



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Self-adjusting surrogate-assisted optimization techniques for expensive constrained black box problems

Bagheri, S.

Citation

Bagheri, S. (2020, April 8). *Self-adjusting surrogate-assisted optimization techniques for expensive constrained black box problems*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87271>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87271>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/87271> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Bagheri, S.

Title: Self-adjusting surrogate-assisted optimization techniques for expensive constrained black box problems

Issue Date: 2020-04-08

Acknowledgements

I would like to genuinely thank TH Köln – University of Applied Sciences for giving me the opportunity to pursue a PhD program in parallel to my job by providing financial support as well as offering a great atmosphere for research. This work would not have been possible without the tireless assistance of my supervisors both from TH Köln and University of Leiden. Also, I thank Dr. Bas van Stein for helping me writing a Dutch summary of my dissertation, and my dear friends Atossa Setoodegan and her husband Dr. Rutger Fick who proofread it.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Summary of Research Questions	8
Chapter 2 Black Box Optimization Methods	10
2.1 Is There Any Free Lunch in Optimization?	10
2.2 Unconstrained Optimization	11
2.3 Constraint Handling Techniques	14
2.4 Surrogate-Assisted Constrained Optimization	17
2.4.1 Taxonomy of Surrogate Models	17
2.4.2 Radial Basis Function Interpolation	19
2.5 Visualization Methods in Optimization	24
Chapter 3 SACOBRA: Self-Adjusting Parameter Control	26
3.1 Outline	26
3.2 Introduction	27
3.3 Related Work	29
3.4 Pitfalls in Surrogate-Assisted Optimization	30
3.4.1 Rescaling the Input Space	30
3.4.2 Logarithmic Transform for Large Output Ranges	31
3.5 Methods	33
3.5.1 COBRA	33
3.5.2 SACOBRA	36
3.6 Experimental Evaluation	42
3.6.1 Experimental Setup	42
3.6.2 Convergence curves	45
3.6.3 Performance profiles	45
3.6.4 Fitness Function Adjustment	48
3.6.5 Comparison with Other Optimizers	52

3.6.6	MOPTA08	55
3.7	Discussion	56
3.7.1	SACOBRA and Surrogate Modeling	56
3.7.2	Limitations of SACOBRA	58
3.7.3	Comparison of Solution Qualities	59
3.8	Conclusion	60
Chapter 4 Handling Equality Constraints in SACOBRA		62
4.1	Outline	62
4.2	Introduction	62
4.3	Taxonomy of Equality Handling Techniques	64
4.4	Method	68
4.4.1	The Proposed Equality Handling Approach	68
4.4.2	Initializing the Margin ϵ	69
4.4.3	Decrementing Margin	69
4.4.4	Refine Mechanism	71
4.5	Experimental Setup	72
4.6	Results & Discussion	74
4.6.1	Convergence Curves	74
4.6.2	Analyzing Update Scheme for Margin ϵ	78
4.6.3	Pareto Set of Solutions or a Single Solution?	81
4.7	Conclusion	83
Chapter 5 SOCU: EGO-based Constrained Optimization		84
5.1	Outline	84
5.2	Introduction	85
5.3	Related Work	86
5.4	Methods	87
5.4.1	Kriging Surrogate Models	87
5.4.2	Expected Improvement with Constraints	88
5.4.3	Plugin Control (PC): Preserving Feasibility	89
5.5	Experimental Setup	92
5.5.1	General Setup	92
5.5.2	Aerodynamic Shape Design Problem	93
5.6	Results	95
5.6.1	Demonstration on <i>Sphere4</i>	95
5.6.2	Noise Variance	98
5.6.3	Performance on G-Problems	98

