

Relational Actions and Planning

- Agents reason in time.
- Agents reason about time.

Time passes as an agent acts and reasons.

Given a goal, it is useful for an agent to think about what it will do in the future to determine what it will do now.

Representing Time

Time can be modeled in a number of ways:

Discrete time Time is modeled as jumping from one time point to another.

Continuous time Time is modeled as being dense.

Event-based time Time steps don't have to be uniform; time steps can be between interesting events.


State space Instead of considering time explicitly, actions can map from one state to another.

You can model time in terms of **points** or **intervals**.

When modeling relations, you distinguish two basic types:

- **Static relations** are those relations whose value does not depend on time.
- **Dynamic relations** are relations whose truth values depends on time. Either
 - ▶ **derived relations** whose definition can be derived from other relations for each time,
 - ▶ **primitive relations** whose truth value can be determined by considering previous times.

The Delivery Robot World



Modeling the Delivery Robot World

- **Individuals:** rooms, doors, keys, parcels, and the robot.
- **Actions:**
 - ▶ move from room to room
 - ▶ pick up and put down keys and packages
 - ▶ unlock doors (with the appropriate keys)
- **Relations:** represent
 - ▶ the robot's position
 - ▶ the position of packages and keys and locked doors
 - ▶ what the robot is holding

Example Relations

- $at(Obj, Loc)$ is true in a situation if object Obj is at location Loc in the situation.
- $carrying(Ag, Obj)$ is true in a situation if agent Ag is carrying Obj in that situation.
- $sitting_at(Obj, Loc)$ is true in a situation if object Obj is sitting on the ground (not being carried) at location Loc in the situation.
- $unlocked(Door)$ is true in a situation if door $Door$ is unlocked in the situation.
- $autonomous(Ag)$ is true if agent Ag can move autonomously. This is static.

Example Relations (cont.)

- $opens(Key, Door)$ is true if key Key opens door $Door$. This is static.
- $adjacent(Pos_1, Pos_2)$ is true if position Pos_1 is adjacent to position Pos_2 so that the robot can move from Pos_1 to Pos_2 in one step.
- $between(Door, Pos_1, Pos_2)$ is true if $Door$ is between position Pos_1 and position Pos_2 . If the door is unlocked, the two positions are adjacent.

- ***move(*Ag*, *From*, *To*)*** agent *Ag* moves from location *From* to adjacent location *To*. The agent must be sitting at location *From*.
- ***pickup(*Ag*, *Obj*)*** agent *Ag* picks up *Obj*. The agent must be at the location that *Obj* is sitting.
- ***putdown(*Ag*, *Obj*)*** the agent *Ag* puts down *Obj*. It must be holding *Obj*.
- ***unlock(*Ag*, *Door*)*** agent *Ag* unlocks *Door*. It must be outside the door and carrying the key to the door.

sitting_at(rob, o109).
sitting_at(parcel, storage).
sitting_at(k1, mail).

between(door1, o103, lab2).
opens(k1, door1).
autonomous(rob).

Derived Relations

$at(Obj, Pos) \leftarrow sitting_at(Obj, Pos).$

$at(Obj, Pos) \leftarrow carrying(Ag, Obj) \wedge at(Ag, Pos).$

$adjacent(o109, o103).$

$adjacent(o103, o109).$

...

$adjacent(lab2, o109).$

$adjacent(P_1, P_2) \leftarrow$
 $between(Door, P_1, P_2) \wedge$
 $unlocked(Door).$

Situation Calculus

- State-based representation where the states are denoted by terms.
- A **situation** is a term that denotes a state.
- There are two ways to refer to states:
 - ▶ **init** denotes the initial state
 - ▶ **do(A, S)** denotes the state resulting from doing action A in state S , if it is possible to do A in S .
- A situation encodes how to get to the state it denotes.
 - ▶ A state may be represented by multiple situations.
 - ▶ A state may be represented by no situations if it is unreachable.
 - ▶ A situation may represent no states, if an action was not possible.

Example Situations

- *init*
- *do(move(rob, o109, o103), init)*
- *do(move(rob, o103, mail),
do(move(rob, o109, o103),
init)).*
- *do(pickup(rob, k1),
do(move(rob, o103, mail),
do(move(rob, o109, o103),
init))).*

Using the Situation Terms

- Add an extra term to each dynamic predicate indicating the situation.
- Example Atoms:

at(rob, o109, init)

at(rob, o103, do(move(rob, o109, o103), init))

at(k1, mail, do(move(rob, o109, o103), init))

Axiomatizing using the Situation Calculus

- You specify what is true in the **initial state** using axioms with *init* as the situation parameter.
- **Primitive relations** are axiomatized by specifying what is true in situation $do(A, S)$ in terms of what holds in situation S .
- **Derived relations** are defined using clauses with a free variable in the situation argument.
- **Static relations** are defined without reference to the situation.

Derived Relations

sitting_at(rob, o109, init).

sitting_at(parcel, storage, init).

sitting_at(k1, mail, init).

adjacent(P_1, P_2, S) \leftarrow
 between(Door, P_1, P_2) \wedge
 unlocked(Door, S).

adjacent(lab2, o109, S).

