



HAL
open science

Introduction to Global Optimization

Rodolphe Le Riche, Charlie Sire

► **To cite this version:**

Rodolphe Le Riche, Charlie Sire. Introduction to Global Optimization. Master. France. 2021.
hal-03500652v1

HAL Id: hal-03500652

<https://hal.science/hal-03500652v1>

Submitted on 22 Dec 2021 (v1), last revised 7 Jan 2022 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Introduction to Global Optimization

Rodolphe Le Riche¹ and Charlie Sire^{2,1}

¹ CNRS LIMOS at Mines Saint-Etienne and UCA, France

² IRSN, France

as part of the Data science Major and Master “Maths in Action”
Mines Saint-Etienne, France

December 2021

Course outline

These slides constitute a 12h introductory course on global optimization. The course starts with basic concepts specific to global optimization and different from those underlying local optimization algorithms. A selection of 6 algorithms is then presented: random search, randomly restarted local searches, simulated annealing, CMA-ES and Bayesian Optimization. This selection is meant to cover the main mechanisms behind global searches.

Pre-requisites are: linear algebra, basic probabilities and local optimization (gradient methods, necessary optimality conditions).

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 Simulated annealing
 - Markov Chains
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

Optimization = a quantitative formulation of decision

Optimization is a¹ way of mathematically modeling decision.

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$$




- x vector of decision parameters (variables) : dimensions, investment, tuning of a machine / program, ...
- $f(x)$: decision cost x
- \mathcal{S} : set of possible values for x , search space

¹non unique, incomplete when considering human beings or life

Local versus global optimum

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$$



$x^l \in \mathcal{S}$ is a local minimum of f over \mathcal{S} if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\|x - x^l\| \leq \varepsilon$, $f(x) \geq f(x^l)$ (it is a strict local minimum if $f(x) > f(x^l)$).


Goal of the class: learn strategies to increase the chances to locate a global optimum.

Examples where global optimization is necessary I

In **redundant structures**, one of the component (x component) can take the role of another.


Composite structures

x is the orientation of the fibers within the plies of a composite laminate and the location where the plies are dropped. Many arrangements of the x 's have almost equivalent performances, leading to local optima (from [Irisarri et al., 2014]).



Examples where global optimization is necessary II


Optical filters



Root mean square distance to a target spectrum (from [Bäck et al., 1995])

Cross-section of the function w.r.t. 2 layer thicknesses. This function is multimodal, the higher dimensional function probably is.

Quiz 1: why $f(x_1, x_2)$, which is multimodal in terms of x_1 when x_2 is fixed, may not be multimodal w.r.t. (x_1, x_2) ?




Examples where global optimization is necessary III

Neural networks

Very redundant structures with lots of symmetries, hence local optima.

Surprisingly, approximate convergence towards local optima works. An effect of high dimension and network flexibility?





from techxplore.com/news/2020-11-neural-network.html,
public domain CC0

Examples where global optimization is necessary IV

Antennas positioning

Find the optimal location of a given number of antennas to cover a territory (the Loire Dept)




Approximation of the Loire surface covered by one antenna for varying locations, $S(x_1, x_2)$. The approximation (silver surface) is the mean of a kriging model learned from 20 examples (the red bullets). The black bullets are test points (not learned), providing some insights into the imperfections of the approximation.

Examples where global optimization is necessary V


Design of Experiments

As an archetypal example, find a point the farthest to a set of pre-existing points

$$\min_{x \in S} \left(- \min_{x^i \in \text{DoE}} \|x - x^i\| \right)$$



Examples where global optimization is necessary VI



Theoretically, global optimization is safer than local optimization for black-box functions.

In practice, global optimization is not always affordable.

Global optimization as a metaphor

Let f be the depth of a canal. To know if the canal is navigable, soundings are made to

find the minimal depth

$$f^* = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$$

find the location(s) of minimal depth

$$x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$$



The motor vessel Sparna lists to its port side after taking on water in void spaces after running aground while transiting the Columbia River, 2016. U.S. Coast Guard Photo

Each sounding takes time. **What is your search strategy?**
Don't forget to use auxiliary information, e.g. former groundings.

The exploration-intensification tradeoff


All global optimization algorithms strike a compromise between exploration and intensification.

- **Intensification**: use already calculated points to concentrate the search in high-return areas of the search space.
- **Exploration**: try the most unknown parts of the search space.

There is an infinite number of ways to handle this compromise.

Essential global optima

Without restrictions, global optimization is a utopia: only look for essential global optima



$$x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$$

such that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\text{volume}[x' \in \mathcal{S} \mid f(x') < f(x) + \varepsilon] > 0$

Theoretically solvable problems : deterministic point of view


If f has a known Lipschitz constant L ,

$$\exists L \text{ such that } \forall x, x' \quad |f(x) - f(x')| \leq L\|x - x'\|$$

we can know how far the true solution is from already calculated points which tells us where to search and when to stop :

$$x^{t+1} = \arg \min_{x \in S} \max_{i=1, \dots, t} f(x^i) - L\|x - x^i\|$$

Quiz 2: knowing $(x^i, f(x^i))$, $i = 1, \dots, t$ and L , what is the accuracy with which the problem has been solved? In other terms, give an upper-bound to $[\min_{i=1, \dots, t} f(x^i) - f(x^*)]$.




Problems solvable in probability I

Let there be k distinct local optima x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* such that $f^* := f(x_1^*) := f_1^* \leq \dots \leq f(x_k^*) = f_k^*$.

Gradient flow: set of points generated as solutions of $\dot{x} = -\nabla f(x)$ starting from a given x , i.e., set of iterates of an infinitesimal step gradient descent. Assume that f and \mathcal{S} are such that it always converges to a local optimum.

Basin of attraction, $\text{attr}(f_i^*)$: set of points $x \in \mathcal{S}$ such that a gradient flow converges to $f(x) = f_i^*$.



