#### G89.2223 Perception

### **Bayesian Decision Theory**

Laurence T. Maloney

#### Last: Visual Tasks



Size? Shape? Distance?

#### Cue combination

Constantine Brancusi

#### Last: Visual Tasks



Constantine Brancusi

Cue combination tells us what to see, not what to do.

Planning of action.

#### Statistical Decision Theory



Abraham Wald



John von Neumann



David Blackwell



Oskar Morgenstern







David Blackwell M. A. Girshick



## **Bayesian Decision Theory**



## **Bayesian Decision Theory**





# BDT with incorrect internal representations of probabilities, values.

#### The Three Elements of SDT

$$W = \{W_{1}, W_{2}, ..., W_{m}\}$$
$$A = \{a_{1}, a_{2}, ..., a_{p}\}$$
$$X = \{X_{1}, X_{2}, ..., X_{n}\}$$

possible states of the world

possible actions

possible sensory events

# **Bayesian Decision Theory (BDT)** on o o o Perception likelihood P(w)prior decision d(x) **Action**

Fig. 1

## Goal: select

# $d: X \rightarrow A$

# to maximize expected gain

## Translated for

New Yorkers ...



#### To help you make money....



#### Bayesian Decision Theory (BDT)

Maximize expected Bayes gain

 $EBG(d) = \iint G(d(x), w) p(x | w) \pi(w) dx dw$ by choice of a decision rule

$$d: X \to A$$

$$EBG(d) = \iint G(d(x), w) p(x | w) \pi(w) dx dw$$

Two stages: pick a random world: prior  $\pi(W)$ Generate a random perception from that world: likelihood p(x|w)

Maximize your expected gain over both random events.

$$Iikelihood \ prior$$

$$EBG(d) = \iint G(d(x),w) \left[ p(x \mid w) \ \pi(w) \right] dx dw$$

$$EBG(d) \propto \iint G(d(x),w) \left[ \tilde{p}(w \mid x) \right] dx dw$$

$$posterior$$

Bayes Theorem:



## BDT, Perception and Action: A Brief History

Barlow(1950) Geisler (1989)

 $\iint G(d(x),w) p(x|w) \pi(w) dx dw$ 

## BDT, Perception and Action: A Brief History

Barlow(1950) Geisler (1989)

 $\iint G(d(x),w) p(x|w) \pi(w) dx dw$ 

Knill & Richards (1996) Yuille & Bulthoff Tanenbaum &Griffiths *Many more* 



## BDT, Perception and Action: A Brief History

Barlow(1950) Geisler (1989)  $\iint G(d(x),w) p(x|w) \pi(w) dx dw$ 

The gain function is the problem posed by the world to the organism Knill & Richards (1996) Yuille & Bulthoff Tanenbaum &Griffiths *Many more* 



Are you Bayesian?



Ward Edwards



# What is the probability that the unknown urn Is the 'black' urn?

Please write down your estimate.





# How can we estimate this probability using Bayesian methods?





$$P[B|b] = \frac{P[b|B]P[B]}{P[b]}$$









$$P[B|b] = \frac{P[b|B]P[B]}{P[b]}$$
$$P[W|b] = \frac{P[b|W]P[W]}{P[b]}$$









$$\frac{P[B|b]}{P[W|b]} = \frac{P[b|B]}{P[b|W]} \frac{P[B]}{P[W]}$$
$$\frac{P[B|b]}{P[W|b]} = \frac{2/3}{1/3} \frac{1/2}{1/2} = 2$$





Next we draw a white ball (w)

What is the probability **now** that the urn is the black one P[B|bw]?





#### log prior after b

$$log \frac{P[B|bw]}{P[W|bw]} = log \frac{P[W|B]}{P[W|W]} + log \frac{P[B|b]}{P[W|b]}$$
$$log \frac{P[B|bw]}{P[W|bw]} = -1 + 1 = 0$$

#### Log Odds

$$\log_{2} \frac{P[B \mid d_{1} \cdots d_{n}]}{P[W \mid d_{1} \cdots d_{n}]} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log_{2} \frac{P[d_{i} \mid B]}{P[d_{i} \mid W]} + \log_{2} \frac{P[B]}{P[W]}$$
$$d_{i} = b, w$$
$$\log posterior odds \qquad log likelihood ratio(s) \qquad log prior odds$$
$$+1 \quad black \qquad 0$$

-1 white

#### Log Odds

$$\log_{2} \frac{P\left[B \mid d_{1} \cdots d_{n}\right]}{P\left[W \mid d_{1} \cdots d_{n}\right]} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log_{2} \frac{P\left[d_{i} \mid B\right]}{P\left[d_{i} \mid W\right]} + \log_{2} \frac{P\left[B\right]}{P\left[W\right]}$$
$$d_{i} = b, W$$



32/33

6 white 11 black <mark>5 difference</mark>

> *Probability that The urn is the black urn*

Only the difference matters

 $32:1 \Rightarrow$ 

#### Log Odds



Sample



Probability that The urn is the black urn

Only the difference matters

Is that your intuition?





# Are *you* Bayesian?

Probably not.

People tend to pick odds closer to 1:1 than the correct odds. This error is an example of human tendency to distort probability.