...

When are actions possible?

poss(A, S) is true if action *A* is possible in situation *S*.

$$\text{poss}(\text{putdown}(Ag, Obj), S) \leftarrow \\ \text{carrying}(Ag, Obj, S).$$
$$\text{poss}(\text{move}(Ag, Pos_1, Pos_2), S) \leftarrow \\ \text{autonomous}(Ag) \wedge \\ \text{adjacent}(Pos_1, Pos_2, S) \wedge \\ \text{sitting_at}(Ag, Pos_1, S).$$

Axiomatizing Primitive Relations

Example: Unlocking the door makes the door unlocked:

$$\text{unlocked}(\text{Door}, \text{do}(\text{unlock}(\text{Ag}, \text{Door}), S)) \leftarrow \\ \text{poss}(\text{unlock}(\text{Ag}, \text{Door}), S).$$

Frame Axiom: No actions lock the door:

$$\text{unlocked}(\text{Door}, \text{do}(A, S)) \leftarrow \\ \text{unlocked}(\text{Door}, S) \wedge \\ \text{poss}(A, S).$$

Example: axiomatizing *carried*

Picking up an object causes it to be carried:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{carrying}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}, \text{do}(\text{pickup}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}), S)) \leftarrow \\ \text{poss}(\text{pickup}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}), S). \end{aligned}$$

Frame Axiom: The object is being carried if it was being carried before unless the action was to put down the object:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{carrying}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}, \text{do}(A, S)) \leftarrow \\ \text{carrying}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}, S) \wedge \\ \text{poss}(A, S) \wedge \\ A \neq \text{putdown}(\text{Ag}, \text{Obj}). \end{aligned}$$

Example: *sitting_at*

An object is sitting at a location if:

- it moved to that location:

$$\textit{sitting_at}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{do}(\textit{move}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}_0, \textit{Pos}), \textit{S})) \leftarrow \\ \textit{poss}(\textit{move}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}_0, \textit{Pos})).$$

- it was put down at that location:

$$\textit{sitting_at}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{do}(\textit{putdown}(\textit{Ag}, \textit{Obj}), \textit{S})) \leftarrow \\ \textit{poss}(\textit{putdown}(\textit{Ag}, \textit{Obj}), \textit{S}) \wedge \\ \textit{at}(\textit{Ag}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{S}).$$

- it was at that location before and didn't move and wasn't picked up.

More General Frame Axioms

The only actions that undo *sitting_at* for object *Obj* is when *Obj* moves somewhere or when someone is picking up *Obj*.

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{sitting_at}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{do}(A, S)) \leftarrow \\ \textit{poss}(A, S) \wedge \\ \textit{sitting_at}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, S) \wedge \\ \forall \textit{Pos}_1 \quad A \neq \textit{move}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{Pos}_1) \wedge \\ \forall \textit{Ag} \quad A \neq \textit{pickup}(\textit{Ag}, \textit{Obj}). \end{aligned}$$

The last line is equivalent to:

$$\sim \exists \textit{Ag} \quad A = \textit{pickup}(\textit{Ag}, \textit{Obj})$$

which can be implemented as

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{sitting_at}(\textit{Obj}, \textit{Pos}, \textit{do}(A, S)) \leftarrow \\ \dots \wedge \dots \wedge \dots \wedge \\ \sim \textit{is_pickup_action}(A, \textit{Obj}). \end{aligned}$$

with the clause:

Given

- an initial world description
- a description of available actions
- a goal

a **plan** is a sequence of actions that will achieve the goal.

Example Planning

If you want a plan to achieve Rob holding the key $k1$ and being at $o103$, the query

ask carrying(rob, k1, S) \wedge at(rob, o103, S).

has an answer

$S = do(move(rob, mail, o103),$
 $do(pickup(rob, k1),$
 $do(move(rob, o103, mail),$
 $do(move(rob, o109, o103), init))))).$

Planning as Resolution

- **Idea:** backward chain on the situation calculus rules.
- A complete search strategy (e.g., A^* or iterative deepening) is guaranteed to find a solution.
- When there is a solution to the query with situation $S = do(A, S_1)$, action A is the last action in the plan.
- You can virtually always use a frame axiom so that the search space is largely unconstrained by the goal. Search space is enormous.

- Given a goal, you would like to consider only those actions that actually achieve it.
- Example:

ask carrying(rob, parcel, S) \wedge in(rob, lab2, S).

the last action needed is irrelevant to the left subgoal.

- So we need to combine the planning algorithms with the relational representations.

Relational Learning

- 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

- Often the values of properties are not meaningful values but names of individuals.
- It is the properties of these individuals and their relationship to other individuals that needs to be learned.
- Relational learning has been studied under the umbrella of “Inductive Logic Programming” as the representations are often logic programs.

Example: trading agent

What does Joe like?