Problems solvable in probability II

p_i , the probability that the gradient flow with random starting point converges to f_i^* , $p_i = \text{vol}[\text{attr}(f_i^*)] / \text{vol}[\mathcal{S}]$.

The difficulty of a problem (assuming the local search is perfect) can be measured with p_1 :

- $p_1 = 1$: unimodal function.
- $p_1 \approx 1$: easy global problem, most local searches will solve it.
- $p_1 \geq \delta > 0$: problem solvable in probability because the probability of finding $f_1^* \rightarrow 1$ as the number of restarts increases. The probability to have at least one search converge to $\text{attr}(f^*)$ in μ repeats is $= 1 - (1 - p_1)^\mu$.
- $p_1 \approx 0$: unstable optimum, non essential. In practice, often avoided because it is not robust to a small error in x^* .

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms**
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 Simulated annealing
 - Markov Chains
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

First, simple, algorithms I

We will now review a few basic global optimization algorithms by increasing order of complexity.

Words of caution:

- Although there are better optimization algorithms than others, there will never be an algorithm better over all possible problems, cf. No Free Lunch theorem [Wolpert and Macready, 1997]: when an algorithm improves on a subset of problems, it regresses on other subsets.
- There is an adequation between the problem and the algorithm. Auxiliary information may be used to select the algorithm (dimension, nature of the search space, budget of calls to f , noise affecting f , regularity of f).

First, simple, algorithms II

- The problem formulation is a degree of freedom to change the problem and make it more amenable to optimization. Examples with shapes and PCA in [Gaudrie et al., 2020].
- A theoretically solvable problem may not be solvable in practice because of the cost of the search, in particular in high dimension ($d \gg 1$). In this case, “solving” the problem is finding the best possible solution.
- For a better understanding, look for the elements of the algorithms that contribute to the **exploration** or to the **intensification** of the search.

Algorithm 1 Random search

Require: $x^{\text{LB}}, x^{\text{UB}}, t^{\text{max}}$

$t \leftarrow 0, \hat{f}^* \leftarrow +\infty$

- 1: **while** $t < t^{\text{max}}$ **do**
 - 2: $x' \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[x^{\text{LB}}, x^{\text{UB}}]$ {uniform law}
 - 3: calculate $f(x'), t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 4: **if** $f(x') < \hat{f}^*$ **then**
 - 5: $\hat{x}^* \leftarrow x', \hat{f}^* \leftarrow f(x')$
 - 6: **end if**
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: **return** \hat{x}^*, \hat{f}^*
-

Quiz 3: if $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]^5$ (hypercube in $d = 5$), and $x^* = (0.2, \dots, 0.2)$ what is the expected time until a point is sampled inside the cube of side 0.1 centered at x^* (i.e., x^* found with a 0.05 accuracy on each of its components)? What is the standard deviation of this time?

Algorithm 2 Restarted local search

Require: x^{LB} , x^{UB} , t^{max} , a LOCAL_SEARCH algorithm

- $t \leftarrow 0$, $\hat{f}^* \leftarrow +\infty$
- 1: **while** $t < t^{\text{max}}$ **do**
 - 2: $x^{\text{init}} \leftarrow \mathcal{U}[x^{\text{LB}}, x^{\text{UB}}]$ {uniform law}
 - 3: $[x', f(x'), t'] \leftarrow \text{LOCAL_SEARCH}(x^{\text{init}})$
 {start from x^{init} , x' candidate local optimum, $f(x')$ its obj. function, t' number of calls to f done during the local search}
 - 4: $t \leftarrow t + t'$
 - 5: **if** $f(x') < \hat{f}^*$ **then**
 - 6: $\hat{x}^* \leftarrow x'$, $\hat{f}^* \leftarrow f(x')$
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** \hat{x}^*, \hat{f}^*
-

It is often interesting to additionally save the candidate local optima x' .


Quiz 4: Let p_1 be the probability to start a local search in the basin of attraction of the optimum x^* , and r be the number of restarts done. By how much does the probability of locating x^* increase if a $r + 1$ restart is done? Why is it a case of diminishing returns?

Algorithm 3 Isotropic ES-(1+1)

Require: t^{\max} , x , $f(x)$, σ^2


$t \leftarrow 1$, $m \leftarrow x$, $C \leftarrow \sigma^2 I$

- 1: **while** $t < t^{\max}$ **do**
 - 2: $x' \leftarrow \mathcal{N}(m, C)$ {Gaussian law}
 - 3: Calculate $f(x')$, $t \leftarrow t + 1$
 - 4: **if** $f(x') < f(x)$ **then**
 - 5: $x \leftarrow x'$, $f(x) \leftarrow f(x')$
 - 6: **end if**
 - 7: $m \leftarrow x$ {update proposal pdf}
 - 8: **end while**
 - 9: **return** x , $f(x)$
-



Simplified : no adaptation of C , neither the **step size** σ , nor the shape which remains isotropic (no privileged search direction).

Step adaptation is important



(1+1)-ES
(red & green)


$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$$

in $[-2.2, 0.8]^n$
for $n = 10$

from [Auger and Dumas, 2017]

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) I

Look at template function, $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$ where $f(x) = \|x\|^2$.
Trivial problem but useful to understand phenomena occurring when d changes.



$$X'_i = x_i + \sigma U_i \quad \text{where} \quad U_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

$$\|X' - x\|^2 = \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^d U_i^2$$

The last term follows a χ_d^2 .


When $d \geq 5$, it is approximated by $\mathcal{N}(d, 2d)$.

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) II

$$\|X' - x\| = \sigma \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d U_i^2}$$
$$\stackrel{d \gg 5}{\rightsquigarrow} \sigma \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{d}, 1/2)$$

i.e., samples concentrate on a sphere centered on x and of radius $\sigma\sqrt{d}$. Useful to choose σ ? Sure, set $\sigma\sqrt{d} = R$, i.e.,

$$\sigma = R/\sqrt{d}.$$




But this step size does not account for the acceptance / refusal in the ES-(1+1) algorithm, and the acceptance rate at given σ decreases with $d \nearrow$.