Conservatism [Ward Edwards]

## BDT in Action:

# Signal Detection Theory

# Origin of SDT: WW2 radar operator

- Are the blobs enemy aircraft? Or just noise (e.g. clouds)?
- Decision has consequences:
  - If you miss an aircraft, people might get killed
  - If you mistake "noise" for an aircraft, fuel, time & resources are wasted



 $W = \{S, \overline{S}\}$  $A = \{Y, N\}$  $X = (-\infty, \infty)$ 

World States Actions Stimulus Intensity
# **Decision outcomes**

SIGNAL: are the blobs real enemy aircraft?



$$W = \{S, \overline{S}\}$$
  

$$A = \{Y, N\} \qquad p[X | S], p[X | \overline{S}] \text{ likelihood}$$
  

$$X = (-\infty, \infty)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S & \overline{S} \\ Y & \begin{bmatrix} V_{YS} & -V_{Y\overline{S}} \\ -V_{NS} & V_{N\overline{S}} \end{bmatrix} & gain \end{array}$$



#### **Computing Expected Bayes Gain**

$$EBG(Y|X) = V_{YS}p[X|S]\pi(S) - V_{Y\overline{S}}p[X|\overline{S}]\pi(\overline{S})$$

$$EBG(N|X) = -V_{NS}p[X|S]\pi(S) + V_{N\overline{S}}p[X|\overline{S}]\pi(\overline{S})$$

$$RULE: "Say Y" \iff EBG(Y|X) > EBG(N|X)$$

$$\frac{p[X|S]}{p[X|\bar{S}]} > \frac{V_{Y\bar{S}} + V_{N\bar{S}}}{V_{YS} + V_{NS}} \times \frac{\pi(\bar{S})}{\pi(S)}$$



How should we set criterion?



posterior odds

**Bayes** Theorem

$$Y \Leftrightarrow \frac{p[S \mid X]}{p[\bar{S} \mid X]} > \frac{V_{YS} + V_{NS}}{V_{Y\bar{S}} + V_{N\bar{S}}}$$

Given the stimulus X are the posterior odds large enough to motivate a Yes response? How should we set criterion?



log likelihood ratio

Compare the LLR to a criterion, log  $\beta$ 

This is equivalent to X > c for the right choice of c.

#### How well do people do?

We can estimate log beta [optimal] and compare it to the log beta people choose.



Tanner, Swets, & Green (1956)



Tanner, Swets, & Green (1956)

#### <u>Themes</u>

Managing uncertainty to maximize gain is the central task of a biological organism.



The use of explicit cost and rewards allow us to probe a much wider range of behavior than previously explored (Trommershäuser et al, 2003, 2008)

We can test SDT/BDT as a framework for modeling perception and action (Maloney & Mamassian, 2009)

#### <u>Aside</u>

The gain function is the organism's link to the environment.

It represents a problem, posed by the environment, a problem that can rapidly change.

Only the luckiest organism can choose its gain function.



Planning Actions Maximizing Expected Gain



One example





Start of trial: display of fixation cross (1.5 s)





Display of response area, 500 ms before target onset (114.2 mm x 80.6 mm)







#### Target display (700 ms)







#### The green target is hit: +100 points











The red target is hit: -500 points











Scores add if both targets are hit:











The screen is hit later than 700 ms after target display: -700 points.

If you are on time but Miss the targets, 0.





#### End of trial



#### **Choice among Movement Strategies**



What should Paulina do?



Subject S4,  $\sigma$  = 3.62 mm, 72x15 = 1080 end points

**Observed Value** 

#### If there were no red penalty circle ....





Aim for center Select perceptual-motor strategies that **minimize variance** 

Harris & Wolpert (1998)

#### **Choice among Movement Strategies**



What should Paulina do?












# **Thought Experiment**



 $\sigma$  = 4.83 mm

## **Thought Experiment**



 $\sigma$  = 4.83 mm

Expected value as function of mean movement end point (x,y):



# **Thought Experiment**



x, y: mean movement end point [mm]



 $\sigma$  = 4.83 mm

y [mm]

#### Movement plans as lotteries



#### Movement plans as lotteries



 $\sigma$  = 4 mm

Lottery:

(1.3%, -500; 30.3%, -400; 60.9%, 100; 7.5%, 0)

#### Movement plans as lotteries

Optimal aim point: lottery with MEV



(6.6%, -500;	52.3%, -400;	37.0%, 100;	4.0%, 0)
(1.3%, -500;	30.3%, -400;	60.9%, 100;	7.5%, 0)
( 0%, -500;	4.6%, -400;	62.6%, 100;	32.8%, 0)
( 0%, -500;	0.7%, -400;	37.6%, 100;	61.7%, 0)



#### Reaching with Asymmetric Gain/Loss



Julia Trommershäuser

Trommershäuser, Maloney, Landy (2003) JOSA A

#### **Test of the model: Experiment 1**

4 stimulus configurations: (varied within block)

R = 9 mm

30<sup>°</sup>

4

3

30°

2 penalty conditions:0 and -500 points (varied between blocks)

5 "practiced movers"1 session of data collection: 360 trials24 data points per condition

# **General Methods: Training**

For all experiments:

- All subjects practice the task for 360 trials or more until their variance stabilizes.
- The timeout limit is gradually decreased to 700 ms during training.
- There are no penalties during training (the concept is never mentioned).
- We verify that each subject's movement variance has stabilized.
- They are told only to make money.



Model prediction:



• model, penalty = 0

Model prediction: configuration 1



• model, penalty = 0

 $\times$  model, penalty = 500

Model prediction: configuration 2



• model, penalty = 0

 $\times$  model, penalty = 500

Model prediction: configuration 3



• model, penalty = 0

 $\times$  model, penalty = 500

Model prediction: configuration 4



model, penalty = 0
model, penalty = 500

#### Comparison with experiment



 $\circ$  exp., penalty = 0

- exp., penalty = 500
- × model, penalty = 500







#### <u>Conclusions</u>

BDT is a promising mode; of movement planning

The use of explicit cost and rewards allow us to probe a much wider range of behavior than previously explored.

Managing uncertainty is the central task of a biological organism.