Individual	Property	Value
<i>joe</i>	<i>likes</i>	<i>resort_14</i>
<i>joe</i>	<i>dislikes</i>	<i>resort_35</i>
...
<i>resort_14</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>resort</i>
<i>resort_14</i>	<i>near</i>	<i>beach_18</i>
<i>beach_18</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>beach</i>
<i>beach_18</i>	<i>covered_in</i>	<i>ws</i>
<i>ws</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>sand</i>
<i>ws</i>	<i>color</i>	<i>white</i>
...

Values of properties may be meaningless names.

Example: trading agent

Possible theory that could be learned:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prop}(\text{joe}, \text{likes}, R) \leftarrow \\ \text{prop}(R, \text{type}, \text{resort}) \wedge \\ \text{prop}(R, \text{near}, B) \wedge \\ \text{prop}(B, \text{type}, \text{beach}) \wedge \\ \text{prop}(B, \text{covered_in}, S) \wedge \\ \text{prop}(S, \text{type}, \text{sand}). \end{aligned}$$

Joe likes resorts that are near sandy beaches.

Inductive Logic Programming: Inputs and Output

- A is a set of atoms whose definitions the agent is learning.
- E^+ is a set of ground atoms observed true: **positive examples**
- E^- is the set of ground atoms observed to be false: **negative examples**
- B is a set of clauses: **background knowledge**
- H is a space of possible hypotheses. H can be the set of all logic programs defining A .

The aim is to find a simplest hypothesis $h \in H$ such that

$$B \wedge h \models E^+ \text{ and}$$

$$B \wedge h \not\models E^-$$

Generality of Hypotheses

Hypothesis H_1 is **more general** than H_2 if H_1 logically implies H_2 .
 H_2 is then **more specific** than H_1 .

Generality of Hypotheses

Hypothesis H_1 is **more general** than H_2 if H_1 logically implies H_2 .
 H_2 is then **more specific** than H_1 .

Consider the logic programs:

- $a \leftarrow b.$
- $a \leftarrow b \wedge c.$
- $a \leftarrow b. \quad a \leftarrow c.$
- $a.$

Which is the most general? Least general?

Generality of Hypotheses

Hypothesis H_1 is **more general** than H_2 if H_1 logically implies H_2 .
 H_2 is then **more specific** than H_1 .

Consider the logic programs:

- $a \leftarrow b.$
- $a \leftarrow b \wedge c.$
- $a \leftarrow b. \quad a \leftarrow c.$
- $a.$

Which is the most general? Least general?

- For target relation $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$ what is the most general logic program?

Generality of Hypotheses

Hypothesis H_1 is **more general** than H_2 if H_1 logically implies H_2 .
 H_2 is then **more specific** than H_1 .

Consider the logic programs:

- $a \leftarrow b.$
- $a \leftarrow b \wedge c.$
- $a \leftarrow b. \quad a \leftarrow c.$
- $a.$

Which is the most general? Least general?

- For target relation $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$ what is the most general logic program?
- What is the least general logic program that is consistent with E^+ and E^- ?

Inductive Logic Programming: Main Approaches

Single target relation: $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$.

Two main approaches:

- Start with the most general hypothesis and make it more complicated to fit the data.

Inductive Logic Programming: Main Approaches

Single target relation: $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$.

Two main approaches:

- Start with the most general hypothesis and make it more complicated to fit the data. Most general hypothesis is

$$t(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

Keep adding conditions, ensuring it always implies the positive examples. At each step, exclude some negative examples.

Inductive Logic Programming: Main Approaches

Single target relation: $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$.

Two main approaches:

- Start with the most general hypothesis and make it more complicated to fit the data. Most general hypothesis is

$$t(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

Keep adding conditions, ensuring it always implies the positive examples. At each step, exclude some negative examples.

- Start with a hypothesis that fits the data and keep making it simpler while still fitting the data.

Inductive Logic Programming: Main Approaches

Single target relation: $A = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n)\}$.

Two main approaches:

- Start with the most general hypothesis and make it more complicated to fit the data. Most general hypothesis is

$$t(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

Keep adding conditions, ensuring it always implies the positive examples. At each step, exclude some negative examples.

- Start with a hypothesis that fits the data and keep making it simpler while still fitting the data. Initially the logic program can be E^+ . Operators simplify the program, ensuring it fits the training examples.

Inductive Logic Programming: General to Specific Search

Maintain a logic program G that entails the positive examples.
Initially:

$$G = \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leftarrow\}$$

A **specialization operator** takes G and returns set S of clauses that specializes G . Thus $G \models S$.

Three primitive specialization operators:

- Split a clause in G on condition c . Clause $a \leftarrow b$ in G is replaced by two clauses: $a \leftarrow b \wedge c$ and $a \leftarrow b \wedge \neg c$.
- Split clause $a \leftarrow b$ on variable X , producing:

$$a \leftarrow b \wedge X = t_1.$$

...

$$a \leftarrow b \wedge X = t_k.$$

where the t_i are terms.

- Remove any clause not necessary to prove the positive examples.