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) III


$$d=1$$

$$P_{\text{accept}} = 1/2$$



$$d=2$$

$$P_{\text{accept}} < 1/2$$



... $d \uparrow$, $P_{\text{accept}} \downarrow$

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) IV

Optimal σ

Change in distance to 0 (random variable): $D_2 = \|x\|^2 - \|X'\|^2$

$$\begin{aligned}D_2 &= \|x\|^2 - \|x + \sigma U\|^2 \\&= \|x\|^2 - (x + \sigma U)^\top (x + \sigma U) \\&= -2\sigma x^\top U - \sigma^2 U^\top U \\&\stackrel{d \geq 5}{\approx} -2\sigma x^\top U - \sigma^2 d \\&\Rightarrow D_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(-\sigma^2 d, 4\sigma^2 R^2)\end{aligned}$$

ES-(1+1) has a test that prevents D_2 from being negative, the

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) V

progress is $l_2 = \max(0, D_2)$. The mean progress is

$$\mathbb{E}(l_2) = \mathbb{E}(\max(0, D_2)) = \int_0^{+\infty} i_2 p(i_2) di_2$$

Change of variable : $j = \frac{i_2 + \sigma^2 d}{2\sigma R}$, $j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(l_2) &= \int_{\frac{\sigma d}{2R}}^{+\infty} (2\sigma R j - \sigma^2 d) \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(j) dj \\ &= 2\sigma R \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{\sigma d}{2R}\right) - \sigma^2 d \left[1 - \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{\sigma d}{2R}\right)\right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{d}{R^2} \mathbb{E}(l_2) = 2 \frac{\sigma d}{R} \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{\sigma d}{2R}\right) - \frac{\sigma^2 d^2}{R^2} \left[1 - \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{\sigma d}{2R}\right)\right]$$


Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) VI

$\frac{d}{R^2} \mathbb{E}(l_2)$ is a function of $\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma d}{R}$.

Its maximizer is $\tilde{\sigma}^* = \arg \max_{\tilde{\sigma}} \frac{d}{R^2} \mathbb{E}(l_2) \approx 1.22 = \frac{\sigma^* d}{R}$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\sigma^* = 1.22 \frac{R}{d}}$$

which is more cautious than the $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{d})$ first estimate.



Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) VII

Extension to quadratic functions

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Hx$$

H Hessian strictly positive definite. The previous optimal step size calculation can be extended.

Eigendecomposition of $H = PD^2P^\top$, P matrix of eigenvectors as columns, $P^\top P = PP^\top = I$, D^2 diagonal matrix of eigenvalues.

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top PDDP^\top x = \frac{1}{2}y^\top y = f(y)$$

where $y = DP^\top x \iff x = PD^{-1}y$

Theoretical step size in ES-(1+1) VIII

$f(y)$ is a sphere, therefore an optimal² step distribution in the y -space is $Y' - y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^{*2}I)$ where

$$\sigma^* = 1.22 \frac{\|y\|}{d} = 1.22 \frac{\sqrt{x^\top PD^2 P^\top x}}{d} = 1.22 \frac{\sqrt{x^\top Hx}}{d}$$

Translating back into the x -space by multiplying by PD^{-1} ,

$$X' - x = PD^{-1}(Y' - y) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^{*2}PD^{-2}P^\top) \equiv \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^{*2}H^{-1})$$

Note that the shape of the covariance matrix is given by the inverse Hessian.

²optimal w.r.t. σ and position invariant on the contour $f = \text{const.}$ See [Rudolph, 1992]

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 **Simulated annealing**
 - **Markov Chains**
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

Definition

- Let's consider $\{X^t\}_{t=0,1..}$ a sequence of random variables in a state space \mathcal{S}
- $\{X^t\}_{t=0,1..}$ is a Markov Chain if
 $\forall t, \forall x^{(0)}, \dots, x^{(t-1)} : p(x^{(t)} | x^{(0)}, \dots, x^{(t-1)}) = p(x^{(t)} | x^{(t-1)})$
- Then we have a simpler expression of the joint density of

$$(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(t)}) : p(x^{(t)}, \dots, x^{(0)}) = p(x^{(0)}) \prod_{t'=1}^t p(x^{(t')} | x^{(t'-1)})$$

The idea is that \mathcal{S} is also our search space in which we will investigate the argmin of the function f with Markov Chains

Discrete states space

- Now we consider $\text{card}(\mathcal{S}) < \infty : \mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, s\}$
- $X^t = j$ for $j \in \mathcal{S}$ means the process is in state j at time t
- Let's define the one-step transition probability from state i at time t to state j at time $t + 1$: $p_{ij}^{(t)} = \mathbb{P}(X^{(t+1)} = j \mid X^{(t)} = i)$
- If $\forall t, p_{ij}^{(t)} = p_{ij}^{(0)} = p_{ij}$: the Markov Chain is called time-homogeneous

In the following we will consider time homogeneous Markov Chains

Transition probability matrix

For a time-homogeneous Markov Chain, we can define a transition probability matrix $\mathbf{P} = (p_{ij})_{i,j \in 1, \dots, s}$

Each row of the matrix must sum to one : $\sum_{j=1}^s p_{ij} = 1$

Marginal probability

- We denote $\pi_i^{(t)}$ the marginal probability that $X^{(t)} = i$
- Then we can define $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)} = (\pi_i^{(t)})_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ the vector probability (the sum is 1)
- $\forall j \in \mathcal{S}, \pi_j^{(t+1)} = \mathbb{P}(X^{(t+1)} = j) = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathbb{P}(X^{(t+1)} = j \mid X^{(t)} = i) \mathbb{P}(X^{(t)} = i) = \sum_{i=1}^s p_{ij} \pi_i^{(t)} = [\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)T} \mathbf{P}]_j$

$$\implies \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)T} \mathbf{P}$$

$$\implies \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t+n)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)T} (\mathbf{P})^n$$

