



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands

Discovering the preference hypervolume: an interactive model for real world computational co-creativity

Hagg, A.

Citation

Hagg, A. (2021, December 7). *Discovering the preference hypervolume: an interactive model for real world computational co-creativity*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3245521>

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/1887/3245521>

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

Discovering the Preference Hypervolume

an Interactive Model for Real World

Computational Co-creativity

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 7 december 2021
klokke 11.15 uur

door

Alexander Hagg

geboren te Delft, Nederland
in 1979

Promotiecommissie

Promotor:	Prof. Dr. T.H.W. Bäck	
Promotor:	Prof. Dr. A. Asteroth	
Co-promotor:	Dr. M. Preuss	
Overige leden:	Prof. Dr. A. Plaat	(voorzitter, LIACS, NL)
	Prof. Dr. J. Batenburg	(secretaris, LIACS, NL)
	Prof. Dr. E. Hart	(Edinburgh Napier University, UK)
	Prof. Dr. S. Colton	(University of London, UK)
	Dr. R. Saunders	(LIACS, NL)
	Dr. A. Kononova	(LIACS, NL)

Copyright © 2021 Alexander Hagg.

This work received funding from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, and the Ministry for Culture and Science of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia (research grants 03FH012PX5 and 13FH156IN6).

Acknowledgements

I would like to dedicate this work to my second supervisor, Alexander Asteroth, whom I met in 2006 as my trade school teacher. During an evaluation meeting, after having read a report I had submitted, he put it aside without really discussing it and asked me why I did not go and study. This moment changed my life as I followed him to the university of applied sciences where he became professor. During my entire academic career he has been an inspiration, enabler, critic, and friend. I will be forever in your debt.

I would like to thank my promotor Thomas Bäck and my coauthors Adam Gaier, Dominik Wilde, Jörg Stork, Martin Zaefferer, Maximilian Mensing, Sebastian Berns, Mike Preuss, and Simon Colton for the inspiring discussions and our work together. Furthermore, I would like to thank my proofreaders, specifically Carolin Hoffmann, Evgeniya Ovchinnikova, Hanna Heinrich, and Bärbel Schomers. Carolin, you have become my sister and without you, my life would have been wildly different and certainly not as happy.

Finally, I would like to thank all the people in my life for being there for me. Writing this thesis is a milestone in my life and without your inspiration I would have not been able to keep going. I love you all.

Abstract

In this thesis, the ideas of Guilford about divergent thinking, Jung on intuition and Sartre on reflection by others are combined to create a Hegelian creative process. It is posed that the central object of preference discovery is a co-creative process in which the Other can be represented by a machine, as is often done in the computational creativity community. This thesis explores efficient methods to enhance introverted intuition using extraverted intuition's communication lines.

Possible implementations of such processes are presented using novel algorithms that perform divergent search to feed the users' intuition with many examples of high quality solutions, allowing them to take influence interactively. In this process, the machine feeds and reflects upon human intuition, combining both what is possible and preferred. The machine model and the divergent optimization algorithms are the motor behind this co-creative process, in which machine and users co-create and interactively choose branches of an ad hoc hierarchical decomposition of the solution space.

The proposed co-creative process consists of several elements, which are treated in this thesis in the following order: a formal model for interactive co-creative processes, evolutionary divergent search, diversity and similarity, data-driven methods to discover diversity, limitations of artificial creative agents, matters of efficiency in behavioral and morphological modeling, visualization, a connection to prototype theory, and methods to allow users to influence artificial creative agents.

We tend to portray human creativity as having few boundaries. It might seem folly for a computer scientist to venture into such a domain where we have biases about human capabilities and are not capable of quantifying results in an objective manner without involving the human we aim to partially replace. This dissertation

is an effort to connect the field of computer science with the fields of philosophy, psychology, and biology, to enhance, not replace human creativity.

The ethical, social and political consequences of replacing humans by algorithms are part of a wider debate about how we organize society in the light of artificial intelligence's deep impact. But instead of replacing the human, this thesis explicitly chooses to embrace human-computer interaction in creative design, putting the human back into the loop of algorithmic design in generative AI and optimization.

Replicators [...] should be thought of as having extended phenotypic effects, consisting of all its effects on the world at large, not just its effects on the individual body in which it happens to be sitting.

(Dawkins 1982)

There is a power and utility to regarding the gene as the unit of selection, but equally there is value to seeing the organism as the unit of niche construction.

(Laland 2004)

Can There Ever Be Too Many Options?

(Scheibehenne 2010)

No one can tell what the painting of tomorrow will be like; one cannot judge a painting until it is done.