Top-down Inductive Logic Program

```
1: procedure TDInductiveLogicProgram( $t, B, E^+, E^-, R$ )
2:    $t$ : an atom whose definition is to be learned
3:    $B$ : background knowledge is a logic program
4:    $E^+$ : positive examples
5:    $E^-$ : negative examples
6:    $R$ : set of specialization operators
7:   Output: logic program that classifies  $E^+$  positively and
    $E^-$  negatively or  $\perp$  if no program can be found
8:    $H \leftarrow \{t(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leftarrow\}$ 
9:   while there is  $e \in E^-$  such that  $B \cup H \models e$  do
10:    if there is  $r \in R$  such that  $B \cup r(H) \models E^+$  then
11:      Choose  $r \in R$  such that  $B \cup r(H) \models E^+$ 
12:       $H \leftarrow r(H)$ 
13:    else
14:      return  $\perp$ 
15:  return  $H$ 
```

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

- describe the mapping between relational probabilistic models and their groundings
- read plate notation
- build a relational probabilistic model for a domain

Relational Probabilistic Models

- 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

Often we want random variables for combinations of individual in populations


- build a probabilistic model before knowing the individuals
- learn the model for one set of individuals
- apply the model to new individuals
- allow complex relationships between individuals

Example: Predicting Relations


<i>Student</i>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Grade</i>
s_1	c_1	A
s_2	c_1	C
s_1	c_2	B
s_2	c_3	B
s_3	c_2	B
s_4	c_3	B
s_3	c_4	$?$
s_4	c_4	$?$

- Students s_3 and s_4 have the same averages, on courses with the same averages. Why should we make different predictions?
- How can we make predictions when the values of properties *Student* and *Course* are individuals?

From Relations to Belief Networks



From Relations to Belief Networks



$I(S)$	$D(C)$	$Gr(S, C)$		
		A	B	C
<i>true</i>	<i>true</i>	0.5	0.4	0.1
<i>true</i>	<i>false</i>	0.9	0.09	0.01
<i>false</i>	<i>true</i>	0.01	0.1	0.9
<i>false</i>	<i>false</i>	0.1	0.4	0.5


$$P(I(S)) = 0.5$$

$$P(D(C)) = 0.5$$

“parameter sharing”


<http://artint.info/code/aispace/grades.xml>

Plate Notation




- S is a logical variable representing students
- C is a logical variable representing courses
- the set of all individuals of some type is called a **population**

Plate Notation




- S is a logical variable representing students
- C is a logical variable representing courses
- the set of all individuals of some type is called a **population**
- $I(S)$, $Gr(S, C)$, $D(C)$ are **parametrized random variables**

Plate Notation




- S is a logical variable representing students
- C is a logical variable representing courses
- the set of all individuals of some type is called a **population**
- $I(S)$, $Gr(S, C)$, $D(C)$ are **parametrized random variables**
- for every student s , there is a random variable $I(s)$
- for every course c , there is a random variable $D(c)$
- for every student s and course c pair there is a random variable $Gr(s, c)$

Plate Notation




- S is a logical variable representing students
- C is a logical variable representing courses
- the set of all individuals of some type is called a **population**
- $I(S)$, $Gr(S, C)$, $D(C)$ are **parametrized random variables**
- for every student s , there is a random variable $I(s)$
- for every course c , there is a random variable $D(c)$
- for every student s and course c pair there is a random variable $Gr(s, c)$
- all instances share the same structure and parameters

Plate Notation for Learning Parameters



- T is a logical variable representing tosses of a thumb tack
- $H(t)$ is a Boolean variable that is true if toss t is heads.
- θ is a random variable representing the probability of heads.
- Range of θ is $\{0.0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.99, 1.0\}$ or interval $[0, 1]$.
- $P(H(t_i)=true|\theta=p) =$

Plate Notation for Learning Parameters



- T is a logical variable representing tosses of a thumb tack
- $H(t)$ is a Boolean variable that is true if toss t is heads.
- θ is a random variable representing the probability of heads.
- Range of θ is $\{0.0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.99, 1.0\}$ or interval $[0, 1]$.
- $P(H(t_i)=true|\theta=p) = p$
- $H(t_i)$ is independent of $H(t_j)$ (for $i \neq j$) given θ : **i.i.d. or independent and identically distributed.**

Parametrized belief networks

- Allow random variables to be parametrized.
- Parameters correspond to logical variables.
logical variables can be drawn as plates.

interested(X)

X

Parametrized belief networks


- Allow random variables to be parametrized. *interested(X)*
- Parameters correspond to logical variables. *X*
logical variables can be drawn as plates.
- Each logical variable is typed with a population. *X : person*
- A population is a set of individuals.
- Each population has a size. $|person| = 1000000$

Parametrized belief networks

- Allow random variables to be parametrized. *interested(X)*
- Parameters correspond to logical variables. *X*
logical variables can be drawn as plates.
- Each logical variable is typed with a population. *X : person*
- A population is a set of individuals.
- Each population has a size. *|person| = 1000000*
- Parametrized belief network means its grounding: an instance of each random variable for each assignment of an individual to a logical variable. *interested(p₁) ... interested(p₁₀₀₀₀₀₀)*
- Instances are independent (but can have common ancestors and descendants).