Stationary distribution

A stationary distribution π for \mathbf{P} is a vector that satisfies the following properties :

- $0 \leq \pi_i \leq 1$
- $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$
- $\pi^T \mathbf{P} = \pi^T$

If $\{X^{(t)}\}$ follows a stationary distribution, then the marginal distributions of $X^{(t)}$ and $X^{(t+1)}$ are identical

Irreducibility and Periodicity

- A Markov Chain is irreducible if any state j can be reached from any state i in a finite number of steps, ie

$$\forall i, j \in \mathcal{S}^2, \forall t, \exists m > 0, \mathbb{P}(X^{t+m} = j | X^t = i) > 0$$

- A state i is said to have period k if any return to state i must occur in multiples of k time steps. Formally we have

$$k = \gcd\{n > 0 | \mathbb{P}(X^{(n)} = i | X^0 = i) > 0\}$$

A state i is aperiodic if $k = 1$ and the Markov Chain is aperiodic if all states are aperiodic.

gcd : greatest common divisor

Reversibility

A Markov chain is reversible if there exists a distribution π which satisfies the detailed balance conditions: $\forall i, j, \pi_i p_{ij} = \pi_j p_{ji}$

Any distribution satisfying detailed balance is a stationary distribution
:

Reversibility

A Markov chain is reversible if there exists a distribution π which satisfies the detailed balance conditions: $\forall i, j, \pi_i p_{ij} = \pi_j p_{ji}$

Any distribution satisfying detailed balance is a stationary distribution
:

$$\begin{aligned}\forall i, j, \pi_i p_{ij} = \pi_j p_{ji} &\Rightarrow \forall j \sum_i \pi_i p_{ij} = \sum_i \pi_j p_{ji} \\ &\Rightarrow \forall j, \sum_i \pi_i p_{ij} = \pi_j \\ &\Rightarrow \forall j, [\boldsymbol{\pi}^T \mathbf{P}]_j = \pi_j\end{aligned}$$

Convergence

If $\{X^{(t)}\}$ is an irreducible and aperiodic Markov Chain with stationary distribution π , then :

- π is the unique stationary distribution
- $X^{(t)}$ converges in distribution to a r.v. X of distribution π
- for any function g , $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n g(X^{(t)}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}(g(X))$

Importance of aperiodicity

Example where $\{X^{(t)}\}$ is an irreducible but not aperiodic Markov Chain with stationary distribution π :

- $\mathcal{S} = 1, 2, 3$
- with $\pi_1 = \pi_2 = \pi_3 = 1/3$
- $p_{1,2} = p_{3,1} = p_{2,3} = 1$

Then π is stationary, and the chain is irreducible

However, if $X_0 = 1$ (say), then $X^{(t)} = 1$ whenever t is a multiple of 3, so $\mathbb{P}(X^{(t)} = 1)$ oscillates between 0 and 1

Continuous states space

Similar results hold for a continuous state space

- In the continuous case, a time-homogeneous Markov Chain is defined by the transition kernel $p(x, x') = p_{X^{(t+1)}|X^{(t)}}(x' | x)$
- The density π is stationary for the Markov Chain with kernel $p(x, x')$ if : $\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{S}, \pi(x') = \int p(x, x')\pi(x)dx$
- Convergence remains under similar conditions

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 **Simulated annealing**
 - Markov Chains
 - **Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm**
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

Objective

Idea : General method to construct a Markov Chain that converges to a target distribution π defined here as follows :

$$\pi(x) = \frac{1}{K} \exp\left(-\frac{f(x)}{T}\right)$$

where $K = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \exp\left(-\frac{f(x)}{T}\right) dx$ is an unknown normalizing constant and T is a positive "temperature" scalar

- Why this target distribution ? As T tends to 0, π becomes a Dirac with all the density mass at $\mathcal{S}_{opt} = \underset{x \in \mathcal{S}}{\operatorname{argmin}} f(x)$
- Why not sampling directly π ? Constant K very hard or impossible to compute

Remark : Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) can be related to other objectives with other hard to compute target distributions

Proof of convergence when $T \rightarrow 0$

Let $x^* \in \mathcal{S}_{opt}$,

$\forall T, \forall x \in \mathcal{S}, \pi(x) > 0$ and $\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x^*)} = \exp\left(-\frac{f(x)-f(x^*)}{T}\right)$

Then

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{opt}, \frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x^*)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow 0} 0$$

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{S}_{opt}, \frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x^*)} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow 0} 1$$

The density mass is concentrated at \mathcal{S}_{opt}

Details with \mathcal{S} finite

More precisely, with $\mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, s\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^s \pi_i = 1 &\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_{j^*}} = \frac{1}{\pi_{j^*}} \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{opt}} \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_{j^*}} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{opt}} \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_{j^*}} = \frac{1}{\pi_{j^*}} \\ &\Rightarrow \text{card}(\mathcal{S}_{opt}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{opt}} \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_{j^*}} = \frac{1}{\pi_{j^*}} \\ &\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \pi_{i^*} \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\text{card}(\mathcal{S}_{opt})} \\ \pi_i \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow 0} 0 \text{ if } i \notin \mathcal{S}_{opt} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm (General case)

π is any target distribution here

$X^{(0)} = x^{(0)}$ drawn from starting distribution h with $\pi(x^{(0)}) > 0$.

Then given $X^{(t)} = x^{(t)}$, we generate $X^{(t+1)}$ as follows :

- 1 Sample a candidate value \tilde{x} from a proposal distribution $h(\cdot | x^{(t)})$
- 2 Compute the Metropolis Hastings ratio $R(x^{(t)}, \tilde{x}) = \frac{\pi(\tilde{x})h(x^{(t)}|\tilde{x})}{\pi(x^{(t)})h(\tilde{x}|x^{(t)})}$
- 3 Sample a value for $X^{(t+1)}$ as follows :

$$X^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} \tilde{x} & \text{with probability } \min(1, R(x^{(t)}, \tilde{x})) \\ x^{(t)} & \text{with probability } 1 - \min(1, R(x^{(t)}, \tilde{x})) \end{cases}$$

Remark : Don't need to compute Normalizing constant K in $R(x^{(t)}, \tilde{x})$

Properties

- Clearly, a chain constructed via the Metropolis Hasting algorithm is Markov since $X^{(t+1)}$ is only dependent on $X^{(t)}$
- Whether the chain is irreducible and aperiodic depends on the choice of proposal distribution; the user must check these conditions for any implementation.
- If this check confirms irreducibility and aperiodicity, then the chain generated by the Metropolis Hastings algorithm has a unique limiting stationary distribution, which is the target distribution π .

