

Dealing with Categorical and Integer-valued Variables in Bayesian Optimization with Gaussian Processes

Eduardo C. Garrido-Merchán
eduardo.garrido@uam.es
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente 11,
Madrid, 28049, Spain

Daniel Hernández-Lobato
daniel.hernandez@uam.es
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
Calle Francisco Tomás y Valiente 11,
Madrid, 28049, Spain

Abstract

Bayesian Optimization (BO) is useful for optimizing functions that are expensive to evaluate, lack an analytical expression and whose evaluations can be contaminated by noise. These methods rely on a probabilistic model of the objective function, typically a Gaussian process (GP), upon which an acquisition function is built. The acquisition function guides the optimization process and measures the expected utility of performing an evaluation of the objective at a new point. GPs assume continuous input variables. When this is not the case, for example when some of the input variables take categorical or integer values, one has to introduce extra approximations. Consider a suggested input location taking values in the real line. Before doing the evaluation of the objective, a common approach is to use a one hot encoding approximation for categorical variables, or to round to the closest integer, in the case of integer-valued variables. We show that this can lead to optimization problems and describe a more principled approach to account for input variables that are categorical or integer-valued. We illustrate in both synthetic and a real experiments the utility of our approach, which significantly improves the results of standard BO methods using Gaussian processes on problems with categorical or integer-valued variables.

1 Introduction

Many problems involve the optimization of a function with no analytical form. An example is tuning the parameters of the control system of a robot to maximize locomotion speed (Lizotte et al., 2007). There is no closed-form expression to describe the function that, given specific values for these parameters, returns an estimate of the corresponding speed. A practical experiment with the robot or a computer simulation will have to be carried out for this purpose. Moreover, the time required for such an evaluation can be high, which means that in practice one can only perform a few evaluations of the objective. Importantly, these evaluations may be noisy and hence different for the same input parameters. The noise can simply be related to the environmental conditions in which the robot’s experiment is performed. When a function has the characteristics described it is called a black-box function. Examples of problems involving the optimization of black-box functions include automatic tuning machine learning hyper-parameters (Snoek et al., 2012), finding optimal control parameters in robotics (Lizotte et al., 2007), optimal weather sensor placement (Garnett et al., 2010) or the optimization search strategies (Cornejo-Bueno et al., 2018).

Bayesian Optimization (BO) methods are popular for optimizing black-box functions with the characteristics described (Moćkus, 1975). More formally, BO methods optimize a real-valued function $f(\mathbf{x})$ over some bounded domain \mathcal{X} (Shahriari et al., 2016). The objective function is assumed to lack an analytical expression (which prevents any gradient computation), to be very expensive to evaluate, and the evaluations are assumed to be noisy (*i.e.*, rather than observing $f(\mathbf{x})$ we observe $y = f(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon$, with ϵ some additive noise). The goal of BO methods is to reduce the number of objective evaluations that need to be performed to solve the optimization problem. For this, they iteratively suggest, in a careful and intelligent way, an input location in which the objective that is being optimized should be evaluated each time. For this, at each iteration $N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ of the optimization process, BO methods fit a probabilistic model, typically a Gaussian process (GP) (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006), to the collected observations of the objective $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^{N-1}$. The uncertainty about the potential values of the objective are provided by the predictive distribution of the GP. This uncertainty is used to generate an acquisition function $\alpha(\cdot)$, whose value at each input location indicates the expected utility of evaluating $f(\cdot)$ there. The next point \mathbf{x}_N at which to evaluate $f(\cdot)$ is the one that maximizes $\alpha(\cdot)$. After collecting this observation, the process is repeated. When enough data has been collected, the GP predictive mean value for $f(\cdot)$ can be optimized to find the solution of the problem.

The key to BO success is that evaluating the acquisition function $\alpha(\cdot)$ is very cheap compared to the evaluation of the objective $f(\cdot)$. This is so because the acquisition function only depends on the GP predictive distribution for $f(\cdot)$ at a candidate point \mathbf{x} . Thus, $\alpha(\cdot)$ can be maximized with very little cost. BO methods hence spend a small amount of time thinking very carefully where to evaluate next the objective function with the aim of finding its optimum with the smallest number of evaluations. This is a useful strategy when the objective function is very expensive to evaluate and it can save a lot of computational time.

A problem, however, of GPs is that these probabilistic models assume that the input variables take real-values. If this is not the case and, for example, some of the variables can take categorical or integer values, extra approximations in the BO method have to be introduced to address this issue. In the case of integer-valued variables, the approximations often involve simply doing some rounding to the closest integer after optimizing the acquisition function. In the case of a categorical variable, one simply uses a one-hot encoding. This involves adding as many extra input variables as different categories this variable can take. Then, after optimizing the acquisition function, the extra variable that is larger is set equal to one and all the others equal to zero. This is the approach followed, for example, in the popular software for BO Spearmint.

We show here that the approaches described for handling categorical and integer-valued variables may make the BO method fail. These problems can be overcome by doing the rounding (to the closest integer or the corresponding one-hot encoding) inside the wrapper that evaluates the objective. Nevertheless, this will make the objective constant in some regions of the input space, *i.e.*, those rounded to the same integer value, in the case of integer-valued variables, or those that lead to the same one-hot encoding, in the case of categorical variables. This constant behavior of the objective will be ignored by the GP model. To overcome this, we introduce a transformation of the input variables that will lead to an alternative covariance function for the GP model. With this covariance function, the GP will correctly describe the objective as constant in particular regions of the input space, leading to better modeling results and, in consequence, to better optimization results.

