Students can access the Course Feedback System through:

1) Canvas

2) https://brown.evaluationkit.com

3) Personalized login link in the reminder emails sent from <u>course_feedback@brown.edu</u>.

Deep Learning

CSCI 1470/2470 Spring 2023

Ritambhara Singh

April 21, 2023 Friday

DALL-E 2 prompt "a painting of deep underwater with a yellow submarine in the bottom right corner"

Review: Q-value and V-value Tables (made up)

	Action #1	Action #2	State	Value
State #1	0	-1	State #1	0
State #2	0.1	1	State #2	1
State #3	-1	-10	State #3	-1
State #4	0	1.9	State #4	1.9
State #5	10	0	State #5	10
State #6	-10	-10	State #6	-10

Review: Value iteration pseudocode

- 1. For all s, set V(s) := 0.
- 2. Repeat until convergence:
 - 1. For all s:
 - 1. For all a, set $Q(s, a) \coloneqq \sum_{s' \in S} T(s, a, s') [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V(s')]$
 - 2. $V(s) := max_a Q(s, a)$
- 3. Return Q

Review: Frozen Lake – final value table & optimal policy



Example Final Value Table

	1	2	3	4
1	0.068	0.061	0.074	0.055
2	0.092	0	0.112	0
3	0.145	0.247	0.3	0
4	0	0.38	0.639	0

Final Policy



Organizing RL problems/algorithms



For a more complete taxonomy of RL algorithms, see <u>https://spinningup.openai.com/e</u> <u>n/latest/spinningup/rl_intro2.htm</u> <u>l#citations-below</u>

Tabular Q-learning

Motivation: Why Not Value Iteration?

In value iteration, we assume that we know the transition and reward functions, but what if this isn't the case?

$$\{S, A, B, I, \gamma\}$$

How can we learn in this scenario?

Examples of Unknown T and/or R:

Self-Driving Cars T,R = ? Frozen Lake F F F F F F F

Can't design T for a self-driving car. Too complex to model directly What if we don't know how slippery the lake is? (i.e. T is unknown)

https://pixabay.com/illustrations/self-driving-car-autonomous-4309836/

First Attempt

Start in Frozen Lake with no knowledge of T or R



OpenAl Gym (<u>https://gym.openai.com/</u>)



Gym is a toolkit for developing and comparing reinforcement learning algorithms. It supports teaching agents everything from walking to playing games like Pong or Pinball.

View documentation > View on GitHub >

Frozen Lake in OpenAl Gym

FrozenLake-v0

The agent controls the movement of a character in a grid world. Some tiles of the grid are walkable, and others lead to the agent falling into the water. Additionally, the movement direction of the agent is uncertain and only partially depends on the chosen direction. The agent is rewarded for finding a walkable path to a goal tile.

Winter is here. You and your friends were tossing around a frisbee at the park when you made a wild throw that left the frisbee out in the middle of the lake. The water is mostly frozen, but there are a few holes where the ice has melted. If you step into one of those holes, you'll fall into the freezing water. At this time, there's an international frisbee shortage, so it's absolutely imperative that you navigate across the lake and retrieve the disc. However, the ice is slippery, so you won't always move in the direction you intend.

The surface is described using a grid like the following:

SFFF	(S: starting point, safe)
FHFH	(F: frozen surface, safe)
FFFH	(H: hole, fall to your doom)
HFFG	(G: goal, where the frisbee is located)

The episode ends when you reach the goal or fall in a hole. You receive a reward of 1 if you reach the goal, and zero otherwise.

RandomAgent on FrozenLake-v0

♦ VIEW SOURCE ON GITHUB

Frozen Lake 'Wandering' Demo

https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1yBCDzAXlu9j0A2aT8fH1zm7beBg tB9yY#scrollTo=sI_x2TsCp15L

Problems with This Approach

S	F	F	F
32709	13151	5951	2868
F	H	F	H
12335	7095	1760	1141
F	F	F	Н
4646	1579	1015	252

Values are the number of times each state was visited over 10000 episodes run in OpenAl Gym

So, what is the issue here?

We're extremely unlikely to reach the goal state through random wandering, so our estimates of T and R will probably be bad

How to Improve?



We can interleave policy improvement with wandering (Get better at exploring **by exploring**)

But how do we improve our policy?

