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IRL with Bounded, Biased Agents

IRL assumes human demonstrator is optimal up to random noise (softmax/Boltzmann)

Humans deviate systematically from optimal:

• Biases: hyperbolic discounting, prospect theory.

• Cognitive bounds: forgetting, myopic (limited depth) planning.
IRL with Bounded, Biased Agents

IRL assumes human demonstrator is optimal up to random noise (softmax/Boltzmann)

Humans deviate systematically from optimal

e.g. Person smokes every week but wishes to quit.
There are decision problems s.t.

- IRL on biased agents can lead to arbitrarily mistaken inferences ....

- ... but true preferences can be recovered (by modifying IRL)

- Problems are simple, uncontrived: Procrastination, Temptation, Bandits (explore/exploit).
IRL with Bounded, Biased Agents

More info:
“Learning the Preferences of Bounded Agents” NIPS workshop 2015.
http://www.agentmodels.org

var agent = function(state, delay, timeLeft){
    return Marginal(function(){
        var action = uniformDraw(actions)
        var eu = expUtility(state, action, delay, timeLeft)
        factor(alpha * eu)
        return action
    })
}

var expUtility = function(state, action, delay, timeLeft){
    var u = discountedUtility(state, action, delay, K)
    if (timeLeft == 1){
        return u
    } else {
        return u + expectation(INFER_EU(function(){
            var nextState = transition(state, action)
            var nextAction = sample(agent(nextState, delay+1, timeLeft-1))
            return expUtility(nextState, nextAction, delay+1, timeLeft-1)
        }))
    }
}
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Active Reinforcement Learning

- Human provides rewards **online**

- **Label** the state-actions that actually occur

- Problem: how to reduce burden on human?

- **Active Reinforcement Learning**: agent selects which state-actions are labeled by human.
Active Reinforcement Learning

- Agent chooses whether to observe reward $R_t$ on time-step $t$
- Observing $R_t$ has cost $c$
- Goal: maximize $\sum_t R_t - c q_t$, $q_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } R_t \text{ is observed} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$
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Human-in-the-loop RL

Environment $M$

Agent $L$

Protocol Program $P$

Human $H$

$s, r$
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$a$
Human teaching for any RL agent

Diagram:
- Environment $M$
- Protocol Program $P$
- Agent $L$
- Human $H$

Actions and States:
- $a$ to $s, r$
- $s, r$ to $a$

Annotations:
- action pruning
- reward shaping
- feature design, pre-processing
Prevent Catastrophes with Interactive RL
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Examples:

- breaking laws / moral rules
- physically harm humans
- manipulate or psychologically harm humans
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Prevent Catastrophes with human in loop

Related work: Safe RL and avoiding SREs (Moldovan and Abeel, Frank et al., Paul et. al, Lipton et al.)

Challenge:

- Simulation often inadequate (esp. for extreme events)
- RL agents learn by **trial** and **error** (don’t know R and T in advance)
- Solution: human blocks catastrophes **before** they happen
Prevent Catastrophes with human in loop

1. Human blocks agent trying bad action, gives big negative reward.

2. Classifier learns to recognize bad actions

3. Classifier takes over human role.

4. (Human interactively defines a new MDP).

Problems: efficiency, robust generalization.
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