Simulated annealing/Metropolis and genetic optimization

Eugeniy E. Mikhailov

The College of William & Mary



Lecture 18

• We see that probing full space permitted by combinatorics is not practical even for a reasonably small size problem.

- We see that probing full space permitted by combinatorics is not practical even for a reasonably small size problem.
- However, nature seems to handle the problem of the energy minimization without any trouble.

- We see that probing full space permitted by combinatorics is not practical even for a reasonably small size problem.
- However, nature seems to handle the problem of the energy minimization without any trouble.
- For example, if you heat up a piece of metal and then slowly cool it i.e. anneal, then the system will reach the minimum energy state.

Metropolis and coworker suggested in 1953 the following heuristic algorithm based on this observation, and the Boltzmann energy distribution law.

- set the temperature to a high value, so kT is larger then typical energy (merit) function fluctuation.
 - This requires some experiments if you do not know this a priori
- assign a state \vec{x} and calculate the energy (*E*) at this point change, somehow, the old \vec{x} to generate a new one, \vec{x}_{new}

• \vec{x}_{new} should be somewhat close/related to the old optimal \vec{x}

- calculate the energy at the new point $E_{new} = E(\vec{x})$
- if $E_{new} < E$ then $x = x_{new}$ and $E = E_{new}$
 - i.e., we move to the new point of the lower energy
- otherwise, move to the new point with probability

 $p = exp(-(E_{new} - E)/kT)$

- this resembles the Boltzmann energy distribution probability
- Ø decrease the temperature a bit, i.e., keep annealing
- repeat from the step 3 for a given number of cycles
- **a** \vec{x} will hold the local optimal solution

Eugeniy Mikhailov (W&M)

(1)

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

There is a theorem which states:

The probability to find the best solution goes to 1, as we run algorithm for a longer time with a slow rate of cooling.

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

There is a theorem which states:

The probability to find the best solution goes to 1, as we run algorithm for a longer time with a slow rate of cooling.

Unfortunately, this theorem is of no use since it does not give a recipe of how long to run the algorithm. It is even suggested that it will need more cycles than the brute force combinatorial search.

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

There is a theorem which states:

The probability to find the best solution goes to 1, as we run algorithm for a longer time with a slow rate of cooling.

Unfortunately, this theorem is of no use since it does not give a recipe of how long to run the algorithm. It is even suggested that it will need more cycles than the brute force combinatorial search. However, in practice a very good solution can be found in quite short time with quite small number of cycles.

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

There is a theorem which states:

The probability to find the best solution goes to 1, as we run algorithm for a longer time with a slow rate of cooling.

Unfortunately, this theorem is of no use since it does not give a recipe of how long to run the algorithm. It is even suggested that it will need more cycles than the brute force combinatorial search.

However, in practice a very good solution can be found in quite short time with quite small number of cycles.

The Metropolis algorithm method is not limited to the discrete space problems, and can be used for the problems accepting real values of the \vec{x} components.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

In finite time (limited number of cycles), the algorithm is guaranteed to find only the local minimum.

There is a theorem which states:

The probability to find the best solution goes to 1, as we run algorithm for a longer time with a slow rate of cooling.

Unfortunately, this theorem is of no use since it does not give a recipe of how long to run the algorithm. It is even suggested that it will need more cycles than the brute force combinatorial search.

However, in practice a very good solution can be found in quite short time with quite small number of cycles.

The Metropolis algorithm method is not limited to the discrete space problems, and can be used for the problems accepting real values of the \vec{x} components.

• the main challenge is to find a good way to choose a new \vec{x} to probe.

Backpack problem with Metropolis algorithm

- The main challenge is to find a good routine to generate a new candidate for the \vec{x}_{new} . We do not want to randomly jump to an arbitrary position of problem space.
- Recall that x generally looks like [0, 1, 1, 0, 1, ..., 0, 1, 1] so lets just randomly toggle/mutate some choices/bits
 - note that a random mutation could lead to the overfilled backpack
- The rest is quite straight forward, as long as we remember, that we are looking for the maximum value in the backpack, while the Metropolis algorithm is designed for the merit function minimization. So, we choose our merit function to be the negative value of all items in the backpack. Also, we need to add a big penalty for the case of the overfilled backpack.
- See the realization of the algorithm in the backpack_metropolis.m file.
- it will find quite a good solution for the "30 items to choose" problem within a second instead of 13 hours of combinatorial search.

Eugeniy Mikhailov (W&M)

The idea is taken from nature, which usually able to find an optimal solution via natural selection.

This algorithm has many modification but the main idea is the following

- Generate a population (set of $\{\vec{x}_i\}$)
 - it is up to you and your resources to decide how large this set should be
- Find the fitness (merit) function for each member of the population
- Remove from the pool all but the most fitted
 - how many should stay is up to heuristic tweaks
- from the most fitted (parents) breed a new population (children) to the size of the original population
- In the second second
- Ohose the fittest member of your population to be the solution

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

As usual, the most important question is generation of a new \vec{x} from the older ones.

Let's use recipe provided by nature. We will refer to \vec{x} as a chromosome or genome.

- chose two parents randomly
- Crossover/recombine parents chromosomes i.e. take randomly gens (\vec{x} components) from either parent and assign to a new child chromosome
- mutate (change) randomly some gens

Some algorithm modifications allow parents to be in the new cycle of selection, some eliminate them (to hope away from local minima).

< ロト < 同ト < ヨト < ヨト

- To find a good solution, you need large populations, since this lets you to explore a larger parameter space. Think microbes vs humans. But this in turn leads to longer computational time for every selection cycle.
- Algorithm is not guaranteed to find the global optimum in finite time.
- Nice feature of the genetic algorithm is that it suits the parallel computation paradigm: you can evaluate the fitness of each child on a different CPU and then compare their fitness.