny	leave	49.0
cloudy	take	8.05
cloudy	leave	14.0
rainy	take	14.0
rainy	leave	7.0


$\max_{Umb} f$:

Fcast	Val
sunny	49.0
cloudy	14.0
rainy	14.0

$\arg \max_{Umb} f$:

Fcast	Umb
sunny	leave
cloudy	leave
rainy	take

Exercise



What are the factors?

Which random variables get summed out first?

Which decision variable is eliminated? What factor is created?

Then what is eliminated (and how)?

What factors are created after maximization?

Complexity of finding an optimal policy

Decision D has k binary parents, and has b possible actions:

- there are assignments of values to the parents.

Complexity of finding an optimal policy

Decision D has k binary parents, and has b possible actions:

- there are 2^k assignments of values to the parents.
- there are different decision functions.

Complexity of finding an optimal policy

Decision D has k binary parents, and has b possible actions:

- there are 2^k assignments of values to the parents.
- there are b^{2^k} different decision functions.

If there are multiple decision functions

- The number of policies is

Complexity of finding an optimal policy

Decision D has k binary parents, and has b possible actions:

- there are 2^k assignments of values to the parents.
- there are b^{2^k} different decision functions.

If there are multiple decision functions

- The number of policies is the product of the number decision functions.
- The number of optimizations in the dynamic programming is

Complexity of finding an optimal policy

Decision D has k binary parents, and has b possible actions:

- there are 2^k assignments of values to the parents.
- there are b^{2^k} different decision functions.

If there are multiple decision functions

- The number of policies is the product of the number decision functions.
- The number of optimizations in the dynamic programming is the sum of the number of assignments of values to parents.
- The dynamic programming algorithm is much more efficient than searching through policy space.

Value of Information

- The value of information X for decision D is the utility of the network with an arc from X to D (+ no-forgetting arcs) minus the utility of the network without the arc.
- The value of information is always

Value of Information

- The value of information X for decision D is the utility of the network with an arc from X to D (+ no-forgetting arcs) minus the utility of the network without the arc.
- The value of information is always non-negative.
- It is positive only if

Value of Information

- The value of information X for decision D is the utility of the network with an arc from X to D (+ no-forgetting arcs) minus the utility of the network without the arc.
- The value of information is always non-negative.
- It is positive only if the agent changes its action depending on X .
- The value of information provides a bound on how much an agent should be prepared to pay for a sensor. How much is a better weather forecast worth?

Value of Information

- The value of information X for decision D is the utility of the network with an arc from X to D (+ no-forgetting arcs) minus the utility of the network without the arc.
- The value of information is always non-negative.
- It is positive only if the agent changes its action depending on X .
- The value of information provides a bound on how much an agent should be prepared to pay for a sensor. How much is a better weather forecast worth?
- We need to be careful when adding an arc would create a cycle. E.g., how much would it be worth knowing whether the fire truck will arrive quickly when deciding whether to call them?

Value of Control

- The value of control of a variable X is the value of the network when you make X a decision variable (and add no-forgetting arcs) minus the value of the network when X is a random variable.
- You need to be explicit about what information is available when you control X .
- If you control X without observing, controlling X can be worse than observing X . E.g., controlling a thermometer.
- If you keep the parents the same, the value of control is always non-negative.

Agents as Processes

Agents carry out actions:

- forever **infinite horizon**
- until some stopping criteria is met **indefinite horizon**
- finite and fixed number of steps **finite horizon**

Decision-theoretic Planning

What should an agent do when

- it gets rewards (and punishments) and tries to maximize its rewards received
- actions can be stochastic; the outcome of an action can't be fully predicted
- there is a model that specifies the (probabilistic) outcome of actions and the rewards
- the world is fully observable

Initial Assumptions

- flat or modular or hierarchical
- explicit states or features or individuals and relations
- static or finite stage or indefinite stage or infinite stage
- fully observable or partially observable
- deterministic or stochastic dynamics
- goals or complex preferences
- single agent or multiple agents
- knowledge is given or knowledge is learned
- perfect rationality or bounded rationality

Utility and time

- Would you prefer \$1000 today or \$1000 next year?
- What price would you pay now to have an eternity of happiness?
- How can you trade off pleasures today with pleasures in the future?

Utility and time

- How would you compare the following sequences of rewards (per week):

A: \$1000000, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0,...

B: \$1000, \$1000, \$1000, \$1000, \$1000,...

C: \$1000, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0, \$0,...

D: \$1, \$1, \$1, \$1, \$1,...