(Sartre and Elkaïm-Sartre 1946)

Contents

Abstract	i
List of Symbols	
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Creativity and Optimization	1
1.2 Examples Drive Creative Processes	2
1.3 Outline of the Dissertation	3
2 The Creative Process	7
2.1 Creativity	7
2.1.1 Formalisms	9
2.1.2 Iterative Processes	11
2.2 Creative Cognition	12
2.2.1 Divergent Thinking	12
2.2.2 Priming	14
2.2.3 Convergent Thinking	14
2.2.4 Reorganization of Information	15
2.2.5 Dissonance	16
2.2.6 Resonance: Experience, Intuition and Bias	16
2.3 Computational Creativity	17
2.3.1 Requirements of Co-creative Systems	19
2.3.2 Related Co-creative Systems	21
2.4 Process Model	23
2.5 Chapter Summary	26
3 Divergent Search	29
3.1 Extending the Phenotype	31

3.1.1	Genome, Phenotype and Behavior in Nature	32
3.1.2	Encoding in Evolutionary Computation	34
3.1.3	Conclusions	38
3.2	Multi-Solution Optimization Methods	38
3.2.1	Diversity in Objective Space	39
3.2.2	Diversity in Genetic Space	40
3.2.3	Diversity in Phenotypic Space	41
3.2.4	Conclusions	49
3.3	Comparing Divergent Search Methods	50
3.3.1	Niching with Voronoi Tessellation	51
3.3.2	Diversity Metrics	53
3.3.3	Evaluation	55
3.3.4	Conclusions	60
3.4	Phenotypic Features	60
3.4.1	Predefined Features	61
3.4.2	Learning Features	62
3.4.3	Evaluation	65
3.4.4	Conclusions	65
3.5	Limitations of Generative Models	66
3.5.1	Variational Autoencoders	67
3.5.2	Study Setup	69
3.5.3	Experiments	72
3.5.4	Discussion	78
3.5.5	Conclusions	80
3.6	Chapter Summary	81
4	Efficiency	83
4.1	Surrogate Modeling of Phenotypic Features	84
4.1.1	Bayesian Optimization	84
4.1.2	Surrogate-Assisted Quality Diversity	85
4.1.3	Surrogate-Assisted Phenotypic Niching	87
4.1.4	Quantitative Comparison	90
4.1.5	Use Case: Wind Nuisance in Architecture	93
4.1.6	Conclusions	99
4.2	Surrogate Modeling of Neural Behaviors	100
4.2.1	Related Distance Kernels	102

4.2.2	Sampled Phenotypic Distance	103
4.2.3	Evaluation	106
4.2.4	Conclusions	112
4.3	Chapter Summary	113
5	The Preference Hypervolume	115
5.1	Genetic Prototypes	116
5.1.1	Unsupervised Clustering	117
5.1.2	Evaluation of Dimensionality Reduction and Clustering	119
5.1.3	Genetic Seeding	122
5.1.4	Quantitative Analysis	124
5.1.5	Qualitative Analysis	126
5.1.6	Conclusions	128
5.2	Modeling User Selection Drift	129
5.2.1	User Decision Hypersurface Model	130
5.2.2	Experimental Setup	134
5.2.3	Selection on Hypersurface	137
5.2.4	Influence of Penalty Weight on Drift	138
5.2.5	Comparing Seeding and Modeling	139
5.2.6	Conclusions	142
5.3	Phenotypic Drift	143
5.3.1	Comparing Genetic and Phenotypic Models	143
5.3.2	The Preference Hypervolume	145
5.3.3	Demonstration	147
5.3.4	Conclusions	150
5.4	Chapter Summary	151
6	In Conclusion	153
	Appendix A Evolutionary Algorithms	161
A.1	Selection	163
A.2	Crossover	163
A.3	Mutation	163
A.4	Diversity Management	164
A.5	Representation	165
	Appendix B T-Distributed Stochastic Neighborhood Embedding	166

Appendix C Gaussian Process Regression	168
Bibliography	171
Acronyms	191
Summary	195
Samenvatting	197
About the Author	201

List of Symbols

k	number of nearest neighbors
\mathcal{X}	population matrix with one member per row
\mathcal{A}	phenotypic archive used as a niching method by quality diversity algorithm
\mathcal{D}	phenotypic feature coordinate matrix with one member per row
$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}, \sigma)$	Gaussian random variable with mean m and variance σ^2
A	area
l	circumference length
P	point symmetry
\mathbf{dR}	radial deviation of polygon key point
$\mathcal{D}\theta$	angular deviation of polygon key point
$L(x, \hat{x})$	evidence lower bound between predicted output x and ground truth \hat{x}
$C(\cdot, \cdot)$	binary cross-entropy between two entrees
$K(\cdot, \cdot)$	Kullback-Leibler divergence between two distributions
β	regularization factor scalar in Kullback-Leibler divergence
γ	annealing factor in Kullback-Leibler divergence
μ	learning rate for optimization algorithms
p	significance value
κ	parameter that controls exploration and exploitation in upper confidence bound acquisition function within Bayesian optimization context

$d()$	pointer to function that returns phenotypic descriptors (features) of a solution in a divergent optimization context
$f()$	pointer to function that evaluates a solution in optimization
\mathbf{M}_f	surrogate model that predicts fitness
\mathbf{M}_d	surrogate model that predicts phenotypic descriptors
u_{max}	maximum air velocity in a flow field
E	enstrophy: a turbulence metric of a flow field
t	point in time
Re	Reynolds number of a flow field
\mathbf{s}	input vector of a neural network
\mathbf{o}	output vector of a neural network
p_{c_L}	lift penalty used in objective function
p_A	area penalty used in objective function
\mathcal{H}	decision hypersurface based on members of QD archive
\mathcal{T}	projection of archive members into similarity space
$\hat{\mathcal{T}}$	projection model
δ	distance measure
\mathcal{S}	selected solutions
$\bar{\mathcal{S}}$	deselected solutions
\mathcal{P}	binary selection partition
\mathcal{M}	user decision hypersurface model
E_s	symmetry error
$p(x)$	constraint penalty of a candidate solution x , selected by a user