Parametrized Bayesian networks / Plates

Parametrized Bayes Net:



+




Bayes Net



Individuals:

i_1, \dots, i_k



Parametrized Bayesian networks / Plates (2)





Creating Dependencies

Instances of plates are independent, except by common parents or children.


Common
Parents



Observed
Children





Overlapping plates



Relations: $likes(P, M)$, $young(P)$, $genre(M)$
 $likes$ is Boolean, $young$ is Boolean,
 $genre$ has range $\{action, romance, family\}$

Overlapping plates



Relations: $likes(P, M)$, $young(P)$, $genre(M)$


$likes$ is Boolean, $young$ is Boolean,

$genre$ has range $\{action, romance, family\}$

Three people: sam (s), chris (c), kim (k)


Two movies: rango (r), terminator (t)

Overlapping plates




- Relations: $likes(P, M)$, $young(P)$, $genre(M)$
- $likes$ is Boolean, $young$ is Boolean, $genre$ has range $\{action, romance, family\}$
- If there are 1000 people and 100 movies,
Grounding contains:
 random variables

Overlapping plates



- Relations: $likes(P, M)$, $young(P)$, $genre(M)$
- $likes$ is Boolean, $young$ is Boolean, $genre$ has range $\{action, romance, family\}$
- If there are 1000 people and 100 movies,
Grounding contains: 100,000 likes + 1,000 age + 100 genre
= 101,100 random variables
- How many numbers need to be specified to define the probabilities required?

Overlapping plates




- Relations: $likes(P, M)$, $young(P)$, $genre(M)$
- $likes$ is Boolean, $young$ is Boolean, $genre$ has range $\{action, romance, family\}$
- If there are 1000 people and 100 movies,
Grounding contains: 100,000 likes + 1,000 age + 100 genre
= 101,100 random variables
- How many numbers need to be specified to define the probabilities required?
1 for $young$, 2 for $genre$, 6 for $likes$ = 9 total.

Representing Conditional Probabilities


- $P(\text{likes}(P, M) | \text{young}(P), \text{genre}(M))$ — **parameter sharing** — individuals share probability parameters.
- $P(\text{happy}(X) | \text{friend}(X, Y), \text{mean}(Y))$ — needs **aggregation** — $\text{happy}(a)$ depends on an unbounded number of parents.
- There can be more structure about the individuals. . .

Example: Aggregation



Exercise #1

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the the population of X is n and all variables are Boolean.

(a) How many random variables are in the grounding?

Exercise #1

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the the population of X is n and all variables are Boolean.

- (a) How many random variables are in the grounding?
- (b) How many numbers need to be specified for a tabular representation of the conditional probabilities?

Exercise #2

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the the population of X is n and all variables are Boolean.

- (a) Which of the conditional probabilities cannot be defined as a table?

Exercise #2

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the the population of X is n and all variables are Boolean.

- (a) Which of the conditional probabilities cannot be defined as a table?
- (b) How many random variables are in the grounding?

Exercise #2

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the the population of X is n and all variables are Boolean.

- (a) Which of the conditional probabilities cannot be defined as a table?
- (b) How many random variables are in the grounding?
- (c) How many numbers need to be specified for a tabular representation of those conditional probabilities that can be defined using a table? (Assume an aggregator is an “or” which uses no numbers).

Exercise #3

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the population of *Person* is n and the population of *Movie* is m , and all variables are Boolean.

(a) How many random variables are in the grounding?

Exercise #3

For the relational probabilistic model:




Suppose the population of *Person* is n and the population of *Movie* is m , and all variables are Boolean.


- (a) How many random variables are in the grounding?
- (b) How many numbers are required to specify the conditional probabilities? (Assume an “or” is the aggregator and the rest are defined by tables).

Hierarchical Bayesian Model

Example: S_{XH} is true when patient X is sick in hospital H .
We want to learn the probability of Sick for each hospital.
Where do the prior probabilities for the hospitals come from?




(a)



(b)

Example: Language Models


Unigram Model:



- D is the document
- I is the index of a word in the document. I ranges from 1 to the number of words in document D .
- $W(D, I)$ is the I 'th word in document D . The range of W is the set of all words.

Example: Language Models


Topic Mixture:



- D is the document
- I is the index of a word in the document. I ranges from 1 to the number of words in document D .
- $W(d, i)$ is the i 'th word in document d . The range of W is the set of all words.
- $T(d)$ is the topic of document d . The range of T is the set of all topics.


Example: Language Models

Mixture of topics, bag of words (unigram):



- D is the set of all documents
- I is the set of indexes of words in the document. I ranges from 1 to the number of words in the document.
- T is the set of all topics
- $W(d,i)$ is the i 'th word in document d . The range of W is the set of all words.
- $S(t,d)$ is true if topic t is a subject of document d . S is Boolean.