E: \$1, \$2, \$3, \$4, \$5,...

Rewards and Values


Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time. What utility should be assigned?
“Return” or “value”

Rewards and Values

Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time. What utility should be assigned?
“Return” or “value”

- **total reward** $V = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i$
- **average reward** $V = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (r_1 + \dots + r_n)/n$

Average vs Accumulated Rewards



Rewards and Values

Suppose the agent receives a sequence of rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ in time.

- **discounted return** $V = r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots$
 γ is the **discount factor** $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t =$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

- How is the infinite future valued compared to immediate rewards?

Properties of the Discounted Rewards

- The discounted return for rewards $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, \dots$ is

$$\begin{aligned} V &= r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \gamma^2 r_3 + \gamma^3 r_4 + \dots \\ &= r_1 + \gamma(r_2 + \gamma(r_3 + \gamma(r_4 + \dots))) \end{aligned}$$

- If V_t is the value obtained from time step t

$$V_t = r_t + \gamma V_{t+1}$$

- How is the infinite future valued compared to immediate rewards?

$$1 + \gamma + \gamma^2 + \gamma^3 + \dots = 1/(1 - \gamma)$$

$$\text{Therefore } \frac{\text{minimum reward}}{1 - \gamma} \leq V_t \leq \frac{\text{maximum reward}}{1 - \gamma}$$

- We can approximate V with the first k terms, with error:

$$V - (r_1 + \gamma r_2 + \dots + \gamma^{k-1} r_k) = \gamma^k V_{k+1}$$

World State

- The world state is the information such that if the agent knew the world state, no information about the past is relevant to the future. **Markovian assumption**.
- S_i is state at time i , and A_i is the action at time i :

$$P(S_{t+1} | S_0, A_0, \dots, S_t, A_t) =$$

World State

- The world state is the information such that if the agent knew the world state, no information about the past is relevant to the future. **Markovian assumption**.
- S_i is state at time i , and A_i is the action at time i :


$$P(S_{t+1}|S_0, A_0, \dots, S_t, A_t) = P(S_{t+1}|S_t, A_t)$$

$P(s'|s, a)$ is the probability that the agent will be in state s' immediately after doing action a in state s .

- The dynamics is **stationary** if the distribution is the same for each time point.

Decision Processes

- A **Markov decision process** augments a Markov chain with actions and values:



Markov Decision Processes

An MDP consists of:

- set S of states.
- set A of actions.
- $P(S_{t+1}|S_t, A_t)$ specifies the dynamics.
- $R(S_t, A_t, S_{t+1})$ specifies the reward at time t .
 $R(s, a, s')$ is the expected reward received when the agent is in state s , does action a and ends up in state s' .
- γ is discount factor.

Example: to exercise or not?

Each week *Sam* has to decide whether to exercise or not:


- States: $\{fit, unfit\}$
- Actions: $\{exercise, relax\}$
- Dynamics:

State	Action	$P(fit State, Action)$
fit	exercise	0.99
fit	relax	0.7
unfit	exercise	0.2
unfit	relax	0.0

- Reward (does not depend on resulting state):

State	Action	Reward
fit	exercise	8
fit	relax	10
unfit	exercise	0
unfit	relax	5

Example: Simple Grid World



Grid World Model

- Actions: up, down, left, right.
- 100 states corresponding to the positions of the robot.
- Robot goes in the commanded direction with probability 0.7, and one of the other directions with probability 0.1.
- If it crashes into an outside wall, it remains in its current position and has a reward of -1 .
- Four special rewarding states; the agent gets the reward when leaving.

Planning Horizons

The planning horizon is how far ahead the planner looks to make a decision.

- The robot gets flung to one of the corners at random after leaving a positive (+10 or +3) reward state.
 - ▶ the process never halts
 - ▶ infinite horizon
- The robot gets +10 or +3 in the state, then it stays there getting no reward. These are absorbing states.
 - ▶ The robot will eventually reach an absorbing state.
 - ▶ indefinite horizon

Information Availability

What information is available when the agent decides what to do?

- **fully-observable MDP** the agent gets to observe S_t when deciding on action A_t .
- **partially-observable MDP** (POMDP) the agent has some noisy sensor of the state. It needs to remember its sensing and acting history.

[This lecture only considers FOMDPs]

- A **stationary policy** is a function:

$$\pi : S \rightarrow A$$

Given a state s , $\pi(s)$ specifies what action the agent who is following π will do.

- An **optimal policy** is one with maximum expected discounted reward.
- For a fully-observable MDP with stationary dynamics and rewards with infinite or indefinite horizon, there is always an optimal stationary policy.