Practical examples of optimization problems involving a mix between real, categorical and

integer-valued variables include finding the optimal hyper-parameters of a machine learning system (Snoek et al., 2012). Specifically, in a deep neural network, we may want to adjust the learning rate, the number of layers and the activation function. These two last variables can only take integer and categorical values, respectively, while the learning rate can take real values. Similarly, in a gradient boosting ensemble of decision trees (Friedman, 2001) we may try to adjust the learning rate and the maximum depth of the trees, which can only take integer values. Our experiments show that the proposed approach for dealing with a mix of real, categorical, and integer-valued variables in BO methods lead to improved results over standard techniques and other alternatives from the literature.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives a short introduction to BO and Gaussian processes. Section 3 describes the proposed approach to deal with categorical and integer-valued variables in BO methods using GPs. Section 4 reviews related methods from the literature. Section 5 describes synthetic and real-world experiments that show that the proposed approach has advantages over standard methods for BO and related techniques. Finally, Section 6 gives the conclusions of this work.

2 Background on Gaussian Processes and Bayesian Optimization

BO methods rely on a probabilistic model for the black-box function being optimized. This model must generate a predictive distribution for the potential values of the objective at each point of the input space. This predictive distribution is used to guide the search, by focusing only on regions of the input space that are expected to deliver the most information about the solution of the optimization problem. Most commonly used models are Gaussian processes (GPs) (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006), Random Forests (Thornton et al., 2013), T-Student processes (Shah et al., 2014) or Deep Neural Networks (Snoek et al., 2015). In this work, we will focus on the use of GP, but the same ideas can be implemented in a T-Student process.

A GP is defined as a prior distribution over functions. When using a GP as the underlying model, the assumption made is that the black-box function $f(\cdot)$ to be optimized has been generated from such a prior distribution, which is characterized by a zero mean and a covariance function $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$. That is $f(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k(\cdot, \cdot))$. The particular characteristics of $f(\cdot)$, e.g., smoothness, additive noise, amplitude, etc., are specified by the covariance function $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ which computes the covariance between $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $f(\mathbf{x}')$. A typical covariance function employed in the context of BO is the Matérn function, in which the ν parameter is set equal to $3/2$ (Snoek et al., 2012). This covariance function is:

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sigma^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}r}{\ell}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}r}{\ell}\right), \quad (1)$$

where r is the Euclidean distance between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' . Namely, $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|$. Note that $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ only depends on r . This particular covariance function and others that share this property are known as *radial basis functions* (RBFs). ℓ is simply a hyper-parameter known as length-scale, which controls the smoothness of the GP. Most of the times a different length scale ℓ_j is used for each dimension j . σ^2 is the amplitude parameter, which controls the range of variability of the GP samples. Finally, ν is a hyper-parameter related to the number of times that the GP samples can be differentiated. Another popular covariance function is the squared exponential.

In this case $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is given by:

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \sigma^2 \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2\ell^2}\right). \quad (2)$$

Assume that we have already evaluated the objective at N input locations. Let the corresponding data be summarized as $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where $y_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i) + \epsilon_i$, with ϵ_i some additive Gaussian noise with variance σ_0^2 . A GP provides a predictive distribution for the potential values of $f(\cdot)$ at different regions of the input space. This distribution is Gaussian and is characterized by a mean $\mu(\mathbf{x})$ and a variance $\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})$. Namely, $p(f(\mathbf{x}^*)|\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(f(\mathbf{x}^*)|m(\mathbf{x}^*), \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}^*))$, where the mean and variance are respectively given by:

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{k}_*^T (\mathbf{K} + \sigma_0^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) = k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{k}_*^T (\mathbf{K} + \sigma_0^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{k}_*. \quad (4)$$

In the previous expression $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{t-1})^N$ is a vector with the objective evaluations observed so far; \mathbf{k}_* is a vector with the prior covariances between $f(\mathbf{x})$ and each y_i ; σ_0^2 is the variance of the additive Gaussian noise; \mathbf{K} is a matrix with the prior covariances among each $f(\mathbf{x}_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$; and $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$ is the prior variance at the candidate location \mathbf{x} . All these quantities are simply obtained by evaluating the covariance function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ on the corresponding input values. See (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006) for further details.

BO methods use the previous predictive distribution to determine at which point \mathbf{x}_{N+1} the objective function has to be evaluated. Once this new observation has been collected, the GP model is updated with the new data and the process repeats. After collecting enough data like this, the GP posterior mean given by (3) can be optimized to provide an estimate of the solution of the optimization problem. Notwithstanding, a GP has some hyper-parameters that need to be adjusted during the fitting process. These include the variance of the additive Gaussian noise σ_0^2 , but also any potential hyper-parameter of the covariance function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$. These can be, *e.g.*, the amplitude parameter and the length-scales (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). Instead of finding point estimates for these hyper-parameters, an approach that has shown good empirical results is to compute an approximate posterior distribution for them using slice sampling (Snoek et al., 2012). The previous Gaussian predictive distribution described in (3) and (4) is then simply averaged over the hyper-parameter samples to obtain the final predictive distribution of the probabilistic model.

