

Data-Driven Evolutionary Optimization of Complex Systems: Big vs Small Data

Yaochu Jin

Head, Nature Inspired Computing and Engineering (NICE) Department of Computer Science, University of Surrey, United Kingdom <u>yaochu.jin@surrey.ac.uk</u>

Outline



- Complexity in evolutionary optimization of real-world problems
- Data driven evolutionary optimization
 - Offline (Big) data driven evolutionary optimization
 - Online small data driven evolutionary optimization
- Concluding remarks

Strengths and Weaknesses of EAs for Optimization



- No need for analytical objective functions and no requirement for derivative information
- Less vulnerable to local optimums
- Less vulnerable to uncertainty (relative quality is more important)
- Well suited for multi-objective optimization
- No theoretical guarantee for global optimum
- Population based search -- computationally intensive

Complexities in Real-World Optimization



- Complexity in problem formulation and solution representation
- Complexity in scale
 - Large number of decision variables
 - Large number of objectives
- Complexity in handling uncertainty
- Complexity in quality evaluation



Complexity in Problem Formulation and Solution Representation

Complexity in Problem Formulation





- The formulation of the objective function is an iterative process
- Representation is critical : multiple sub-systems, optimization-control coupling
- Different objectives/ constraints / decision variables may have to be considered / weighted differently at different stages
- Different resources are available at different stages

Complexity in Shape Representation



Expert Knowledge





Free Form Deformation(FFD)





Shape Representations in Micro Heat Exchanger





A Spline representation









A frequency-amplitude representation

Micro Heat Exchanger Optimization - Results





- Maximize the heat transfer rate (thermodynamic)
- Minimize the sum of pressure drop with a penalty (aerodynamic)



Complexity in Scale: Large Decision and Objective Space

Swarm Intelligence for Large-Scale Optimization



- Large-scale evolutionary optimization
 - Divide and conquer by random grouping
 - Detection of correlation between decision variables
 - A competitive swarm optimizer (CSO)
 - A social-learning based particle swarm optimizer (SL-PSO)

R. Cheng and Y. Jin. A competitive swarm optimizer for large-scale optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 45(2):191-205, 2015

R. Cheng and **Y. Jin**. A social learning particle swarm optimization algorithm for scalable optimization. *Information Sciences*, 291:43-60, 2015

Competitive Swarm Optimization (CSO)





t = t + 1

- Randomly pick two solutions
- Compare their fitness. The winner is directly passed to the next generation while the loser will be updated as follows:

$$V_{l,k}(t+1) = R_1(k, t) V_{l,k}(t) + R_2(k, t) (X_{w,k}(t) - X_{l,k}(t)) + \varphi R_3(k, t) (\bar{X}_k(t) - X_{l,k}(t))$$

• Neither global nor personal best is used

A Social Learning PSO (SL-PSO)





$$X_{i,j}(t+1) = \begin{cases} X_{i,j}(t) + \Delta X_{i,j}(t+1), \text{ if } p_i(t) \le P_i^L & 0 \le p_i(t) \le P_i^L \le 1\\ X_{i,j}(t), \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\Delta X_{i,j}(t+1) = r_1(t) \cdot \Delta X_{i,j}(t) + r_2(t) \cdot I_{i,j}(t) + r_3(t) \cdot \epsilon \cdot C_{i,j}(t),$$

$$\begin{cases} I_{i,j}(t) = X_{k,j}(t) - X_{i,j}(t), \\ C_{i,j}(t) = \overline{X}_j(t) - X_{i,j}(t). \end{cases}$$

Large Number of Objectives – Many-Objective Optimization



- Computational challenges
 - Calculation of performance some indicators becomes intractable
- Performance degradation
 - Loss of selection pressure in Pareto-based approaches
- Solution assessment becomes tricky
 - The performance become very sensitive and also easily biased
 - Solution sets are no loner comparable
 - Diversity becomes trickier to measure
- Can we still be able to find a "representative" subset of the Pareto front?

