Al-Augmented Algorithms – How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love Choice

Lars Kotthoff

University of Wyoming larsko@uwyo.edu

Glasgow, 23 July 2018

#### Outline

- $\triangleright$  Big Picture
- $\triangleright$  Motivation
- $\,\triangleright\,$  Algorithm Selection and Portfolios
- Algorithm Configuration
- $\triangleright$  Outlook

# **Big Picture**

- advance the state of the art through meta-algorithmic techniques
- rather than inventing new things, use existing things more intelligently – automatically
- $\triangleright$  invent new things through combinations of existing things

# **Big Picture**

- advance the state of the art through meta-algorithmic techniques
- rather than inventing new things, use existing things more intelligently – automatically
- $\triangleright$  invent new things through combinations of existing things



WE'VE DECIDED TO DROP THE CS DEPARTMENT FROM OUR WEEKLY DINNER PARTY HOSTING ROTATION.

# Motivation – What Difference Does It Make?

## **Prominent Application**



Fréchette, Alexandre, Neil Newman, Kevin Leyton-Brown. "Solving the Station Packing Problem." In Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI), 2016.

# Performance Differences



Hurley, Barry, Lars Kotthoff, Yuri Malitsky, and Barry O'Sullivan. "Proteus: A Hierarchical Portfolio of Solvers and Transformations." In CPAIOR, 2014.

#### Leveraging the Differences



Xu, Lin, Frank Hutter, Holger H. Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. "SATzilla: Portfolio-Based Algorithm Selection for SAT." J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR) 32 (2008): 565–606.

#### Performance Improvements



Hutter, Frank, Domagoj Babic, Holger H. Hoos, and Alan J. Hu. "Boosting Verification by Automatic Tuning of Decision Procedures." In FMCAD '07: Proceedings of the Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design, 27–34. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2007.

# Common Theme

Performance models of black-box processes

- $\triangleright$  also called surrogate models
- replace expensive underlying process with cheap approximate model
- build approximate model based on real evaluations using machine learning techniques
- no knowledge of what the underlying process does required (but can be helpful)
- allow better understanding of the underlying process through interrogation of the model

# **Algorithm Selection**

#### Algorithm Selection

Given a problem, choose the best algorithm to solve it.

Rice, John R. "The Algorithm Selection Problem." Advances in Computers 15 (1976): 65–118.

# Algorithm Selection



# Algorithm Portfolios

- instead of a single algorithm, use several complementary algorithms
- idea from Economics minimise risk by spreading it out across several securities
- same for computational problems minimise risk of algorithm performing poorly
- $\triangleright$  in practice often constructed from competition winners

Huberman, Bernardo A., Rajan M. Lukose, and Tad Hogg. "An Economics Approach to Hard Computational Problems." Science 275, no. 5296 (1997): 51–54. doi:10.1126/science.275.5296.51.

# Algorithms

"algorithm" used in a very loose sense

- $\triangleright$  algorithms
- $\triangleright$  heuristics
- $\triangleright$  machine learning models
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  consistency levels
- ▷ ...

Why not simply run all algorithms in parallel?

- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  not enough resources may be available/waste of resources
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  algorithms may be parallelized themselves
- $\triangleright$  memory contention

### Building an Algorithm Selection System

- ▷ most approaches rely on machine learning
- ▷ train with representative data, i.e. performance of all algorithms in portfolio on a number of instances
- ▷ evaluate performance on separate set of instances
- ▷ potentially large amount of prep work

# Key Components of an Algorithm Selection System

- $\triangleright$  feature extraction
- ▷ performance model
- $\triangleright$  prediction-based selector/scheduler
- optional:
  - $\triangleright$  presolver
  - secondary/hierarchical models and predictors (e.g. for feature extraction time)

# Types of Performance Models



#### Benchmark Library – ASlib

- $\triangleright$  currently 29 data sets/scenarios with more in preparation
- ▷ SAT, CSP, QBF, ASP, MAXSAT, OR, machine learning...
- ▷ includes data used frequently in the literature that you may want to evaluate your approach on
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  performance of common approaches that you can compare to
- ▷ http://aslib.net

Bischl, Bernd, Pascal Kerschke, Lars Kotthoff, Marius Lindauer, Yuri Malitsky, Alexandre Fréchette, Holger H. Hoos, et al. "ASlib: A Benchmark Library for Algorithm Selection." Artificial Intelligence Journal (AIJ), no. 237 (2016): 41–58.