The key for BO success is found in the acquisition function $\alpha(\cdot)$. This function uses the predictive distribution given by the GP to compute the expected utility of performing an evaluation of the objective at each input location. The next point at which the objective has to be evaluated is simply $\mathbf{x}_{N+1} = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \alpha(\mathbf{x})$. Because this function only depends on the predictive distribution given by the GP and not on the actual objective $f(\cdot)$, the maximization of $\alpha(\cdot)$ is very cheap. A popular acquisition function is expected improvement (EI) (Jones et al., 1998). EI is given by the expected value of the utility function $u(y) = \max(0, \nu - y)$ under the GP predictive distribution for y , where $\nu = \min(\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N)$ is the best value observed so far, assuming minimization. Therefore, EI measures on average how much we will improve on the current best found solution by performing an evaluation at each candidate point. The EI acquisition function is given by the following expression:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{x})(\gamma(\mathbf{x})\Phi(\gamma(\mathbf{x})) + \phi(\gamma(\mathbf{x}))), \quad (5)$$

where $\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = (\nu - \mu(\mathbf{x}))/\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\phi(\cdot)$ are respectively the c.d.f. and p.d.f. of a standard Gaussian distribution.

Another popular acquisition function for BO is Predictive Entropy Search (PES) (Hernández-Lobato et al., 2014). PES is an information-theoretic method that chooses the next input location \mathbf{x}_{N+1} at which the objective function has to be evaluated as the one that maximizes the information about the global maximum \mathbf{x}^* of the optimization problem. The information about this minimum is given in terms of the differential entropy of the random variable \mathbf{x}^* . This random variable is characterized by the corresponding posterior distribution $p(\mathbf{x}^*|\mathcal{D}_N)$. PES simply chooses \mathbf{x}_{N+1} as the point that maximizes the expected reduction in the differential entropy of \mathbf{x}^* . The PES acquisition function is:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = H[p(\mathbf{x}^*|\mathcal{D}_N)] - \mathbb{E}_y[H[p(\mathbf{x}^*|\mathcal{D}_N \cup (\mathbf{x}, y))]], \quad (6)$$

where the expectation w.r.t. y is given by the predictive distribution of the GP at \mathbf{x} .

A problem is, however, that evaluating (6) in closed form is intractable. This expression has to be approximated in practice. Hernández-Lobato et al. (2014) use the fact that the previous expression is simply the mutual information between \mathbf{x}^* and y , $I(\mathbf{x}^*; y)$, which is symmetric. Therefore one can swap the roles of y and \mathbf{x}^* in (6). This greatly simplifies the acquisition function and an efficient approximation based on the expectation propagation algorithm is possible. PES has been compared to other acquisition function showing improved optimization results. In particular, it has a better trade-off between exploration and exploitation than EI.

3 Dealing with Categorical and Integer-valued Variables

In the framework described, the objective function $f(\cdot)$ is assumed to have input variables taking values on the real line. This is so, because in a GP the variables introduced in the covariance function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ are assumed to be real. A problem may arise when some of the input variables can only take values in a closed subset of a discrete set, such as the integers, or when some the input variables are categorical. In this second case a typical approach is to use a one-hot encoding of categorical variables. That is, the number of input dimensions is extended by adding extra variables, one per potential category. The only valid configurations are those in which one of the extra variables takes value one (*i.e.*, the extra variable corresponding to the active category), and all other extra variables take value zero. For example, consider a categorical input dimension x_j taking values in the set $\mathbb{C} = \{red, green, blue\}$. We will replace dimension j in \mathbf{x} with three extra dimensional variables taking values $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1)$, for each value in \mathbb{C} , respectively.

When not all input variables take real values, a standard GP will ignore that only some input variables configurations are valid and will place some probability mass on points at which $f(\cdot)$ cannot be evaluated. These incorrect modelling assumptions about $f(\cdot)$ may have a negative impact on the optimization process. Furthermore, the optimization of $\alpha(\cdot)$ will give candidate points \mathbf{x}_{N+1} in which integer-valued or categorical variables will be assigned invalid values. In practice, some mechanism must be implemented to transform real values into integer or categorical values before the evaluation can take place. Importantly, if this is not done with care, some problems may appear.

3.1 Naive and Basic Approaches

As described before, if the problem of interest considers some categorical or integer-valued variables, $f(\cdot)$ cannot be evaluated at all potential input locations. It can only be evaluated at those input locations that are compatible with the categorical or integer-valued variables. A naive approach to account for this is to (i) optimize $\alpha(\cdot)$ assuming all variables take values in the real line, and (ii) replace all the values for the integer-valued variables by the closest integer, and replace all categorical variables with the corresponding one-hot encoding in which only one of the extra input variables takes value one and all the others take value zero. In this second case, the active variable is simply chosen as the one with the highest value among the extra input variables. More precisely, let \mathbb{Q}_k be the set of extra input dimensions of \mathbf{x} corresponding to the categorical input variable k and let $j \in \mathbb{Q}_k$. Then, we simply set $x_j = 1$ if $x_j > x_i \forall i \in \mathbb{Q}_k$ and $i \neq j$. Otherwise, $x_j = 0$. This is the approach followed by the popular software for BO Spearmint (<https://github.com/HIPS/Spearmint>).