Example: to exercise or not?

Each week *Sam* has to decide whether to exercise or not:

- States: $\{fit, unfit\}$
- Actions: $\{exercise, relax\}$

How many stationary policies are there?

What are they?

Example: to exercise or not?

Each week *Sam* has to decide whether to exercise or not:

- States: $\{fit, unfit\}$
- Actions: $\{exercise, relax\}$

How many stationary policies are there?

What are they?

For the grid world with 100 states and 4 actions,
how many stationary policies are there?

Value of a Policy

Given a policy π :

- $Q^\pi(s, a)$, where a is an action and s is a state, is the expected value of doing a in state s , then following policy π .
- $V^\pi(s)$, where s is a state, is the expected value of following policy π in state s .
- Q^π and V^π can be defined mutually recursively:

$$Q^\pi(s, a) =$$

$$V^\pi(s) =$$

Value of the Optimal Policy

- $Q^*(s, a)$, where a is an action and s is a state, is the expected value of doing a in state s , then following the optimal policy.
- $V^*(s)$, where s is a state, is the expected value of following the optimal policy in state s .
- Q^* and V^* can be defined mutually recursively:

$$Q^*(s, a) =$$

$$V^*(s) =$$

$$\pi^*(s) =$$

Value Iteration

- Let V_k and Q_k be k -step lookahead value and Q functions.
- Idea: Given an estimate of the k -step lookahead value function, determine the $k + 1$ step lookahead value function.
- Set V_0 arbitrarily.
- Compute Q_{i+1} , V_{i+1} from V_i .
- This converges exponentially fast (in k) to the optimal value function.

The error reduces proportionally to $\frac{\gamma^k}{1 - \gamma}$

Asynchronous Value Iteration

- The agent doesn't need to sweep through all the states, but can update the value functions for each state individually.
- This converges to the optimal value functions, if each state and action is visited infinitely often in the limit.
- It can either store $V[s]$ or $Q[s, a]$.

Asynchronous VI: storing $V[s]$

- Repeat forever:

- ▶ Select state s

- ▶ $V[s] \leftarrow \max_a \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) (R(s, a, s') + \gamma V[s'])$

Asynchronous VI: storing $Q[s, a]$

- Repeat forever:

- ▶ Select state s , action a

- ▶ $Q[s, a] \leftarrow \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) \left(R(s, a, s') + \gamma \max_{a'} Q[s', a'] \right)$

Policy Iteration

- Set π_0 arbitrarily, let $i = 0$
- Repeat:
 - ▶ evaluate $Q^{\pi_i}(s, a)$
 - ▶ let $\pi_{i+1}(s) = \operatorname{argmax}_a Q^{\pi_i}(s, a)$
 - ▶ set $i = i + 1$
- until $\pi_i(s) = \pi_{i-1}(s)$

Policy Iteration

- Set π_0 arbitrarily, let $i = 0$
- Repeat:
 - ▶ evaluate $Q^{\pi_i}(s, a)$
 - ▶ let $\pi_{i+1}(s) = \operatorname{argmax}_a Q^{\pi_i}(s, a)$
 - ▶ set $i = i + 1$
- until $\pi_i(s) = \pi_{i-1}(s)$

Evaluating $Q^{\pi_i}(s, a)$ means finding a solution to a set of $|S| \times |A|$ linear equations with $|S| \times |A|$ unknowns.

It can also be approximated iteratively.

Modified Policy Iteration

Set $\pi[s]$ arbitrarily

Set $Q[s, a]$ arbitrarily

Repeat forever:

- Repeat for a while:
 - ▶ Select state s , action a
 - ▶ $Q[s, a] \leftarrow \sum_{s'} P(s'|s, a) (R(s, a, s') + \gamma Q[s', \pi[s']])$
- $\pi[s] \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_a Q[s, a]$

$$Q^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} P(s'|a, s) (R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s'))$$

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

$$\pi^*(s) = \operatorname{argmax}_a Q(s, a)$$

Let

$$R(s, a) = \sum_{s'} P(s'|a, s) R(s, a, s')$$

Then:

$$Q^*(s, a) =$$

$$Q^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} P(s'|a, s) (R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^*(s'))$$

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

$$\pi^*(s) = \operatorname{argmax}_a Q(s, a)$$

Let

$$R(s, a) = \sum_{s'} P(s'|a, s) R(s, a, s')$$

Then:

$$Q^*(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s'} P(s'|a, s) V^*(s')$$