# (Much) More Information

Comments? Suggestions? Corrections'

#### Algorithm Selection literature summary Last update 16 February 2018

click headings to sort click citations to expand

citation	domain	features	practicit schat	and it have	medici when	nortfolio	
					pression matter	p	,
Largley 1983b, Largley 1983a	search	past performance	algorithm	hand-crafted and learned rules	office and online	dynamic	1963
Carbonell et al. 1991	planning	search statistics	control rules	construction	online	dynamic	1991
Gratch and DeJong 1992	planning	problem domain features, search statistics	control rules	probabilistic rule construction	online	dynamic	1992
Smith and Setil 1992	software design	features of abstract representation	algorithms and data structures	simulated annealing	offine	static	1992
Aha 1992	machine learning	instance features	algorithm	learned rules	office	atatic	1992
Brodiey 1993	machine learning	instance and algorithm features	algorithm	hand-crafted rules	office	statio	1993
Kamel et al. 1923	differential equations	past performance, instance feetures	algorithm	hand-crafted rules	offine	static	1993
Minton 1993b, Minton 1993a, Minton 1995	constraints	runtime performance	algorithm	hand-crafted and learned rules	office	dynamic	1993
Cahil 1994	software design	instance features	algorithms and data structures	frame-based knowledge base	office	static	1994
Tsang et al. 1995	constraints	instance features				statio	1995
Brewer 1995	software design	runtime performance	algorithms, data structures and their parameters	statistical model	office	static	1995
Weerswarana et al. 1996, Joshi et al. 1996	differential equations	instance features	ruttime performance	Bayesian belief propagation, neurol nets	offine	atatic	1996
Borrett et al. 1995	constraints	search statistics	switch algorithm?	hand-crafted rules	online	static, static order	1996
Allen and Minton 1998	SAT, constraints	probing	runtime performance	hand-crafted rules	online	static	1996
Sakkout et al. 1996	constraints	search statistics	switch algorithm?	hand-crafted rules	online	static	1996
Huberman et al. 1997	graph colouring	past performance	resource allocation	statistical model	office	static	1997
Gomes and Selman 1997b, Gomes and Selman 1997a	constraints	problem size and past performance	algorithm	statistical model	offine	statio	1997
Cook and Vernell 1997	perellel seerch	probing	set of search strategies	decision trees, Bayesian classifier, nearest neighbour, neural net	online	statio	1997
Fink 1997, Fink 1998	planning	past performance	resource allocation	statistical model, regression	office	static	1997
Lobjois and Lemeltre 1998	branch and bound	probing	runtime performance	hand-crafted rules	online	static	1998
Caseau et al. 1999	vehicle routing problem	runtime performance	algorithm	genetic algorithms	offine	static	1999
Howe et al. 1999	planning	instance features	resource allocation	linear regression	office	static	1990
Terashima-Marin et al. 1999	scheduling	instance and search features	algorithm	genetic algorithms	office	dynamic	1999
Wison et al. 2000	software design	instance features	data structures	nearest neighbour	office	atatic	2000
Beck and Fox 2000	job shop scheduling	instance feature changes during search	algorithm scheduling policy	hand-crafted rules	online	static	2000
Brazoli and Soares 2000	classification	past performance	ranking	distribution model	office	static	2000
Lagoudakis and Littman 2000	order selection, sorting	instance features	remaining cost for each sub- problem	NDP	online	etatic	2000
Silito 2000	constraints	probing	cost of solving problem	statistical model	offine	statio	2000
Pfshringer et al. 2000	classification	instance features, probing	algorithm	9 different classifiers	offine	atatic	2000
Fukunega 2000	TSP	past performence	resource allocation	performance simulation for different allocations	offine	static	2000
Soares and Brazdil 2000	machine learning	instance features	ranking	nearest neighbour	offine	static	2000
Gomes and Selman 2001	constraints, mixed integer programming	past performance	algorithm	statistical model	offine	dynamic	2001
Epstein and Freuder 2001, Epstein et al. 2002, Epstein et al. 2006, Epstein and Petrovic 2011	constraints	variable characteristics	algorithm	weights, hand-crafted rules	offline and online	dynamic	2001
Lagoudakis and Littman 2001	DPLL branching rules	instance features	remaining cost for each sub- problem	NDP	online	statio	2001
Narayak 2001	optimisation	search statistics	expected utility of algorithm	reinforcement learning	offline and online	statio	2001
Horvitz et al. 2001	constraints	instance and instance generator features, search statistics	runtime performance, restart peramoters	Bayesian model	offline and online	static	2001
Republicant Teacor 2001	constraints.	instance feet one search	and resident second relate to entit	based scaling a day	affine .		3001

http://larskotthoff.github.io/assurvey/

Kotthoff, Lars. "Algorithm Selection for Combinatorial Search Problems: A Survey." Al Magazine 35, no. 3 (2014): 48–60.