The first row of Figure 1 shows, for an integer-valued input variable, that the naive approach just described can lead to a mismatch between the points in which the acquisition takes high values, and where the actual evaluation is performed. Importantly, this can produce situations in which the BO method always evaluates the objective at a point where it has already been evaluated. This may happen simply because the next and following evaluations are performed at different input locations from the one maximizing the acquisition function. More precisely, since the evaluation is performed at a different point, it may not reduce at all the uncertainty about the potential values of the objective at the point maximizing the acquisition function. Of course, in the case of categorical input variables this mismatch between the maximizer of the acquisition function and the actual point at which the objective is evaluated will also be a problem. For this reason, we discourage the use of this approach.

The previous problem can be easily solved. In the case of integer-valued variables, one can simply do the rounding to the closest integer value inside the wrapper that evaluates the objective. In the case of categorical variables, a similar approach can be followed in inside the wrapper using one-hot encoding. Namely, (i) look at which extra input variable has the largest value, (ii) set that input variable equal to one, and (iii) set all other extra input variables equal to zero. This basic approach is shown in the second row of Figure 1 for the integer-valued case. Here, the points at which the acquisition takes high values and the points at which the objective is evaluated coincide. Thus, the BO method will tend to always evaluate at different input locations, as expected. This will avoid the problem described before, in which the BO method may get stuck. The problem is, however, that the actual objective is constant in the intervals that are rounded to the same integer value. This constant behavior is ignored by the GP, and is expected to lead to sub-optimal optimization results. The same behavior is expected in the case of categorical input variables.

3.2 Proposed Approach

We propose a method to alleviate the problems of the basic approach described in Section 3. For this, we consider that the objective should be constant in those regions of the input space that lead to the same input variable configuration on which the actual objective has to be evaluated. This property can be easily introduced into the GP by modifying $k(\cdot, \cdot)$. Covariance functions are often stationary and only depend on the distance between the input points (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). If the distance between two points is zero, the values




Figure 1: Different methods for dealing with integer-valued variables. At the top of each image, we show a GP fit to the data (posterior mean and 1-std confidence interval, in purple) that models a 1-dimensional objective taking values in the set $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (dashed line). To display the objective we have rounded the real values at which to do the evaluation to the closest integer. Below the GP fit, it is shown the acquisition function whose maximum is the recommendation for the next new evaluation. Each column shows similar figures before and after evaluating a new point, respectively. The proposed approach leads to no uncertainty about the objective after two evaluations. Best seen in color.

of the function at both points will be the same (the correlation is equal to one). Based on this fact, we suggest to transform the input points to $k(\cdot, \cdot)$, obtaining an alternative covariance function $k'(\cdot, \cdot)$:

$$k'(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = k(T(\mathbf{x}_i), T(\mathbf{x}_j)), \quad (7)$$

where $T(\mathbf{x})$ is a transformation in which all non real input variables of $f(\cdot)$ in \mathbf{x} are modified as follows:

- The input variables corresponding to an integer-valued input variable are rounded to the closest integer value.
- All extra input variables corresponding to the same categorical input variable are assigned zero value unless they take the largest value among the corresponding group of extra variables. If they take the largest value, they are assigned value one.

Essentially $T(\cdot)$ does the same transformation on \mathbf{x} as the one described in Section 3.1 for the basic approach inside the wrapper that evaluates the objective. Importantly, however, this transformation also takes place in the covariance function of the GPs, which will allow for a better modeling of the objective.

The beneficial properties of $k'(\cdot, \cdot)$ when used for BO are illustrated in the third row of Figure 1 for the case of an integer-valued input variable. We can see that the GP model correctly identifies that the objective function is constant inside intervals of real values that

are rounded to the same integer. The uncertainty is also the same in those intervals, and this is reflected in the acquisition function. Furthermore, after performing a single measurement in each interval, the uncertainty about $f(\cdot)$ goes to zero. This better modelling of the objective is expected to be reflected in a better performance of the optimization process. The same behavior is expected in the case of categorical variables.

In the case of integer-valued variables, the transformation $T(\mathbf{x})$ will round all integer-valued variables values in \mathbb{R} to the closest integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. The set of integer values, \mathbb{Z} , has a notion of order. That is, for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can define operators of order that involve two values: $<$, $>$, \leq and \geq , such that $z_i < z_j$, $z_j > z_i$, $z_i \leq z_j$ and $z_j \geq z_i$, having that $z_i, z_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. This order will be preserved by the resulting transformation. More precisely, assume an integer input variable and that $T(\mathbf{x})$ and $T(\mathbf{x}')$ only differ in the value of such integer input variable. The prior covariance between $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $f(\mathbf{x}')$ under $k(T(\mathbf{x}), T(\mathbf{x}'))$ will be higher the closer the corresponding integer values of $T(\mathbf{x})$ and $T(\mathbf{x}')$ are one from another. Therefore, the GP will be able to exploit the smoothness in the objective $f(\cdot)$ when solving the optimization problem.