B. Li, J. Li, K. Tang, and X. Yao. Many-objective evolutionary algorithms: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 48:13–35, 2015 H. Ishibuchi, N. Tsukamoto, and Y. Nojima. Evolutionary manyobjective optimization: A short review. In: *Proceedings of IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 2419–2426. IEEE, 2008

H. Wang, Y. Jin and X. Yao. Diversity assessment in many-objective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Cyber*netics, 2016 (accepted)

Evolutionary Many-Objective Optimization



EAs for solving MaOPs may largely be divided into the following categories:

- **Preference based**, including decomposition approaches
- Convergence acceleration, mainly by modifying the dominance relationship or by including additional criteria
- Performance indicator based

Use of "Knee-Points" to Accelerate Convergence





X. Zhang, Y. Tian, and Y. Jin, A Knee Point Driven Evolutionary Algorithm for Many-Objective Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 19(6):761-776, 2015

Specification of Preferences





Angle-penalized distance (APD):

$$d^{j} = (1 + P(\theta^{j})) \cdot ||\bar{f}^{j}||,$$
$$P(\theta^{j}) = k \cdot (\frac{t}{t_{max}})^{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\theta^{j}}{\gamma_{v}},$$

R. Cheng, Y. Jin, M. Olhofer and B. Sendhoff. A reference vector guided evolutionary algorithm for many-objective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 2016 (Accepted)

Efficient Non-Dominated Sorting



- Non-dominated sorting becomes extremely time-consuming in case of
 - A large population size
 - A large number of objectives
- Computationally efficient non-dominated sorting
 - ENS: An efficient non-dominated sorting algorithm for 2 or 3 objectives with a large population size
 - **A-ENS**: An approximate non-dominated sorting for many objectives
 - T-ENS: An accurate tree-based non-dominated sorting for large-scale many-objective optimization

X. Zhang, Y. Tian, R. Cheng, and Y. Jin. An efficient approach to non-dominated sorting for evolutionary multi-objective \ optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 19(2):201-213, 2015
X. Zhang, Y. Tian, Y. Jin. Approximate non-dominated sorting for evolutionary many-objective optimization. *Information Sciences*, 2016 (accepted)
X. Zhang, Y. Tian, P. Chong, and Y. Jin. A decision variable clustering-based evolutionary algorithm for large-scale.

X. Zhang, Y. Tian, R. Cheng, **and Y. Jin**. A decision variable clustering-based evolutionary algorithm for large-scale many-objective optimization. 2016 (Submitted)

Code for the ENS variants available!



Complexity in Quality Evaluation

Complexity in Quality Evaluation

- An analytic fitness function is not available
 - Very time-consuming numerical simulations
 - Expensive experiments
 - History production data only









Data Driven Evolutionary Optimization

Data Driven Optimization - Offline and Online



Data-driven evolutionary optimization



Offline data-driven optimization

Online data-driven optimization

UNIVERSITY OF

SURRI

H. Wang, Y. Jin and J. O. Jansen. Data-driven surrogate-assisted multi-objective evolutionary optimization of a trauma system. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 2016 (accepted)



Offline (Big) Data Driven Evolutionary Optimization

Scottish Trauma system design

Major

trauma



Trauma unit (TU)

• A trauma unit is a hospital which manages less severely injured patients.

Local emergency hospital (LEH) • A local emergency hospital is a hospital which only deals with minor injuries.

UNIVERSITY OF

H. Wang, Y. Jin and J. O. Jansen. Data-driven surrogate-assisted multi-objective evolutionary optimization of a trauma system. IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation, 2016 (accepted)

- **Objective 1**: Minimize total travel time
- **Objective 2**: Minimize the exceptions number (the cases "triaged-to-MTC" diverted to a TU)

UNIVERSITY OF

SURRF)

- Constraint 1: Number of helicopter transfers
- Constraint 2: MTC case volume
- Constraint 3: TU proximity to avoid two close TUs

Main research question is: how to reduce computational time given the large amount of data (the amount of data could be much larger)?