Proof : Discrete states space

We denote here the target distribution $p = \pi$ And we introduce the matrix \mathbf{H} with $\forall i, j, H_{ij}$ the probability of proposing the candidate value j for $X^{(t+1)}$ knowing $X^{(t)} = i$

Let's show that π satisfies the detailed balanced condition

Proof : Discrete states space

We denote here the target distribution $p = \pi$ And we introduce the matrix \mathbf{H} with $\forall i, j, H_{ij}$ the probability of proposing the candidate value j for $X^{(t+1)}$ knowing $X^{(t)} = i$

Let's show that π satisfies the detailed balanced condition

The transition probability matrix is \mathbf{P} with $p_{ij} = \min(1, \frac{\pi_j H_{ji}}{\pi_i H_{ij}}) H_{ij}$

We assume $\pi_j H_{ji} \leq \pi_i H_{ij}$ (without loss of generality) :

$$p_{ij} = \frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i} H_{ji}$$

$$p_{ji} = H_{ji}$$

Then $\pi_j p_{ji} = \pi_i p_{ij}$

Proof : Continuous states space (1/2)

$$X^{(t)} \sim \pi(x)$$

The transition kernel is $p(x, x') = \min(1, \frac{\pi(x')h(x|x')}{\pi(x)h(x'|x)})h(x' | x)$

We assume $\pi(x')h(x | x') \leq \pi(x)h(x | x')$ (without loss of generality)

:

$$p(x, x') = \frac{\pi(x')}{\pi(x)} h(x' | x)$$

$$p(x', x) = h(x' | x)$$

Then $p(x', x)\pi(x') = p(x, x')\pi(x)$ (reversibility in continuous case)

Proof : Continuous states space (2/2)

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int p(x', x)\pi(x')dx' &= \int p(x, x')\pi(x)dx' \\ &= \pi(x) \int p(x, x')dx' \\ &= \pi(x)\end{aligned}$$

Proposal distribution

A well-chosen proposal distribution produces candidate values that cover the support of the stationary distribution in a reasonable number of iterations and produces candidate values that are not accepted or rejected too frequently:

- If the proposal distribution is too diffuse relative to the target distribution, the candidate values will be rejected frequently and thus the chain will require many iterations to adequately explore the space of the target distribution.
- If the proposal distribution is too focused (e.g., has too small a variance), then the chain will remain in one small region of the target distribution for many iterations while other regions of the target distribution will not be adequately explored.

Gaussian proposal distribution

$h(\cdot | x^{(t)})$ density of $\mathcal{N}(x^{(t)}, \sigma^2)$ often used

- Irreducibility is true only on the support of π because all x with $\pi(x) = 0$ would be rejected
- But $\forall t, x^{(t)} \in \text{supp}(\pi)$
- Then, we can consider $\mathcal{S} = \text{supp}(\pi)$

Even if $x^{(0)} \notin \text{supp}(\pi)$, as the support of $h(\cdot | x^{(t)})$ is infinite,
 $\mathbb{P}(\{\exists t_1, X^{(t_1)} \in \text{supp}\pi\}) = 1$

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 Simulated annealing**
 - Markov Chains
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing**
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

Principle of Simulated Annealing

- Apply Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with $\pi(x) = \frac{1}{K} \exp(-\frac{f(x)}{T})$ for a set of decreasing temperatures
- Choose a symmetric proposal distribution $h(\cdot | x)$ ie $\forall x, x' \in \mathcal{S}, h(x | x') = h(x' | x)$
- Metropolis Hastings ratio is $R(x, x') = \exp(\frac{f(x) - f(x')}{T})$
- Then :
 - If $f(x') \leq f(x) : R(x, x') \geq 1 \Rightarrow$ acceptance
 - Else
 - Large $T \Rightarrow R(x, x') \simeq 1 \Rightarrow$ Exploration
 - Small $T \Rightarrow R(x, x') \ll 1 \Rightarrow$ Intensification

Algorithm

Initialization $x, k = 0, T_k = T_0, L_k = L_0$

While $T_k \neq 0$, repeat :

- 1 For $l = 0$ to L_k do :
 - Sample a solution \tilde{x} from the proposal distribution $h(\cdot | x)$
 - If $f(\tilde{x}) < f(x)$ then $x = \tilde{x}$ (\tilde{x} becomes the current solution)
 - Else, \tilde{x} becomes the current solution with probability $\exp\left(\frac{f(x) - f(\tilde{x})}{T_k}\right)$
- 2 $k = k + 1$
- 3 Compute (L_k, T_k)

Discussion about the parameters

There are several parameters involved :

- The length of thermal equilibrium chain L_k
Number of proposed transitions, Number of accepted transitions, combinations of both
- The initial temperature
Large enough so that acceptance rate $\simeq 1$
- The cooling schedule (see next slide)
- The stopping criteria
For instance when current solution no longer changes from one iteration to the next during a sufficiently large number of iterations

Cooling schedule

Decreasing speed must not be too fast to avoid remaining in a local minimum

- Logarithm schedule $T_k = \frac{T_0}{1+\ln(1+k)}$

Guarantee convergence but too slow in practice

- Geometric schedule : $T_k = \alpha^k T_0$


Most typical values of α between 0.8 and 0.99

- Exponential schedule : $T_k = T_0 \exp(-\alpha k^{\frac{1}{N}})$

Very fast during the first iterations

Cooling schedules comparison

Plot with $\alpha = 0.85$ for the geometric schedule and $\alpha = 1$, $N = 3$ for the exponential schedule



Physical interpretation

Principle of physical annealing :

- A crystalline solid is heated : molecular structure is weaker and is more susceptible to change
- Then it's allowed to cool very slowly until it achieves its most regular possible crystal lattice configuration (its minimum lattice energy state)
- If cooling is abrupt, the solid will be found in a metastable state with non-minimal energy
- At thermal equilibrium, the probability that a system is in a macroscopic configuration i with energy E_i is given by the Boltzmann distribution $\pi_i = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{E_i}{k_B T}\right)}{K}$, with K the normalizing constant and k_B the Boltzmann constant

Performance of simulated annealing

Simulated annealing not very competitive in practice compared to CMA-ES for instance.