In the case of categorical variables (*e.g.*, variables that can take values such as *red*, *green*, *blue*) there is no notion of order. That is, the operators $<$, $>$, \geq and \leq have no meaning nor purpose. One can not compare two different values c_1, c_2 of any categorical-valued set \mathbb{C} according to these operators. However, what does exist in a categorical set is a notion of equality or difference, given by the operators $=$, \neq . The proposed transformation is able to preserve this notion of no order and notion of equal or different. More precisely, assume a single categorical variable and that $T(\mathbf{x})$ and $T(\mathbf{x}')$ only differ in the values of the corresponding extra variables associated to that categorical variable. The prior covariance between $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $f(\mathbf{x}')$ under $k(T(\mathbf{x}), T(\mathbf{x}'))$ will be the same as long as $T(\mathbf{x})$ and $T(\mathbf{x}')$ encode a different value for the categorical variable. Of course if $T(\mathbf{x})$ and $T(\mathbf{x}')$ encode the same value for the categorical variable, the covariance will be maximum.

Figure 2 illustrates the described modelling properties in the case of a real and an integer-valued variable in the transformation suggested in (7). This figure shows the mean and standard deviation of the posterior distribution of a GP given some observations. The results obtained with a standard GP that does not use the proposed transformation are also displayed. In this case, the data has been sampled from a GP using the covariance function in (7) where $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the squared exponential covariance function (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). One dimension takes continuous values and the other dimension takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Note that the posterior distribution captures the constant behavior of the function in any interval of values that are rounded to the same integer, only for the integer dimension (top). A standard GP (corresponding to the basic approach in Section 3) cannot capture this shape (bottom).

Figure 3 illustrates the proposed transformation for the categorical case and a single variable that can only take two values, *e.g.*, *True* and *False*. Using one-hot encoding, these two values will be represented as $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$, respectively. In the naive approach described before, this categorical variable will be replaced by two real variables taking values in the range $[0, 1]$. Notwithstanding, any combination of values in which the first component is larger than the second will lead to the configuration value $(1, 0)$. Conversely, any combination of values in which the second component is larger will lead to the configuration value $(0, 1)$. Therefore, the corresponding objective will be constant in those regions of the input space that lead to the same configuration. This behavior is illustrated by Figure 3 top, in which the posterior distribution of the GP is plotted given two observations. In this case we use the proposed transformation of the covariance function. Note that the uncertainty goes to zero after just having a single observation corresponding to the *True* value and a single observation

corresponding to the *False* value. This makes sense, because the objective is constant in all those regions of the input space that lead to the same configuration of the extra variables introduced in the input space. In Figure 3 (bottom) we show that a standard GP cannot model this behavior, and the posterior distribution of the mean is not constant in those regions of the input space that lead to the same configuration for the categorical variable. Furthermore, the posterior standard deviation is significantly different from zero, unlike in the proposed approach. Summing up, Figure 3 shows that by using the proposed covariance function, we are better modeling the objective function, which in the end will be translated in better optimization results.




Figure 2: (top) Posterior mean and standard deviation of a GP model over a 2-dimensional space in which the first dimension can only take 5 different integer values and when the covariance function in (7) is used. Note that the second dimension can take any real value. (bottom) Same results for a GP model using a covariance function without the proposed transformation. Best seen in color.

4 Related Work

We describe here two approaches that can be used as an alternative to BO methods using GPs when categorical and/or integer-valued variables are present in a black-box optimization problem. These are Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration




Figure 3: (top) Posterior mean and standard deviation of a GP model over a 1-dimensional categorical variable taking only two different values. The covariance function in (7) is used in the GP model in this case. Note that in the uncertainty goes to zero after these two single observations. Same results using a covariance function without the proposed transformation. In this case the uncertainty about the potential values of the function is very big. Best seen in color.

(SMAC) (Hutter et al., 2011) and the Tree-structured Parzen Estimator Approach (TPE) (Bergstra et al., 2011). Both can naturally handle integer and categorical-valued variables. SMAC is present in the popular machine learning tool AutoWeka (Thornton et al., 2013). TPE is used in the HyperOpt tool (Bergstra et al., 2013).

SMAC uses a random forest as the underlying surrogate model of the black-box objective (Breiman, 2001). The predictive distribution given by this model is used to select promising parameter values on which the objective should be evaluated. In random forest T random regression trees are iteratively fit using each time a bootstrap sample of training data. Each bootstrap sample is obtained by drawing with replacement from the observed data N instances. Furthermore, in random forest, at each node, a randomly chosen subset of variables are tested to split the data. This introduces variability in the generated regression trees. Given a candidate test location, the prediction for that point is computed for each of the T trees. The predictive distribution of the model is simply a Gaussian distribution with the empirical mean and variance across the individual tree predictions. Given this predictive distribution,

the EI criterion described in Section 2 is computed and used to select a new point at which the objective $f(\cdot)$ should be evaluated. The main advantage of random forest is that it has a smaller computational cost than a GP.

The regression trees used by random forest to compute the predictive distribution can naturally consider integer and categorical-valued variables. Therefore this method does not suffer from the limitations described in Section 3 for GPs. A problem, however, is that the predictive distribution of random forest is not very good. In particular, it relies on the randomness introduced by the bootstrap samples and the randomly chosen subset of variables to be tested at each node to split the data. This result is confirmed by our experiments, in which BO methods using GPs tend to perform better than SMAC.