Example: Latent Dirichlet Allocation



- D is the document
- I is the index of a word in the document. I ranges from 1 to the number of words in document D .
- T is the topic
- $w(d, i)$ is the i 'th word in document d . The range of w is the set of all words.
- $to(d, i)$ is the topic of the i th-word of document d . The range of to is the set of all topics.
- $pr(d, t)$ is the proportion of document d that is about topic t . The range of pr is the reals.

Example: Language Models


Mixture of topics, set of words:



- D is the set of all documents
- W is the set of all words.
- T is the set of all topics
- Boolean $A(w, d)$ is true if word w appears in document d .
- Boolean $S(t, d)$ is true if topic t is a subject of document d .



Example: Language Models

Mixture of topics, set of words:



- D is the set of all documents
- W is the set of all words.
- T is the set of all topics
- Boolean $A(w, d)$ is true if word w appears in document d .
- Boolean $S(t, d)$ is true if topic t is a subject of document d .
- Rephil (Google) has 900,000 topics, 12,000,000 “words”, 350,000,000 links.

Creating Dependencies: Exploit Domain Structure




Predicting students errors


$$\begin{array}{rcc} & x_2 & x_1 \\ + & y_2 & y_1 \\ \hline z_3 & z_2 & z_1 \end{array}$$

Predicting students errors

$$\begin{array}{r} + \quad \quad x_2 \quad x_1 \\ \quad y_2 \quad y_1 \\ \hline z_3 \quad z_2 \quad z_1 \end{array}$$




Predicting students errors




- What if there were multiple digits

Predicting students errors




- What if there were multiple digits, problems

Predicting students errors




- What if there were multiple digits, problems, students

Predicting students errors



- What if there were multiple digits, problems, students, times?


Predicting students errors



- What if there were multiple digits, problems, students, times?
- How can we build a model before we know the individuals?

Multi-digit addition with parametrized BNs / plates


$$\begin{array}{rcccc} & x_{j_x} & \cdots & x_2 & x_1 \\ + & y_{j_y} & \cdots & y_2 & y_1 \\ \hline z_{j_z} & \cdots & z_2 & z_1 \end{array}$$



- Parametrized Random Variables:


Multi-digit addition with parametrized BNs / plates

$$\begin{array}{r} x_{j_x} \quad \cdots \quad x_2 \quad x_1 \\ + \quad y_{j_y} \quad \cdots \quad y_2 \quad y_1 \\ \hline z_{j_z} \quad \cdots \quad z_2 \quad z_1 \end{array}$$




- Parametrized Random Variables: $x(D, P)$, $y(D, P)$, $knows_carry(S, T)$, $knows_add(S, T)$, $c(D, P, S, T)$, $z(D, P, S, T)$
- Logical variables:

Multi-digit addition with parametrized BNs / plates



- Parametrized Random Variables: $x(D, P)$, $y(D, P)$, $\text{knows_carry}(S, T)$, $\text{knows_add}(S, T)$, $c(D, P, S, T)$, $z(D, P, S, T)$
- Logical variables: digit D , problem P , student S , time T .
- Random variables:

Multi-digit addition with parametrized BNs / plates



- Parametrized Random Variables: $x(D, P)$, $y(D, P)$, $\text{knows_carry}(S, T)$, $\text{knows_add}(S, T)$, $c(D, P, S, T)$, $z(D, P, S, T)$
- Logical variables: digit D , problem P , student S , time T .
- Random variables: There is a random variable for each assignment of a value to D and a value to P in $x(D, P)$

- A language for relational probabilistic models.
- **Idea**: combine logic and probability, where all uncertainty is handled in terms of Bayesian decision theory, and a logic program specifies consequences of choices.
- Parametrized random variables are represented as logical atoms, and plates correspond to logical variables.

Independent Choice Logic

- An **alternative** is a set of ground atomic formulas.
 \mathcal{C} , the **choice space** is a set of disjoint alternatives.
- \mathcal{F} , the **facts** is a logic program that gives consequences of choices.
 \mathcal{F} can include negation as failure
No member of an alternative unifies with the head of a clause.
- P_0 a probability distribution over alternatives:

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{C} \sum_{a \in A} P_0(a) = 1.$$

Meaningless Example

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}, \{b_1, b_2\}\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f \leftarrow c_1 \wedge b_1, & f \leftarrow c_3 \wedge b_2, \\ d \leftarrow c_1, & d \leftarrow \sim c_2 \wedge b_1, \\ e \leftarrow f, & e \leftarrow \sim d \end{array} \right\}$$

$$P_0(c_1) = 0.5 \quad P_0(c_2) = 0.3 \quad P_0(c_3) = 0.2$$

$$P_0(b_1) = 0.9 \quad P_0(b_2) = 0.1$$

- There is a possible world for each selection of one element from each alternative.
- The logic program together with the selected atoms specifies what is true in each possible world.
- The elements of different alternatives are independent.