5.6.4	Performance on XFOIL	101
5.7	Conclusion	102
Chapter 6 Handling Equality Constraints in SOCU		104
6.1	Outline	104
6.2	Introduction	105
6.3	Method Description	106
6.4	Experimental Setup	106
6.5	Results & Discussion	107
6.5.1	Convergence Curves	107
6.5.2	SOCU+EH vs. SACOBRA+EH	108
6.5.3	Curse of Dimensionality	111
6.6	Conclusion	112
Chapter 7 Radial Basis Function vs. Kriging Surrogates		114
7.1	Outline	114
7.2	Introduction	115
7.3	Related Work	116
7.4	Methods	117
7.4.1	Gaussian Process Modeling	117
7.4.2	Radial Basis Function Interpolation	120
7.4.3	GP vs. RBF	122
7.5	Experimental Setup	123
7.6	Results and Discussion	125
7.7	Conclusion	129
Chapter 8 Online Model Selection		131
8.1	Outline	131
8.2	Introduction	132
8.3	Related Work	132
8.4	Online Model Selection in SACOBRA	134
8.5	Experimental Evaluation	135
8.5.1	Experimental Setup	135
8.5.2	Results	137
8.6	Discussion	143
8.7	Conclusion	147
Chapter 9 SACOBRA for Functions with High-Conditioning		149
9.1	Outline	149

9.2	Introduction and Related Work	150
9.3	Why Is High Conditioning An Issue for Surrogates?	152
9.4	Online Whitening Scheme for SACOBRA	153
9.4.1	Derivation of the Transformation Matrix	155
9.4.2	Calculation of Inverse Square Root Matrix	157
9.5	Experimental Setup	158
9.6	Results & Discussion	159
9.6.1	Convergence Curves	159
9.6.2	Parallel Computation	161
9.6.3	Data Profile	163
9.6.4	Curse of Dimensionality	163
9.7	Conclusion	164
Chapter 10 Conclusion and Outlook		167
10.1	Contributions	167
10.2	Future Directions	170
Bibliography		171
Appendix		189
A	G-Problem Suite Description	189
B	Transforming G22	215
Summary		218
Samenvatting		221
About the Author		224

List of Tables

2.1	Commonly used radial basis functions	22
3.1	Adaptive control elements	36
3.2	Characteristics of the first G-functions with inequality constraints . .	43
3.3	The default parameter setting used for COBRA	44
3.5	Number of failed runs for constrained optimizers	55
3.6	Comparing optimizers on MOPTA08 problem	57
4.1	Characteristics of G-problems with equality constraints	73
4.2	Comparing different equality handling techniques on G-functions . . .	80
5.1	Characteristics of G-functions with inequality constraints and $2 - 4 d$	93
5.2	Effect of noise variance	98
6.1	Success rate of SACOBRA and SOCU on COPs with equality constraints	111
7.1	Commonly used kernel functions for GP and radial basis functions . .	117
7.2	Characteristics of the G-functions	124
7.3	Differences between SOCU-Kriging and SOCU-RBF	125
8.1	Commonly used radial basis functions	134
8.2	Comparing different constrained optimizers for G-problems	145
9.1	Condition number of BBOB benchmark	158
A.1	Characteristics of the G-functions	191

List of Figures

1.1 Opel Astra crash model	3
1.2 Cooling system shape optimization	4
2.1 Taxonomy of derivative-free unconstrained optimizers	13
2.2 Conceptualization of RBF interpolation in $1D$, with Gaussian $\phi(r)$. .	23
2.3 Conceptualization of RBF interpolation in $1D$, with cubic $\phi(r)$	23
3.1 The influence of scaling on RBF.	31
3.2 The influence of large output ranges on RBF	32
3.3 COBRA flowchart.	34
3.4 SACOBRA flowchart.	39
3.5 SACOBRA optimization process for G01–G05mod excluding G02 . .	46
3.6 SACOBRA optimization process for G06–G11mod	47
3.7 SACOBRA optimization process for G02 in 10 and 20 dimensions . .	48
3.8 Data profile of SACOBRA on G-problems	49
3.9 Wilcoxon rank sum test for SACOBRA	50
3.10 <i>plog</i> effect on G-problems	51
3.11 Comparing SACOBRA, COBRA, DE and COBYLA	54
3.12 Data profile of SACOBRA on MOPTA08	56
4.1 A simple $2D$ optimization problem with one equality constraint	64
4.2 A $2D$ optimization problem with a multimodal fitness function	65
4.3 Dilemma of margin-based equality handling methods	67
4.4 Main steps of SACOBRA with the equality handling mechanism. . . .	68
4.5 Refine step	72
4.6 Impact of the feasibility margin decaying factor β	74
4.7 SACOBRA convergence curves for G-problems with equality constraints	76
4.8 SACOBRA convergence curves for G-problems with equality constraints	77
4.9 SACOBRA convergence curves for G-problems with equality constraints	78
4.10 Impact of different update schemes for the equality margin ϵ	79
4.11 Pareto-optimal solutions for G05 minimizing fitness and violation . .	81