TPE also uses EI as the acquisition function. However, its computation is carried out in a different way, using a different modelling strategy. Whereas standard BO methods fit a discriminative model for $p(y|\mathbf{x})$ directly, TPE follows a generative approach. More precisely, $p(\mathbf{x}|y)$ and $p(y)$ are fit instead. Both approaches are related as $p(y|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|y)p(y)}{p(\mathbf{x})}$ where $p(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}|y)p(y)dy$. To obtain an estimate of $p(\mathbf{x}|y)$, TPE models each dimension with a probability distribution that serves as a prior for that dimension. Then, TPE replaces that distributions with non-parametric densities. TPE redefines $p(\mathbf{x}|y)$ by using two different densities, $\ell(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$. $\ell(\mathbf{x})$ is estimated using the observations in which the evaluation is lower than a chosen value y^* . $g(\mathbf{x})$ is estimated using the rest of observations, respectively. That is,

$$p(\mathbf{x}|y) = \begin{cases} \ell(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } y \leq y^*, \\ g(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } y > y^*. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Importantly, these two densities are obtained using Parzen estimators, a non-parametric density estimator, in the case of continuous random variables. In the case of categorical variables, a categorical distribution is used instead. Similarly, in the case of a variable over the integers, a distribution that considers only this domain is used instead. This can easily account for categorical and integer-valued input variables in TPE. y^* is simply set as some quantile of the observed y values. An interesting property of this approach is that no specific model for $p(y)$ is necessary. TPE derives a different expression for the EI acquisition function. Namely,

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{-\infty}^{y^*} (y^* - y)p(y|\mathbf{x})dy = \int_{-\infty}^{y^*} (y^* - y)\frac{p(\mathbf{x}|y)p(y)}{p(\mathbf{x})}dy \propto (\gamma + \frac{g(\mathbf{x})}{\ell(\mathbf{x})}(1 - \gamma))^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

where we have used that $\gamma = p(y < y^*)$ and that $p(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}|y)p(y)dy = \gamma\ell(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \gamma)g(\mathbf{x})$. See (Bergstra et al., 2011) for further detail. The TPE EI criterion is hence maximized simply by choosing points with high probability under $\ell(\mathbf{x})$ and low probability under $g(\mathbf{x})$. The advantage of this approach is that both of the models, $\ell(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$, are hierarchical processes that naturally take into account discrete-valued and continuous-valued variables.

In the literature there are other approaches for BO with GPs that can account for categorical and integer-valued input variables (Rainforth et al., 2016). However, they follow the basic approach described in Section 3 and are expected to be sub-optimal when compared to the proposed approach. Therefore, we do not consider them in our experiments.

5 Experiments

We carry out several experiments to evaluate the performance of the proposed approach for considering integer and categorical-valued input variables in BO methods using GPs. We compare its performance with that of the basic approach described in Section 3. Each of these two approaches has been implemented in the software for BO Spearmint (<https://github.com/HIPS/Spearmint>). We also compare results with other methods that do not use a GP as a surrogate model, in both synthetic and real problems. Those methods are the ones described in Section 4. Namely, SMAC and TPE.

The results reported in this section show averages and corresponding standard deviations obtained after 100 repetitions of each experiment. Standard deviations are estimated using 200 bootstrap samples. In the synthetic problems we consider two scenarios. Namely, noiseless and noisy observations, and report results for both of them. The hyper-parameters of each GP in the basic and the proposed approaches (length-scales, level of noise and amplitude) are approximately sampled from their posterior distribution using slice sampling as in (Snoek et al., 2012). In the synthetic experiments, we generate 10 samples for each hyper-parameter, and the acquisition function of each method is averaged over these samples. In the real-world problems we generate 50 samples for each hyper-parameter. We use a Matérn covariance function in the GPs. In the synthetic experiments, at each iteration of the optimization process, each method outputs a recommendation obtained by optimizing the mean prediction of the GP. In the real world-experiments, however, we simply output the best-observed evaluation, to reduce the impact of model bias. SMAC and TPE approaches deliver a recommendation based on the best-observed evaluation, in both synthetic and real-world scenarios.

5.1 Synthetic Experiments

A first batch of experiments considers minimizing synthetic objectives which are sampled from a GP prior. More precisely, we generate 100 optimization problems in 2 and 4 dimensions. We consider two scenarios. Each scenario involves optimizing a combination of real and categorical input variables, and a combination of real and integer-valued input variables, respectively. These two scenarios are also analyzed in the case of noiseless and noisy evaluations. The variance of the additive Gaussian noise is set equal to 0.01. Here we use EI as the acquisition function for the basic and the proposed approaches. We run each method (Basic, Proposed, SMAC and TPE) for 50 iterations in these experiments.

Note that SMAC and TPE do not assume a GP for the underlying model and could be in disadvantage in these experiments. However, we believe it is still interesting to compare results with them in this setting in which the exact solution of the optimization problem can be easily obtained and the level of noise can be controlled. In the following section we carry out experiments in which the actual objectives need not be sampled from a GP, to illustrate the advantages of the proposed approach in a wider range of problems.

A first set of experiments considers 2 input variables. In the integer case, the first variable is real and the second variable can take 5 different integer values. In the categorical case, the first variable is real and the second is categorical, taking 5 different values. Figure 4 shows the average results obtained by each method. This figure shows, as a function of the evaluations made, the average difference in absolute value between the objective associated to the recommendation made and the minimum value of the objective, in a log scale. We observe that the proposed approach significantly outperforms the basic approach and all other

methods. More precisely, it is able to provide recommendations that are more accurate with a smaller number of evaluations, both for the noise and noiseless scenario. TPE outperforms SMAC and also the basic approach in the noisy setting. The bad results of TPE and SMAC are probably due to the use of an underlying model that is different from a GP. Therefore, they can suffer from model bias.