Meaningless Example: Semantics

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f \leftarrow c_1 \wedge b_1, & f \leftarrow c_3 \wedge b_2, \\ d \leftarrow c_1, & d \leftarrow \sim c_2 \wedge b_1, \\ e \leftarrow f, & e \leftarrow \sim d \end{array} \right\}$$


$$\begin{array}{lll} P_0(c_1) = 0.5 & P_0(c_2) = 0.3 & P_0(c_3) = 0.2 \\ P_0(b_1) = 0.9 & P_0(b_2) = 0.1 & \end{array}$$

		selection		logic program			
		$\underbrace{\hspace{1cm}}$		$\underbrace{\hspace{1cm}}$			
w_1	\models	c_1	b_1	f	d	e	$P(w_1) = 0.45$
w_2	\models	c_2	b_1	$\sim f$	$\sim d$	e	$P(w_2) = 0.27$
w_3	\models	c_3	b_1	$\sim f$	d	$\sim e$	$P(w_3) = 0.18$
w_4	\models	c_1	b_2	$\sim f$	d	$\sim e$	$P(w_4) = 0.05$
w_5	\models	c_2	b_2	$\sim f$	$\sim d$	e	$P(w_5) = 0.03$
w_6	\models	c_3	b_2	f	$\sim d$	e	$P(w_6) = 0.02$

$$P(e) = 0.45 + 0.27 + 0.03 + 0.02 = 0.77$$

Belief Networks and ICL rules

- (Discrete) belief networks can be directly mapped into ICL.
There is an alternative for each free parameter.



prob *ta* : 0.02.

prob *fire* : 0.01.

alarm $\leftarrow ta \wedge fire \wedge atf$.

alarm $\leftarrow \sim ta \wedge fire \wedge antf$.

alarm $\leftarrow ta \wedge \sim fire \wedge atnf$.

alarm $\leftarrow \sim ta \wedge \sim fire \wedge antnf$.

prob *atf* : 0.5.

prob *antf* : 0.99.

prob *atnf* : 0.85.

prob *antnf* : 0.0001.

smoke $\leftarrow fire \wedge sf$.


prob *sf* : 0.9.

smoke $\leftarrow \sim fire \wedge snf$.

prob *snf* : 0.01.

Decision Trees and ICL rules

- Rules can represent decision tree with probabilities:



$$e \leftarrow a \wedge b \wedge h_1.$$

$$P_0(h_1) = 0.7$$

$$e \leftarrow a \wedge \sim b \wedge h_2.$$

$$P_0(h_2) = 0.2$$

$$e \leftarrow \sim a \wedge c \wedge d \wedge h_3.$$

$$P_0(h_3) = 0.9$$

$$e \leftarrow \sim a \wedge c \wedge \sim d \wedge h_4.$$


$$P_0(h_4) = 0.5$$

$$e \leftarrow \sim a \wedge \sim c \wedge h_5.$$

$$P_0(h_5) = 0.3$$

Predicting Grades

Plates correspond
to logical variables.



$\text{prob } \text{int}(S) : 0.5.$

$\text{prob } \text{diff}(C) : 0.5.$

$\text{grade}(S, C, G) \leftarrow \text{int}(S) \wedge \text{diff}(C) \wedge \text{idg}(S, C, G).$


$\text{prob } \text{idg}(S, C, a) : 0.5, \text{idg}(S, C, b) : 0.4, \text{idg}(S, C, c) : 0.1.$

$\text{grade}(S, C, G) \leftarrow \text{int}(S) \wedge \sim \text{diff}(C) \wedge \text{indg}(S, C, G).$

$\text{prob } \text{indg}(S, C, a) : 0.9, \text{indg}(S, C, b) : 0.09, \text{indg}(S, C, c) : 0.01.$

...

Movie Ratings



$\text{prob } \text{young}(P) : 0.4.$

$\text{prob } \text{genre}(M, \text{action}) : 0.4, \text{genre}(M, \text{romance}) : 0.3,$
 $\text{genre}(M, \text{family}) : 0.4.$

$\text{likes}(P, M) \leftarrow \text{young}(P) \wedge \text{genre}(M, G) \wedge \text{ly}(P, M, G).$

$\text{likes}(P, M) \leftarrow \sim \text{young}(P) \wedge \text{genre}(M, G) \wedge \text{lny}(P, M, G).$

$\text{prob } \text{ly}(P, M, \text{action}) : 0.7.$

$\text{prob } \text{ly}(P, M, \text{romance}) : 0.3.$

$\text{prob } \text{ly}(P, M, \text{family}) : 0.8.$


$\text{prob } \text{lny}(P, M, \text{action}) : 0.2.$

$\text{prob } \text{lny}(P, M, \text{romance}) : 0.9.$

$\text{prob } \text{lny}(P, M, \text{family}) : 0.3.$

Aggregation


The relational probabilistic model:



Cannot be represented using tables. Why?

Aggregation

The relational probabilistic model:



Cannot be represented using tables. Why?

- This can be represented in ICL by

$$b \leftarrow a(X) \wedge n(X).$$

“noisy-or”, where $n(X)$ is a noise term, $\{n(X), \sim n(X)\} \in \mathcal{C}$


- If $a(c)$ is observed for each individual c :

$$P(b) = 1 - (1 - p)^k$$

Where $p = P(n(X))$ and k is the number of $a(c)$ that are true.