However :

- Intuition in the concept of the algorithm is essential to understand global optimization
- Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) applied more and more in Industry (Bayesian inference)
- Simulated annealing can be combined with other algorithms (especially for the proposal distribution)

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 Simulated annealing
 - Markov Chains
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 Bayesian optimization
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

- CMA-ES = Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution-Strategy.
- A stochastic global optimization method,
- incrementally developed since 1996 by Hansen, Auger and others [Hansen and Ostermeier, 2001, Hansen, 2016].
- Default parameter values provided, contrarily to simulated annealing and other (stochastic) evolutionary optimization methods.

Algorithm 4 CMA-ES structure

Require: t^{\max} , m , C , μ , λ

$t \leftarrow 0$

- 1: **while** $t < t^{\max}$ **do**
 - 2: $x^1, \dots, x^\lambda \leftarrow$ i.i.d. calls to $\mathcal{N}(m, C)$
 - 3: Calculate $f(x^1), \dots, f(x^\lambda)$, $t \leftarrow t + \lambda$
and rank them, $f(x^{1:\lambda}) \leq \dots \leq f(x^{\lambda:\lambda})$
 - 4: Update m and C from the μ best, $x^{1:\lambda}, \dots, x^{\mu:\lambda}$
 - 5: **end while**
 - 6: **return** best observed point and m
-

It is an ES- $\mu^\dagger\lambda$ algorithm. Note the order notation $i : \lambda$.

Metaphor: $\lambda =$ population size, $\mu =$ number of parents,
an iteration = a generation g , ES = Evolution Strategy.

Do not confuse this C proposal density in \mathcal{S} with the covariance matrix of kriging in f -space.

Now, let's detail the updates.

From points to steps

Because large dimensional spaces cannot be sufficiently explored to learn accurate models, it is better to work with steps than with points: learn steps leading to progress (dynamic), and not points that were good (static).

$$\text{points : } x \sim \mathcal{N}(m^{(g)}, C^{(g)})$$

$$\text{steps : } s := x - m^{(g)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C^{(g)})$$

Update of the mean m

New mean = old mean + average of good steps

$$\begin{aligned}m^{(g+1)} &= m^{(g)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} s^{i:\lambda} \\ &= m^{(g)} + \frac{1}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (x^{i:\lambda} - m^{(g)}) \\ \Rightarrow m^{(g+1)} &= \frac{1}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} x^{i:\lambda}\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

New mean is also the average of the best new points.

Update of the covariance C I


New covariance = empirical covariance of the good steps

$$\begin{aligned}C^{(g+1)} &= \frac{1}{\mu - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} s^{i:\lambda} s^{i:\lambda \top} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (x^{i:\lambda} - m^{(g)})(x^{i:\lambda} - m^{(g)})^{\top}\end{aligned}$$

It is different from the covariance matrix of good points ([Larrañaga and Lozano, 2001])

$$C_{\text{EMNA}}^{(g+1)} = \frac{1}{\mu - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (x^{i:\lambda} - m^{(g+1)})(x^{i:\lambda} - m^{(g+1)})^{\top}$$

Update of the covariance C II



Adaptation of C (top row) versus of C_{EMNA} (bottom row), from [Hansen, 2016]. The step length of C correctly increases while that of C_{EMNA} prematurely decreases.

Path=cumulated steps I

To decrease the cost for estimating $C (= \lambda)$,


- i) average the steps and
- ii) cumulate them through time:

$$\bar{s} = \frac{1}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} (x^{(i:\lambda)} - m^{(g)}) = m^{(g+1)} - m^{(g)} \quad (2)$$

One could then have an estimation of C with a time smoothing,

$$C^{(g+1)} = (1 - c_1)C^{(g)} + c_1 \bar{s} \bar{s}^T$$

but it is insensitive to a change of direction, hence unable to converge.



Path=cumulated steps II

Path = time cumulation of the steps:

$$\boxed{p^{(g+1)} = (1 - c_c)p^{(g)} + \sqrt{c_c(2 - c_c)}\mu \bar{s}} \quad (3)$$

Why these coefficients? To allow convergence when everything is stable: If $p^{(g)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$ and $s^{(i:\lambda)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$, then $p^{(g+1)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, C)$.

Proof: 1st term $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, (1 - c_c)^2 C)$, $\bar{s} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\mu^2} C)$, second term $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, c_c(2 - c_c)\mu^2 \frac{1}{\mu^2} C)$, then sum the covariances of the two terms \square

Path=cumulated steps III

Putting it together:

$$C^{(g+1)} = (1 - c_1)C^{(g)} + c_1 \underbrace{p^{(g+1)} p^{(g+1)\top}}_{\text{rank 1 update}} \quad (4)$$

Quiz 5: Why is it called “rank 1 update”?

Default values [Hansen, 2016]:

- Population size and selection pressure: $\lambda \geq 4 + \lfloor 3 \ln(d) \rfloor$,
 $\mu = \lambda/2$
- $c_1 \approx 2/d^2$ and $c_c \approx 3/d$.