Figure 4: Average results on the synthetic experiments with 2 dimensions. The first row shows results for a real and an integer-valued input variable. The second row shows results for a real and a categorical input variable. Left column is for noiseless observations. Right column is for noisy observations.

A second set of experiments considers 4 input variables. In the integer case, the two variables take real values, and two variables take 5 different integer values. In the categorical case, two variables are real and two variables are categorical with 3 different values each. Figure 5 shows the average results obtained by each method. Again, we observe that the proposed approach significantly outperforms the basic approach and all other methods. If we compare Figure 4 and 5, we observe that in this higher dimensional input space the proposed approach gives even better results than in the previous setting. This makes sense, because when the number of dimensions is higher, the optimization problem is more difficult, and a better model can give much better results.

The functions that we have optimized in this section are extracted from a GP prior. Therefore, one can argue that the observed disadvantage of TPE and SMAC when compared to the proposed approach is in fact due to model bias, as the GP matches the objective function in this case. In order to compare results when there is model bias in the proposed approach, we carry out two real-world experiments in the next section.

5.2 Real-world Experiments

In this section, we compare all methods on the practical problem of finding the optimal parameters of a gradient boosting ensemble (Friedman, 2001) on the digits dataset. This




Figure 5: Average results on the synthetic experiments with 4 dimensions. The first row shows results for two real and two integer-valued input variables. The second row shows results for two real and two categorical input variables. Left column is for noiseless observations. Right column is for noisy observations.

dataset has 1,797 data instances, 10 class labels and 64 dimensions. It has been extracted from the python package scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Similarly, we also consider finding the optimal hyper-parameters of a deep neural network on the MNIST dataset (LeCun, 1998). This dataset has 60,000 data instances, 768 dimensions and 10 class labels. In this set of experiments, we use Predictive Entropy Search (PES) as the acquisition function, for both the basic and the proposed approach.

In the task of finding an optimal ensemble on the digits dataset, the objective that is considered for optimization is the average test log likelihood of the ensemble. This objective is evaluated using a 10-fold cross-validation procedure. Note that model bias can be an issue for all methods in this case, since the actual objective is unknown. We consider a total of 125 evaluations of the objective. A summary of the parameters optimized, their type and their range is displayed on Table 1. These parameters are: The logarithm of the learning rate, the maximum depth of the generated trees and the minimum number of samples used to split a node in the tree building process. Importantly, while the first parameter can take real values, the other two can only take integer values.

Table 1: Names, types and range of the parameters optimized for the ensemble of trees.

Name	Type	Range
Log Learning Rate	Real	$[-10, 0]$
Maximum Tree Depth	Integer	$[1, 6]$
Minimum Number of Samples to Split	Integer	$[2, 6]$

In each repetition of the experiment described (there are 100 repetitions) we consider a

different 10-fold cross validation split of the data. The average results obtained are displayed in Figure 6 (top). This figure shows the average difference, in absolute value, between the test log-likelihood of the recommendation made and the best observed test-log likelihood, for that particular split, in a log scale. We observe that the proposed approach significantly outperforms the basic approach. More precisely, it is able to find parameter values that lead to a gradient boosting ensemble with a better test log likelihood, using a smaller number of evaluations of the objective. Furthermore, the proposed approach also performs better than SMAC or TPE.




Figure 6: (top) Average results on the task of finding an optimal gradient boosting ensemble on the digits dataset. (bottom) Average results on the task of finding an optimal deep neural network on the MNIST dataset.

In the task of finding an optimal deep neural network on the MNIST dataset, the objective considered is the test log-likelihood of the network on a validation set of 10,000 instances, extracted from the training set. We consider 150 evaluations of the objective. A summary of the parameters optimized, their type and their range is displayed on Table 2. These parameters

are: The logarithm of the learning rate, the activation function and the number of hidden layers. The first parameter can take values in the real line. The second and third parameters are categorical and integer-valued. The number of units in each layer, is set equal to 75.

The average results obtained are displayed in Figure 6 (bottom). The figure shows the average difference, in absolute value, between the test log-likelihood of the recommendation made and the best observed test-log likelihood, in a log scale. Again, the proposed approach significantly outperforms the basic approach. More precisely, it is able to find parameter values that lead to a deep neural network with a better test log likelihood on the validation set, using a smaller number of evaluations of the objective. The proposed approach also outperforms SMAC. However, TPE is only slightly worse than the proposed approach at the end and it outperforms the basic approach. We believe that the better results of TPE obtained in this problem can be a consequence of model bias in the GP that is used to fit the objective in the proposed approach.

Table 2: Name, type and range of the deep neural network parameters optimized.