# Algorithm Configuration

# Algorithm Configuration

Given a (set of) problem(s), find the best parameter configuration.

- Dash anything you can change that makes sense to change
- ▷ e.g. search heuristic, variable ordering, type of global constraint decomposition
- ▷ not random seed, whether to enable debugging, etc.
- $\triangleright$  some will affect performance, others will have no effect at all

# Automated Algorithm Configuration

- Dash no background knowledge on parameters or algorithm
- $\triangleright$  as little manual intervention as possible
  - $\triangleright$  failures are handled appropriately
  - $\triangleright$  resources are not wasted
  - $\triangleright$  can run unattended on large-scale compute infrastructure

# Algorithm Configuration



Frank Hutter and Marius Lindauer, "Algorithm Configuration: A Hands on Tutorial", AAAI 2016

- $\triangleright$  evaluate algorithm as black box function
- observe effect of parameters without knowing the inner workings
- $\triangleright$  decide where to evaluate next
- balance diversification/exploration and intensification/exploitation

- ▷ most approaches incomplete
- cannot prove optimality, not guaranteed to find optimal solution (with finite time)
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  performance highly dependent on configuration space
- $\rightarrow$  How do we know when to stop?

### Time Budget

How much time/how many function evaluations?

- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  too much  $\rightarrow$  wasted resources
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  too little  $\,\rightarrow\,$  suboptimal result
- $\triangleright$  use statistical tests
- $\triangleright$  evaluate on parts of the instance set
- $\triangleright$  for runtime: adaptive capping

### Grid and Random Search

▷ evaluate certain points in parameter space



Bergstra, James, and Yoshua Bengio. "Random Search for Hyper-Parameter Optimization." J. Mach. Learn. Res. 13, no. 1 (February 2012): 281–305.

#### Model-Based Search

- ▷ evaluate small number of configurations
- build model of parameter-performance surface based on the results
- $\,\vartriangleright\,$  use model to predict where to evaluate next
- ▷ repeat
- ▷ allows targeted exploration of new configurations
- Dash can take instance features into account like algorithm selection

Hutter, Frank, Holger H. Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. "Sequential Model-Based Optimization for General Algorithm Configuration." In LION 5, 507–23, 2011.









34













40

Benchmark Library – AClib

- ▷ ASP, MIP, planning, machine learning, ...
- 4 algorithm configuration tools from the literature already integrated
- https://bitbucket.org/mlindauer/aclib2

Hutter, Frank, Manuel López-Ibáñez, Chris Fawcett, Marius Lindauer, Holger H. Hoos, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Thomas Stützle. "AClib: A Benchmark Library for Algorithm Configuration." In Learning and Intelligent Optimization, 36–40. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014.

# Outlook

Quo Vadis, Software Engineering?



Quo Vadis, Software Engineering?



Hoos, Holger H. "Programming by Optimization." Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery (CACM) 55, no. 2 (February 2012): 70–80. https://doi.org/10.1145/2076450.2076469.

# Meta-Algorithmics in the Physical Realm – Al and Lasers





#### Tools and Resources

LLAMA https://bitbucket.org/lkotthoff/llama
SATzilla http://www.cs.ubc.ca/labs/beta/Projects/SATzilla/
iRace http://iridia.ulb.ac.be/irace/
mlrMBO https://github.com/mlr-org/mlrMBO
SMAC http://www.cs.ubc.ca/labs/beta/Projects/SMAC/
Spearmint https://github.com/HIPS/Spearmint
TPE https://jaberg.github.io/hyperopt/

autofolio https://bitbucket.org/mlindauer/autofolio/ Auto-WEKA http://www.cs.ubc.ca/labs/beta/Projects/autoweka/ Auto-sklearn https://github.com/automl/auto-sklearn

# Summary

# Algorithm Selection choose the best *algorithm* for solving a problem

Algorithm Configuration choose the best *parameter configuration* for solving a problem with an algorithm

- $\triangleright$  mature research areas
- ▷ can combine configuration and selection
- $\triangleright$  effective tools are available
- COnfiguration and SElection of ALgorithms group COSEAL http://www.coseal.net

Don't set parameters prematurely, embrace choice!

#### I'm hiring!



#### Several funded graduate positions available.