Algorithm 5 A simplified CMA-ES

Require: t^{\max} , $m^{(1)}$, $C^{(1)}$, λ , μ , $p^{(1)}$

$t \leftarrow 0$, $g \leftarrow 1$

1: **while** $t < t^{\max}$ **do**

2: $x^1, \dots, x^\lambda \leftarrow$ i.i.d. calls to $\mathcal{N}(m^{(1)}, C^{(1)})$

3: Calculate $f(x^1), \dots, f(x^\lambda)$, $t \leftarrow t + \lambda$
and rank them, $f(x^{1:\lambda}) \leq \dots \leq f(x^{\lambda:\lambda})$

4: Update m and C (Eqs. (1) to (4)):

$$m^{(g+1)} = \frac{1}{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} x^{i:\lambda}$$

$$\bar{s} = m^{(g+1)} - m^{(g)}$$

$$p^{(g+1)} = (1 - c_c)p^{(g)} + \sqrt{c_c(2 - c_c)\mu} \bar{s}$$

$$C^{(g+1)} = (1 - c_1)C^{(g)} + c_1 p^{(g+1)} p^{(g+1)\top}$$

5: $g \leftarrow g + 1$

6: **end while**

7: **return** best observed point and $m^{(g)}$

The state-of-the-art CMA-ES

The above simplified CMA-ES was given for its ease of explanations. The following features are missing:

- Weighting of the parents: $\bar{s} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} w_i s^{i:\lambda}$
- Separation of the size and shape of the covariance matrix:
 $C = \sigma^2 R$
- Simultaneous rank-1 (pp^T) and rank- μ ($\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} s^{i:\lambda} s^{i:\lambda T}$) updates of the covariance
- Restarts with increasing population sizes
[Auger and Hansen, 2005]

Content

- 1 Why global optimization? Basic concepts
- 2 First, simple, algorithms
 - Random search
 - Restarted local searches
 - Evolution strategy ES-(1+1)
- 3 Simulated annealing
 - Markov Chains
 - Markov Chain Monte Carlo : Metropolis Hastings algorithm
 - Simulated annealing
- 4 Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy (CMA-ES)
- 5 **Bayesian optimization**
- 6 Bibliography
- 7 Answers to the quizzes

Optimizing with the help of GPs

Scientific domain: Bayesian optimization.


The problem:

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \quad (5)$$

where $f()$ is a black-box costly function. No property of f that is helpful for optimization such as Lipschitz, convexity, uni-modality is known.


Principle: replace calls to $f()$ by the predicted density of the GP. Underlying assumption about the regularity of the function through the kernel choice, but it still works if this assumption is not satisfied.

Given a GPR, where do you sample next?



(EGO figures from [Durrande and Le Riche, 2017])

In our example, the best observed value is 1.79




We need **an acquisition criterion** that uses the GP and seeks a compromise between exploration and intensification: **the expected improvement** . . .

The Expected Improvement

$$\text{EI}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \max(0, (\min(F) - y(x))) p(y(x)) dy(x) = \dots = \sqrt{c(x, x)} [w(x) \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w(x)) + \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w(x))]$$

$$\text{with } w(x) = \frac{\min(F) - m(x)}{\sqrt{c(x, x)}}.$$



El formula I

$$\begin{aligned} \text{El}(x) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \max(0, (\min(F) - y(x))) p(y(x)) dy(x) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\min(F)} (\min(F) - y(x)) p(y(x)) dy(x) + \int_{\min(F)}^{+\infty} 0 dy(x) \end{aligned}$$

change of variable, temporarily drop some x 's to ease notation:

$$v = v(x) = \frac{y(x) - m(x)}{s(x)}, \quad s = s(x) = \sqrt{c(x, x)}$$

$$\text{El}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{\min(F) - m}{s}} (\min(F) - m - vs) p(v) dv$$

El formula II


v is made to be standard, $p(v) = \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}v^2\right)$, so
 $\text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}'(v) = -v \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(v)$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{El}(x) &= (\min(F) - m(x)) \times \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(v(x)) + s(x) \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(v(x)) \\ &= \sqrt{c(x,x)} [w(x) \times \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w(x)) + \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w(x))]\end{aligned}$$

where $w(x) = \frac{\min(F) - m(x)}{\sqrt{c(x,x)}}$ \square .


Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 0




Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 1




Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 2




Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 3




Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 4



Expected Improvement

Let's see how it works... iteration 5






This algorithm is called **Efficient Global Optimization** (EGO, [Jones et al., 1998]):

- 1 make an initial design of experiments X and calculate the associated F , $t = \text{length}(F)$
 - 2 built a GP from (X, F) (max. log-likelihood on σ and θ_i 's)
 - 3 $X_{t+1} = \arg \max_x EI(x)$ (with another optimizer, e.g. CMA-ES [Hansen and Ostermeier, 2001])
 - 4 calculate $F_{t+1} = f(X_{t+1})$, increment t
 - 5 stop ($t > t^{\max}$) or go to 2.
- + EGO provides a good trade-off between intensification and exploration without arbitrary parameters.
- + It requires few function observations to get close to optima.
- × EGO does not converge in the traditional sense: it creates dense samples in the volume of S . The efficiency comes from the order in which points are sampled.

EGO in higher dimension

Hartmann function, $f(x^*) = -3.32$, 10 points in initial design of experiments



Notice the global sampling of the search space with point clusters

(from [Ginsbourger, 2009])

El and the intensification/exploration tradeoff

El(x) increases when the variance $c(x, x)$ increases and it increases when the mean $m(x)$ decreases.

Quiz 6: Prove that $\partial \text{El}(x) / \partial m(x) < 0$.

Quiz 7: Prove that $\partial \text{El}(x) / \partial c(x, x) > 0$.

References I



Auger, A. and Dumas, L. (2017).
Derivative free optimization.



Auger, A. and Hansen, N. (2005).
A restart CMA evolution strategy with increasing population size.
In 2005 IEEE congress on evolutionary computation, volume 2, pages 1769–1776. IEEE.



Bäck, T., Schütz, M., et al. (1995).
Evolution strategies for mixed-integer optimization of optical multilayer systems.
In Evolutionary Programming, pages 33–51.