- The EA is able to find the Pareto optimal solutions
- The computation time can be reduced as much as possible

- 40,000 incident records (location, injury, patient)
- 18 trauma centers in Scotland



UNIVERSITY OF SURREY

• Fitness evaluations is highly time-consuming when the number of records is huge

Elitist Non-dominated Sorting GA (NSGA-II)





<u>Solution</u>

- Group the data into a number of clusters and use the cluster centers to evaluate the objective and constraint functions
- How to make sure the accuracy is good enough?



• The maximum error should not change the individuals to be selected

• Adaptation of K



←ER ←Acceptable ER

UNIVERSITY OF



UNIVERSITY OF

	IGD	Time (s)
SA-NSGA-II with CS	$2.47e-02\pm1.96e-02$	$6.54e+03\pm3.57e+03$
SA-NSGA-II without CS	$2.51e-02\pm 2.79e-02$	$10.31e+03\pm 5.00e+03$
NSGA-II	$0.00e+00\pm0.00e+00$	$8.14e+04\pm 5.36e+02$

Discussions



- Online big data driven evolutionary optimization, e.g., stream data
- Efficient learning of big data
- Noisy and / or heterogeneous data



Online (Small) Data Driven Evolutionary Optimization

Small Data - Collecting Data is Expensive



- In many cases, collecting data is very expensive
 - Highly time-consuming numerical simulation
 - Expensive physical experiments
 - Real-industrial processes only

Surrogate-Assisted Evolutionary Optimization



- Use a meta-model /surrogate to replace the expensive fitness evaluations, e.g., CFD simulations
 - Choose a surrogate
 - Collect data
 - Train the surrogate
 - Replace the CFD



Online data-driven optimization





Model Management



• Use surrogates only: Risk of converging to a false optimum



- Surrogate management / evolution control
 - ➢ population-based
 - ➤ generation-based
 - individual-based
 - Iocal search
 - Combination of the above

Y. Jin. A comprehensive survey of fitness approximation in evolutionary computation. *Soft Computing*, 9(1), 3-12, 2005 Y. Jin. Surrogate-assisted evolutionary computation: Recent advances and future challenges. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, 1(2):61-70, 2011

Model Management - Main Questions



Which individuals are to be re-evaluated using the real-fitness function?

- Solutions that are of potentially good performance
- Solutions whose estimated fitness have large amount of uncertainty
 - Less explored
 - Effective for model improvement
- How to measure uncertainty?
- How to measure model quality? (Jin et al 2003, Huesken et al 2005)

M. Huesken, Y. Jin and B. Sendhoff. Structure optimization of neural networks for evolutionary design optimization. *Soft Computing*, 9(1), 21-28, 2005
Y. Jin, M. Huesken and B. Sendhoff. Quality measures for approximate models in evolutionary computation. In: *Proceedings of the GECCO Workshop on "Learning, Adaptation and Approximation in Evolutionary Computation*", pp.170-174, Chicago, 2003

Model Management - Promising Ones





- 12-D Ackley function
- (3,12)-ES
- average over 10 runs
- The best strategy is more efficient than the random strategy
- In the best strategy, about half of the individual should be controlled to guarantee correct convergence

Y. Jin, M. Olhofer and B. Sendhoff. A framework for evolutionary optimization with approximate fitness functions. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 6(5): 481-494 (2002)

Model Management – Promising and Uncertain Ones



Given a stochastic model (Gaussian process),

• Mean fitness value:

 $f = \mu(x);$

• Lower confidence bound (LCB)

 $f = \mu(x) - \alpha \sigma(x) (\alpha > 0)$

• Expected improvement (EI)



$$\operatorname{EI}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+))\Phi(Z) + \sigma(\mathbf{x})\phi(Z) & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) > 0\\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{cases} \quad Z = \frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}$$

• Probability of Improvement (PI)

 $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the normal cumulative distribution function.