Name	Type	Range
Log Learning Rate	Real	$[-10, 0]$
Activation Function	Categorical	Linear, Sigmoid, Tanh or ReLU
Number of hidden layers	Integer	$[1, 3]$

6 Conclusions

BO methods rely on a probabilistic model of the objective function, typically a Gaussian process (GP), upon which an acquisition function is built. The acquisition function is used to select candidate points, on which the objective should be evaluated, to solve the optimization problem in the smallest number of evaluations. Nevertheless, GPs assume continuous input variables. When this is not the case and some of the input variables take categorical or integer values, one has to introduce extra approximations. A common approach before doing the evaluation of the objective is to use a one-hot encoding approximation for categorical variables, or to round the value to the closest integer, in the case of integer-valued variables. We have shown that this can lead to problems as the BO method can get stuck, always trying to evaluate the same candidate point.

The problem described is a consequence of a mismatch between the regions of the input space that have high acquisition values and the points on which the objective is evaluated. A simple way of avoiding this problem is to do the approximations (a one-hot encoding in the case of categorical variables or the approximation to the closest integer in the case of integer-valued variables) inside the wrapper that is used to evaluate the objective. This technique works in practice, but it has the limitation that it makes the objective constant in those regions of the input space that lead to the same configuration. This constant behavior cannot be modeled by standard GPs.

In this paper we have proposed to modify the covariance function of the underlying GPs model to account for those regions of the input space in which the objective should be constant. The transformation simply rounds integer-valued variables to the closest integer. In the case of categorical variables in which one-hot encoding has been used, we simply set the largest extra variable equal to one and all the other equal to zero. The consequence of this transformation is

that the distance between those points of the input space that lead to the same configuration becomes zero. This enforces maximum correlation between the GP values at those input values, leading to a constant behavior.

The proposed approach has been compared to a basic approach for dealing with categorical and integer-valued input variables in the context BO and GPs. Furthermore, we have also compared results with two other approaches that can be used to solve these optimization problems and that can naturally account for integer and categorical variables. Namely, SMAC and TPE. Several experiments involving synthetic and real-world experiments illustrate the benefits of the proposed approach. In particular, it outperforms the basic approach and SMAC and is most of the times better or at least equivalent to TPE.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the use of the facilities of Centro de Computación Científica (CCC) at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. The authors also acknowledge financial support from the Spanish Plan Nacional I+D+i, Grants TIN2016-76406-P, TEC2016-81900-REDT (MINECO/FEDER EU), and from Comunidad de Madrid, Grant S2013/ICE-2845.

References

- Bergstra, J., Yamins, D., and Cox, D. D. (2013). Hyperopt: A Python Library for Optimizing the Hyperparameters of Machine Learning Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 12th Python in Science Conference*, pages 13–20.
- Bergstra, J. S., Bardenet, R., Bengio, Y., and Kégl, B. (2011). Algorithms for Hyper-Parameter Optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2546–2554.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random Forests. *Machine learning*, pages 5–32.
- Cornejo-Bueno, L., Garrido-Merchán, E. C., Hernández-Lobato, D., and Salcedo-Sanz, S. (2018). Bayesian Optimization of a Hybrid System for Robust Ocean Wave Features Prediction. *Neurocomputing*, 275:818–828.
- Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy Function Approximation: A Gradient Boosting Machine. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1189–1232.
- Garnett, R., Osborne, M. A., and Roberts, S. J. (2010). Bayesian Optimization for Sensor Set Selection. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks*, pages 209–219.
- Hernández-Lobato, J. M., Hoffman, M. W., and Ghahramani, Z. (2014). Predictive Entropy Search for Efficient Global Optimization of Black-box Functions. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 918–926.
- Hutter, F., Hoos, H. H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2011). Sequential Model-Based Optimization for General Algorithm Configuration. In *International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 507–523.

- Jones, D. R., Schonlau, M., and Welch, W. J. (1998). Efficient Global Optimization of Expensive Black-Box Functions. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 13(4):455–492.
- LeCun, Y. (1998). The MNIST Database of Handwritten Digits. [http://yann. lecun. com/exdb/mnist/](http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/).
- Lizotte, D. J., Wang, T., Bowling, M. H., and Schuurmans, D. (2007). Automatic Gait Optimization with Gaussian Process Regression. In *IJCAI*, volume 7, pages 944–949.
- Moćkus, J. (1975). On Bayesian Methods for Seeking the Extremum. In *Optimization Techniques IFIP Technical Conference*, pages 400–404.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M., and Duchesnay, E. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(Oct):2825–2830.
- Rainforth, T., Le, T. A., van de Meent, J. W., Osborne, M. A., and Wood, F. (2016). Bayesian Optimization for Probabilistic Programs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 280–288.
- Rasmussen, C. E. and Williams, C. K. I. (2006). *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press.
- Shah, A., Wilson, A., and Ghahramani, Z. (2014). Student-t Processes as Alternatives to Gaussian Processes. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 877–885.
- Shahriari, B., Swersky, K., Wang, Z., Adams, R. P., and de Freitas, N. (2016). Taking the Human Out of the Loop: A Review of Bayesian Optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175.
- Snoek, J., Larochelle, H., and Adams, R. P. (2012). Practical Bayesian Optimization of Machine Learning Algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, pages 2171–2180.
- Snoek, J., Rippel, O., Swersky, K., Kiros, R., Satish, N., Sundaram, N., Patwary, M., Prabhat, M., and Adams, R. (2015). Scalable Bayesian Optimization Using Deep Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2171–2180.
- Thornton, C., Hutter, F., Hoos, H. H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2013). Auto-weka: Combined Selection and Hyperparameter Optimization of Classification Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 847–855.