Durrande, N. and Le Riche, R. (2017).
Introduction to Gaussian Process Surrogate Models.
Lecture at 4th MDIS form@ter workshop, Clermont-Fd, France.
HAL report cel-01618068.



Gaudrie, D., Le Riche, R., Picheny, V., Eaux, B., and Herbert, V. (2020).
Modeling and optimization with gaussian processes in reduced eigenbases.
Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization, 61(6):2343–2361.

References II



Ginsbourger, D. (2009).

Multiplés métamodèles pour l'approximation et l'optimisation de fonctions numériques multivariées.

PhD thesis, Mines de Saint-Etienne.



Hansen, N. (2016).

The CMA evolution strategy: A tutorial.

arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.00772.



Hansen, N. and Ostermeier, A. (2001).

Completely derandomized self-adaptation in evolution strategies.

Evol. Comput., 9(2):159–195.



Irisarri, F.-X., Lasseigne, A., Leroy, F.-H., and Le Riche, R. (2014).

Optimal design of laminated composite structures with ply drops using stacking sequence tables.

Composite Structures, 107:559–569.



Jones, D. R., Perttunen, C. D., and Stuckman, B. E. (1993).

Lipschitzian optimization without the lipschitz constant.

Journal of optimization Theory and Applications, 79(1):157–181.

References III



Jones, D. R., Schonlau, M., and Welch, W. J. (1998).
Efficient Global Optimization of expensive black-box functions.
Journal of Global optimization, 13(4):455–492.



Larrañaga, P. and Lozano, J. A. (2001).
Estimation of distribution algorithms: A new tool for evolutionary computation, volume 2.
Springer Science & Business Media.



Rudolph, G. (1992).
On correlated mutations in evolution strategies.
In Männer, R. and Manderick, B., editors, *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature 2, PPSN-II, Brussels, Belgium, September 28-30, 1992*, pages 107–116. Elsevier.





Wolpert, D. H. and Macready, W. G. (1997).
No free lunch theorems for optimization.
IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation, 1(1):67–82.

Answers to the quizzes I

- Quiz 1 : Let's consider $\min_{x_1} f(x_1, x_2 = z)$ where z is fixed. At the local optima, the necessary optimality condition for is $\partial f(x_1, z)/\partial x_1 = 0$ but these (x_1, z) may not be optima in 2 dimensions since $\partial f(x_1, z)/\partial x_2$ may not be 0. As an example, the function $f(x_1, x_2) = (\|x\| - R)^2 + 0.1\|x - (-2, 0)^T\|^2$ has a unique optimum at $(-2, 0)^T$. It is multimodal for many x_2 fixed,

e.g., $x_2 = 0.5$:



Answers to the quizzes II

- Quiz 2 :

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, t\} \quad , \quad f(x^i) - L\|x - x^i\| \leq f(x)$$

$$\text{tightest lower bound : } \max_{i=1, \dots, t} (f(x^i) - L\|x - x^i\|) \leq f(x)$$

the min of the left-hand-side remains smaller than the min of the right-hand-side,

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{i=1, \dots, t} (f(x^i) - L\|x - x^i\|) \leq f(x^*) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} f(x)$$

multiply this inequality by -1 and add it to $\min_{i=1, \dots, t} f(x^i)$ to upperbound the f -distance to the optimum,

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, t} f(x^i) - f(x^*) \leq \min_{i=1, \dots, t} f(x^i) - \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \max_{i=1, \dots, t} (f(x^i) - L\|x - x^i\|)$$

Answers to the quizzes III

- Quiz 3: because the point is uniformly sampled, the probability to be in the neighborhood of x^* is $p = \text{volume neighborhood} / \text{volume } \mathcal{S} = 10^{-5} / 1 = 10^{-5}$. The number of trials before a point falls in the neighborhood, T , follows a geometric distribution, $\mathbb{P}(T = k) = (1 - p)^{k-1} p$ whose expectation is $1/p = 10^5$ and whose standard deviation is $\sqrt{1 - 10^{-5}} / 10^{-5} \approx 10^5$.
- Quiz 4: Let p_r be the probability of locating the optimum within r restarts, $p_r = 1 - (1 - p_1)^r$.
 $p_{r+1} - p_r = 1 - (1 - p_1)^{r+1} - 1 + (1 - p_1)^r = p_1(1 - p_1)^r$ which is positive, so there is a gain in a $(r + 1)$ -th search, but it is a decreasing gain with r .

Answers to the quizzes IV

- Quiz 5: It is called “rank 1 update” because the correction to the covariance matrix, $p^{(g+1)}p^{(g+1)\top}$, is a matrix of rank 1. Indeed, the rank of a matrix is the dimension of its image space, which is the number of non-zero eigenvalues. A matrix like pp^\top has 1 non-zero eigenvalue, $\|p\|^2$, because $(pp^\top)\frac{p}{\|p\|} = \|p\|^2\frac{p}{\|p\|}$, and all $d - 1$ vectors perpendicular to p have a 0 eigenvalue.
- Quiz 6: switch to shorthand notation dropping all x 's (everything is at x), $s = \sqrt{c(x, x)}$, $w = (\min(F) - m)/s$, one has: $\frac{\partial w}{\partial m} = -\frac{1}{s}$,
 $\frac{\partial \text{EI}}{\partial m} = s[-\frac{1}{s} \times \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) + w(-\frac{1}{s}) \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) - w(-\frac{1}{s}) \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w)] = -\text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) < 0$.
- Quiz 7: same notation as previous quiz, $\frac{\partial w}{\partial s} = -\frac{1}{s}w$,
 $\frac{\partial \text{EI}}{\partial s} = w \times \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) + \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) + s[-\frac{1}{s}w \times \text{cdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) + w(-\frac{1}{s}w) \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) - w(-\frac{1}{s}w) \times \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w)] = \text{pdf}_{\mathcal{N}}(w) > 0$.