$$\mathrm{PI}(\mathbf{x}) = P(f(\mathbf{x}) \ge f(\mathbf{x}^+)) = \Phi\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}^+)}{\sigma(\mathbf{x})}\right)$$

M. Emmerich, K.C. Giannakoglou, B. Naujoks, Single- and multiobjective evolutionary optimization assisted by Gaussian random field metamodels. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 10 (4) : 421–439 (2006) Eric Brochu, Vlad M. Cora and Nando de Freitas. A tutorial on Bayesian optimization of expensive cost functions, with application

to active user modeling and hierarchical reinforcement learning, 2010. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1012.2599

Model Management in Multi-Objective Optimization



- Each objective is considered separately (similar to single objective optimization)
- Multiple objectives are converted to a scalar objective function and then use the model management criteria for single objective optimization
 - Random weights
 - Uniformly distributed weights
- Use a scalar performance indicator, e.g., hypervolume

D. Horn, T. Wagner, D. Biermann, C. Weihs, and B. Bischl. Model-Based Multi-Objective Optimization: Taxonomy, Multi-Point Proposal, Toolbox and Benchmark. In: *Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization*, LNCS 9018, pages 64–78.

Potential Benefit of a Global Model





A global model might help smoothen the fitness landscape

D. Lim, Y. Jin, Y.-S. Ong, and B. Sendhoff. Generalizing surrogate-assisted evolutionary computation. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 14(3):329 - 355, 2010
C. Sun, Y. Jin, J. Zeng and Y. Yu. A two-layer surrogate-assisted particle swarm optimization algorithm. *Soft Computing*, 19(6):1461-1475, 2015

Dual Surrogates in Memetic Algorithms





Results: Multi-Objective

1.4





Global and Local Surrogate Models



Two-layer (global and local) surrogate-assisted PSO

- 1: Construct a global surrogate model;
- 2: Approximate a fitness value for each individual in the swarm using the global surrogate model;
- 3: for each particle i in the swarm do
- 4: Find its neighbors in the local database;
- 5: if there are enough samples to construct a local surrogate then
- 6: Construct a local surrogate model;
- 7: Approximate the fitness of particle i using the local surrogate model;

8:
$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \min\{\tilde{f}_g(\mathbf{x}_i), \tilde{f}_l(\mathbf{x}_i)\}$$

9: **else**

10:
$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \tilde{f}_g(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

- 11: **end if**
- 12: end for



C. Sun, Y. Jin, J. Zeng and Y. Yu. A two-layer surrogate-assisted particle swarm optimization algorithm. *Soft Computing*, 19(6):1461-1475, 2015

Surrogate-Assisted Large-Scale Evolutionary Optimization?



- Dimension mostly limited up to 10 in GP-assisted EAs, mostly up to 30
 - Curse of dimensionality
 - Dramatic increase in computational cost for training surrogates,
 e.g., Gaussian processes it can take hours to build a GP model 8

Fitness Estimation Assisted CSO for Large-Scale Optimization







- Fitness estimation in competitive swarm optimization for dimensions up to 500
 - Fitness estimated based on positional relationships

- Particles whose fitness is estimated (ES)
- Particles whose fitness is calculated (EV)

Loser particles whose fitness is estimated (ES)

Winner particle whose fitness is calculated (EV)

C. Sun, J. Ding, J. Zeng and Y. Jin. Fitness approximation assisted competitive swarm optimizer for large scale expensive optimization problems. *Memetic Computing*, 2016 (accepted)

Concluding Remarks



- Evolutionary optimization of complex systems is promising yet challenging
- Data-driven evolutionary optimization becomes increasing important
- Surrogate-assisted evolutionary optimization will not only be essential for evolutionary optimization of complex systems but also provides a platform for integrating evolution and learning techniques
 - Which to re-evaluate (sample)
 - ➤ Active learning
 - Small data
 - Semi-supervised learning
 - ➤ Transfer learning
 - big data
 - Deep learning