5.1	Feasibility function $F(\vec{x}) = \prod F_i(\vec{x})$	89
5.2	EI_{mod} shift towards the infeasible area for G06 problem	90
5.3	Impact of plugin control	91
5.4	<i>Sphere4</i> problem	94
5.5	SOCU vs. SOCU w/o plugin vs. Schonlau on <i>Sphere4</i>	96
5.6	SOCU vs. Schonlau	97
5.7	SOCU vs. SOCU w/o plugin vs. Schonlau on G-problems	99
5.8	SOCU vs. SACOBRA	100
5.9	Data profile of SACOBRA vs. SOCU vs. Schonlau on G-problems . .	101
5.10	SOCU vs. SACOBRA vs. Schonlau on XFOIL	102
6.1	Conceptualizing the equality constraint's feasibility function in SOCU.	105
6.2	SOCU optimization for G11 problem with an equality constraint . . .	108
6.3	SOCU optimization process on 4 G-problems with equality constraints.	109
6.4	Comparing SOCU+EH and SACOBRA+EH	110
6.5	SOCU results for G03 problems with various dimensions.	112
7.1	Left: prior function distribution using squared exponential kernel. Right: posterior function distribution given the evaluated points using squared exponential kernel.	119
7.2	Showcasing possible ill-conditioned or singular Φ for cubic RBF . . .	120
7.3	Comparing RBF and GP from the DICEKRIGING package in R . . .	123
7.4	SOCU-Kriging vs. SOCU-RBF (optimization performance)	126
7.5	SOCU-Kriging vs. SOCU-RBF (computational time)	127
7.6	Impact of the noise variance on SOCU-Kriging	128
7.7	Approximation error for the objective and constraint functions of G01	130
8.1	Online model selection performance on G01,G03-G7	138
8.2	Online model selection performance on G08-G13	139
8.3	Online model selection performance on G14-G19	140
8.4	Same as Fig. 8.1 for problems G21, G23, G24.	141
8.5	Online model selection data profile with a fix tolerance	142
8.6	Online model selection data profile with a problem-specific tolerance .	143
8.7	Approximation error per iterations for problem G13.	144
8.8	Frequency of model selection in each iteration	147
9.1	Conceptualization flowchart of surrogate-assisted optimization	150
9.2	F02 function from BBOB benchmark set (ellipsoidal function)	153
9.3	Modeling a function with high-conditioning with RBF	154

9.4	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, CMA-ES and DE	160
9.5	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, CMA-ES and DE (parallelizable case)	162
9.6	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, DE and CMA-ES for strictly limited function evaluations	163
9.7	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, DE and CMA-ES	164
9.8	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, DE and CMA-ES (parallelizable case)	165
9.9	Comparing SACOBRA, SACOBRA+OW, DE and CMA-ES (dimensionality analysis)	166
A.1	Normalized radial visualization of G-problem's properties.	190
A.2	G02 problem description	193
A.3	G03 problem description	195
A.4	G03mod problem description	195
A.5	G06 problem description	198
A.6	G08 problem description	200
A.7	G11 problem description	202
A.8	G11mod problem description	202
A.9	G24 problem description	214