Example: Multi-digit addition

$$\begin{array}{r} x_{j_x} \quad \cdots \quad x_2 \quad x_1 \\ + \quad y_{j_y} \quad \cdots \quad y_2 \quad y_1 \\ \hline z_{j_z} \quad \cdots \quad z_2 \quad z_1 \end{array}$$



ICL rules for multi-digit addition

$$\begin{aligned} z(D, P, S, T) = V \leftarrow & \\ & x(D, P) = V_x \wedge \\ & y(D, P) = V_y \wedge \\ & c(D, P, S, T) = V_c \wedge \\ & \text{knows_add}(S, T) \wedge \\ & \neg \text{mistake}(D, P, S, T) \wedge \\ & V \text{ is } (V_x + V_y + V_c) \text{ div } 10. \end{aligned}$$

ICL rules for multi-digit addition

$$\begin{aligned} z(D, P, S, T) = V \leftarrow \\ & x(D, P) = V_x \wedge \\ & y(D, P) = V_y \wedge \\ & c(D, P, S, T) = V_c \wedge \\ & \text{knows_add}(S, T) \wedge \\ & \neg \text{mistake}(D, P, S, T) \wedge \\ & V \text{ is } (V_x + V_y + V_c) \text{ div } 10. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} z(D, P, S, T) = V \leftarrow \\ & \text{knows_add}(S, T) \wedge \\ & \text{mistake}(D, P, S, T) \wedge \\ & \text{selectDig}(D, P, S, T) = V. \\ z(D, P, S, T) = V \leftarrow \\ & \neg \text{knows_add}(S, T) \wedge \\ & \text{selectDig}(D, P, S, T) = V. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatives:

$$\forall DPST \{ \text{noMistake}(D, P, S, T), \text{mistake}(D, P, S, T) \}$$

$$\forall DPST \{ \text{selectDig}(D, P, S, T) = V \mid V \in \{0..9\} \}$$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

User	Item	Date	Rating
Sam	Terminator	2009-03-22	5
Sam	Rango	2011-03-22	4
Sam	The Holiday	2010-12-25	1
Chris	The Holiday	2010-12-25	4
...	

Netflix: 500,000 users, 17,000 movies, 100,000,000 ratings.

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

User	Item	Date	Rating
Sam	Terminator	2009-03-22	5
Sam	Rango	2011-03-22	4
Sam	The Holiday	2010-12-25	1
Chris	The Holiday	2010-12-25	4
...	

Netflix: 500,000 users, 17,000 movies, 100,000,000 ratings.

r_{ui} = rating of user u on item i

$\widehat{r_{ui}}$ = predicted rating of user u on item i

D = set of (u, i, r) tuples in the training set (ignoring Date)

Sum squares error:

$$\sum_{(u,i,r) \in D} (\widehat{r_{ui}} - r)^2$$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

- Predict same for all ratings: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

- Predict same for all ratings: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu$
- Adjust for each user and item: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

- Predict same for all ratings: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu$
- Adjust for each user and item: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u$
- One hidden feature: f_i for each item and g_u for each user

$$\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u + f_i g_u$$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

- Predict same for all ratings: $\widehat{r}_{ui} = \mu$
- Adjust for each user and item: $\widehat{r}_{ui} = \mu + b_i + c_u$
- One hidden feature: f_i for each item and g_u for each user

$$\widehat{r}_{ui} = \mu + b_i + c_u + f_i g_u$$

- k hidden features:

$$\widehat{r}_{ui} = \mu + b_i + c_u + \sum_k f_{ik} g_{ku}$$

Learning Relational Models with Hidden Variables

- Predict same for all ratings: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu$
- Adjust for each user and item: $\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u$
- One hidden feature: f_i for each item and g_u for each user

$$\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u + f_i g_u$$

- k hidden features:

$$\widehat{r_{ui}} = \mu + b_i + c_u + \sum_k f_{ik} g_{ku}$$

- Regularize

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize } & \sum_{(u,i) \in K} (\mu + b_i + c_u + \sum_k f_{ik} g_{ku} - r_{ui})^2 \\ & + \lambda(b_i^2 + c_u^2 + \sum_k f_{ik}^2 + g_{ku}^2) \end{aligned}$$

Parameter Learning using Gradient Descent

$\mu \leftarrow$ average rating

assign $f[i, k]$, $g[k, u]$ randomly

assign $b[i]$, $c[u]$ arbitrarily

repeat:

for each $(u, i, r) \in D$:

$e \leftarrow \mu + b[i] + c[u] + \sum_k f[i, k] * g[k, u] - r$

$b[i] \leftarrow b[i] - \eta * e - \eta * \lambda * b[i]$

$c[u] \leftarrow c[u] - \eta * e - \eta * \lambda * c[u]$

for each feature k :

$f[i, k] \leftarrow f[i, k] - \eta * e * g[k, u] - \eta * \lambda * f[i, k]$

$g[k, u] \leftarrow g[k, u] - \eta * e * f[i, k] - \eta * \lambda * g[k, u]$