- Every time we take an action, use the observed reward to update our estimate of Q
- V(s) is still max Q(s, a), so it only matters how we undate O



 $Q^{\pi}(s, a) = E[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')]$ $Q^{\pi}(s, a) = \sum_{s' \in S} P(s'|s, a)[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')]$

- Every time we take an action, use the observed reward to update our estimate of Q
- V(s) is still max Q(s, a), so it only matters how we update Q



 $\begin{aligned} Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= E[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \\ Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= \sum_{s' \in S} P(s'|s, a) [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \end{aligned}$

- Every time we take an action, use the observed reward to update our estimate of Q
- V(s) is still max Q(s, a), so it only matters how we update Q

Use Q to pick action a_0 . Observe transition and get reward r_0 . Use r_0 to update $Q(s_0, a_0)$ immediately



 $\begin{aligned} Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= E[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \\ Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= \sum_{s' \in S} P(s'|s, a) [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \end{aligned}$

- Every time we take an action, use the observed reward to update our estimate of Q
- V(s) is still max Q(s, a), so it only matters how we update Q

Use Q to pick action a_0 . Observe transition and get reward r_0 . Use r_0 to update $Q(s_0, a_0)$ immediately



 $\begin{aligned} Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= E[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \\ Q^{\pi}(s, a) &= \sum_{s' \in S} P(s'|s, a) [R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')] \end{aligned}$

- Every time we take an action, use the observed reward to update our estimate of Q
- V(s) is still max Q(s, a), so it only matters how we update Q

Use Q to pick action a_0 . Observe transition and Repeat process for s_1 . Update $Q(s_1, a_1)$ with get reward r_0 . Use r_0 to update $Q(s_0, a_0)$ r_1 immediately Н F G

 $Q^{\pi}(s, a) = E[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')]$ $Q^{\pi}(s, a) = \sum_{s' \in S} P(s'|s, a)[R(s, a, s') + \gamma V^{\pi}(s')]$

How do we Update Q?

Basic Strategy:

Take a weighted average of our old Q estimate with our new Q estimate

$$Q(s,a) = (1-\alpha)Q_{old}(s,a) + \alpha Q_{new}(s,a)$$

Where the hyperparameter α controls how quickly we learn

But what should $Q_{new}(s, a)$ be?

Determining
$$Q_{new}(s, a)$$

In value iteration, we took an expectation over all possible next states and actions to get a new estimate for Q(s, a)

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

How do we change this?

In Q-Learning, we only take one action and see one new state, and use that one transition to update our estimate for Q(s, a), so our update rule becomes

$$Q(s,a) = R(s,a,s') + \gamma V(s')$$

i.e. the reward we observed for moving into state s', plus whatever our current value function estimate thinks is the value of being in state s'

The Q-Learning Update Rule



Combining our new estimate for Q(s, a) with the weighted average equation, the final update rule for Q-Learning becomes

$$Q(s,a) = (1 - \alpha)Q_{old}(s,a) + \alpha Q_{new}(s,a)$$

$$Q(s,a) = (1-\alpha)Q(s,a) + \alpha(R(s,a,s') + \gamma V(s'))$$



- Initially, the agent is acting randomly, because all states have a value of zero
 - It would likely fall into the holes many times before reaching the goal state for the first time

- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0



- Initially, the agent is acting randomly, because all states have a value of zero
 - It would likely fall into the holes many times before reaching the goal state for the first time, but for this example assume it got lucky
- At every transition in this path(each <s,a,r,s'> tuple), the agent sees a reward of zero up until the final one, so none of the Q-estimates change except the state before the goal

•
$$Q(s, a) = (1 - \alpha)0 + \alpha(0) = 0$$

- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0



- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0

- Initially, the agent is acting randomly, because all states have a value of zero
 - It would likely fall into the holes many times before reaching the goal state for the first time, but for this example assume it got lucky
- At every transition in this path(each <s,a,r,s'> tuple), the agent sees a reward of zero up until the final one, so none of the Q-estimates change except the state before the goal
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(0) = 0$
- The last transition has a positive reward though, so the previous state action pair is changed
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(1) = .5$



- In another episode, the agent will still act randomly(since most values are still zero), unless it reaches the state next to the goal, which now has a positive value.
 - Assume it got lucky once again

- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0



- In another episode, the agent will still act randomly(since most values are still zero), unless it reaches the state next to the goal, which now has a positive value.
 - Assume it got lucky once again
- When that happens, the previous state-action pair will be updated using the value of the state next to the goal
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(0 + \gamma * .5) = .5*.5*.99$

- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0



- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0

- In another episode, the agent will still act randomly(since most values are still zero), unless it reaches the state next to the goal, which now has a positive value.
 - Assume it got lucky once again
- When that happens, the previous state-action pair will be updated using the value of the state next to the goal
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(0 + \gamma * .5) = .5*.5*.99$
- When choosing its next action from the state next to the goal, the agent will choose $\operatorname{argmax}_a Q(s, a)$, picking the action corresponding to the value of .5 (since all the other action-values for that state are zero).



- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0

- In another episode, the agent will still act randomly(since most values are still zero), unless it reaches the state next to the goal, which now has a positive value.
 - Assume it got lucky once again
- When that happens, the previous state-action pair will be updated using the value of the state next to the goal
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(0 + \gamma * .5) = .5*.5*.99$
- When choosing its next action from the state next to the goal, the agent will choose $\operatorname{argmax}_a Q(s, a)$, picking the action corresponding to the value of .5 (since all the other action-values for that state are zero).
- The value of the previous state is then updated again
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha).5 + \alpha(1) = .75$



- $\alpha = .5, \gamma = .99$
- Values in the grid are Q(s,a)
- Blank quadrants have a Q-value of 0

- In another episode, the agent will still act randomly(since most values are still zero), unless it reaches the state next to the goal, which now has a positive value.
 - Assume it got lucky once again
- When that happens, the previous state-action pair will be updated using the value of the state next to the goal
 - $Q(s, a) = (1 \alpha)0 + \alpha(0 + \gamma * .5) = .5^*.5^*.99$
- When choosing its next action from the state next to the goal, the agent will choose $\operatorname{argmax}_a Q(s, a)$, picking the action corresponding to the value of .5 (since all the other action-values for that state are zero).
- The value of the previous state is then updated again

• $Q(s, a) = (1 - \alpha).5 + \alpha(1) = .75$

 This process repeats over and over again until the Q-values converge to Q^{*}(s, a), the optimal Q-values.

Problem: Exploration/Exploitation

 But what if Frozen Lake had two goal states?



Problem: Exploration/Exploitation

- But what if Frozen Lake had two goal states?
 - Q-Learning could learn a path to the .5 reward without ever getting to the 1 reward state.
 - Converges to a suboptimal solution



Problem: Exploration/Exploitation

- But what if Frozen Lake had two goal states?
 - Q-Learning could learn a path to the .5 reward without ever getting to the 1 reward state.
 - Converges to a suboptimal solution
- How can we balance exploiting knowledge we already have with exploring unseen parts of the state space?



Solution: Epsilon-Greedy Policies

- Instead of always following our estimate of Q, we instead take random actions

 eprcent of the time, where

 e is a hyperparameter
- We can also decrease
 e over time, as our estimates of Q improve
 - Ex: after each episode, set $\epsilon = \frac{E}{(E+i)}$, where i is the number of



Q-Learning Update in Code

```
if np.random.rand(1) < epsilon:
    act = env.action_space.sample()
else:
    act = np.argmax(Q[st])
nst, rwd, done, _ = env.step(act)
```

```
Q[st][act] = (1-alpha)Q[st][act] + alpha(rwd +
gamma*V[nst])
```



Q-Learning Code Demo

<u>https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1yBCDzAXlu9j0A2aT8fH1zm7beBg</u> <u>tB9yY#scrollTo=sl_x2TsCp15L</u>
Organizing RL problems/algorithms



For a more complete taxonomy of RL algorithms, see <u>https://spinningup.openai.com/e</u> <u>n/latest/spinningup/rl_intro2.htm</u> <u>l#citations-below</u>

Deep Q-learning

Limitations of Tabular Q-Learning

- Tabular methods can't handle large or continuous state spaces
 - Can't have a table for infinite Q or V values
- Lots of problems have these kinds of state spaces
 - Robotic navigation: The state of the robot could be (map of environment, position), where position is a 2-D vector. Infinite possible states in this setup.
 - Go: has ~10^170 states



Beyond Tabular Learning

In Q-learning, we are learning a function Q that maps from a state-action pair to a real number

 $Q:(s,a)\to\mathbb{R}$

Or, equivalently, from a state to a vector of real numbers $Q\colon (s) \to \mathbb{R}^{|a|}$

Instead of storing every (s,a) in a table to learn this function, we can learn a function to approximate Q using a (relatively) small set of parameters θ

 $Q:(s,a,\theta) \to \mathbb{R}, \theta \ll |S \times A|$

Neural Nets as Function Approximators



Neural networks are excellent function approximators, so we can use a deep network to learn this parameterized function

Frozen Lake Example



Frozen Lake Example

- Feed a one-hot representation of the state into a neural network to approximate the Q-value for each action
 - One-hot vector of length 16 for frozen lake
- Can also pass in a more complex state to the Q-network rather than a one hot representation.
 - Useful when the number of states is very large, making a one hot representation impractical
 - Or when states are continuous



TF Example Code for Frozen Lake

- # Weights for Q-Network
- Q = tf.Variable(tf.random.uniform([16,4],0,0.01))
- # Q-value function
- def qVals(inptSt):
 - oneH = tf.one_hot(inptSt,16)
 - qVals = tf.matmul([oneH],Q)

return qVals

argmax over q-values to get estimated best action
action = tf.argmax(qVals(st),1)

Atari Example

• 81x81 Images of the game

- Even if each pixel is just on or off, that's 2^{81×81} possible states, way too many for a table
- They're actually colored, so real scenario is even worse
- Need a different approach to learn Q and V values for large state spaces like these



https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TmPfTpjtdgg

How To Train This Q Network?

The original Q-learning update is not a minimization problem

$$Q(s,a) = (1-\alpha)Q(s,a) + \alpha(R(s,a,s') + \gamma V(s'))$$

So how can we transform this into a loss function we can use?



For more reading: <u>https://huggingface.co/learn/deep-rl-course/unit2/introduction?fw=pt</u>