

Hopping between distant basins

Maldon Goodridge^{*} John Moriarty[†] Jure Vogrinc[‡] Alessandro Zocca[§]

August 12, 2021

Abstract

We present the Basin Hopping with Skipping (BH-S) algorithm for stochastic optimisation, which replaces the perturbation step of basin hopping (BH) with a so-called skipping proposal from the rare-event sampling literature. Empirical results on benchmark optimisation surfaces demonstrate that BH-S can improve performance relative to BH by encouraging non-local exploration, that is, by hopping between distant basins.

keywords: Basin hopping, stochastic optimisation, skipping sampler, rare events, Markov chains

1 Introduction and background

In the literature on global optimisation of a non-convex energy landscape a source of inspiration has been methods from the theory of rare-event sampling. Examples include the methods of cross-entropy for combinatorial and continuous optimisation [25] and, more recently, splitting for optimisation [4]. In stochastic optimisation algorithms such as random search [26], basin hopping [14, 31], simulated annealing [12] and the multistart method [9, 16], one or more initial points X_0 are perturbed in order to discover new neighbourhoods (or ‘basins’) of lower energy, which may then be explored by a local procedure such as gradient descent. As such algorithms discover progressively smaller energy values, the remaining lower-energy basins form a decreasing sequence of sets. Viewing the optimisation domain heuristically as a probability space and these basins as events, the discovery of smaller energy values can then also be likened to rare-event sampling.

In this analogy, the local perturbation step plays a similar role to the proposal step in a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampler (see [3], [23]). Thus in order to enhance performance, one may explore the use of alternative MCMC proposal distributions developed in the context of rare event sampling as alternative perturbation steps within stochastic optimisation routines. This is the approach we take in the present paper.

To illustrate the potential benefit of this approach consider an energy landscape having multiple, well-separated basins whose minimum energies are approximately equal to the global minimum. Then if X_0 lies in one such basin, separation means that local perturbations are not well suited to the direct discovery of another basin. Instead, algorithms using local perturbations to minimise over such a landscape should be non-monotonic, accepting transitions from X_0 to states of higher energy in the hope of later reaching lower-energy basins. In contrast, since non-local perturbation steps offer the possibility of direct moves between distant low-energy basins, they may possibly be effective on such surfaces within a monotonic optimisation algorithm. In this paper we explore the use of a particular non-local perturbation, the ‘skipping perturbation’ of [19].

^{*}School of Mathematics, Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, UK. Email: ahw493@qmul.ac.uk

[†]School of Mathematics, Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, UK. Email: j.moriarty@qmul.ac.uk

[‡]Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK. Email: jure.vogrinc@warwick.ac.uk

[§]Department of Mathematics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081HV, Netherlands. Email: a.zocca@vu.nl

Although other non-local perturbations have been proposed in the literature (see for example [1, 22, 13, 27, 28, 30] in the context of MCMC), skipping has the advantage of being just as straightforward to implement as a local random walk perturbation. That is, it requires no additional information about the energy landscape beyond the ability to evaluate it pointwise.

We explore its use within the basin hopping (BH) algorithm [14, 31], which combines local optimisation with perturbation steps and requires only pointwise evaluations of the energy function f . The resulting ‘basin hopping with skipping’ (BH-S) algorithm is thus as generally applicable as the BH algorithm.

The BH algorithm works as follows: the current state X_n is perturbed via a random walk step to give Y_n which is, in turn, mapped via deterministic local minimisation to a local minimum X_{n+1} . This local minimum point is then either accepted or rejected as the new state with probability given by the Metropolis acceptance ratio, and the procedure is repeated until a pre-determined stopping criterion is met. Due to its effectiveness and ease of implementation, the BH algorithm has been used to solve a wide array of optimisation problems (see [8, 20, 21] for more details).

In contrast with the non-monotonic BH algorithm, BH-S is monotonic and replaces the random walk step with a skipping perturbation over the sublevel set of the current state X_n . Like a flat stone skimming across water, this involves repeated perturbations in a straight line until either a point of lower energy is found, or the skipping process is halted. The BH-S algorithm, which was first outlined in [19], thus provides a direct mechanism to escape local minima which contrasts with the indirect approach taken by BH. Another perspective is that BH-S alters the balance between the computational effort expended on local optimisation versus the effort spent on perturbation, typically increasing the latter while decreasing the former (cf. Table 1 below).

Through the use of benchmark functions, the aim of the present paper is to offer guidance on tuning the method and to present a systematic overview on the types of optimisation problem on which BH-S tends to outperform BH. The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the algorithms, empirical results are presented and discussed in Section 3, and Section 4 concludes.

2 The BH-S algorithm

Consider a global optimisation problem on a rectangular subdomain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, of the form

$$\min f(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{x} \in D := \prod_{i=1}^d [l_i, u_i], \quad (1)$$

for some scalars $l_i \leq u_i$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. In the rest of the paper, we will often refer to f as the *energy function* and to its graph as the *energy landscape*. This terminology, which is similar to that of simulated annealing, is appropriate since the BH algorithm was originally conceived as a method to find the lowest energy configuration of a molecular system [31]. In this section we review the BH algorithm and then introduce basin hopping with skipping (BH-S).

2.1 Basin hopping algorithm

The core idea of the basin hopping algorithm [31], which is presented in Algorithm 1, is to supplement local deterministic optimisation by alternating it with a random perturbation step capable of escaping local minima. More specifically, inside the `RandomPerturbation` procedure at step 5 of Algorithm 1 a random perturbation $W \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is drawn and added to the current state X_n giving a state $Y_n = X_n + W$. Most commonly, the increment W is either spherically symmetric or has independent coordinates. The state Y_n becomes the starting point of a deterministic local minimisation routine. In our implementation of Algorithm 1 the `LocalMinimisation` procedure at step 6 is performed using the limited-memory BFGS algorithm [15], a quasi-Newton method capable of incorporating boundary constraints (although we note that other choices are possible). The resulting local minimum U_n is then

either accepted or rejected as the new state with probability equal to

$$\min \left(1, \exp \left(-\frac{f(U_n) - f(X_n)}{T} \right) \right),$$

where $T \geq 0$ is a fixed temperature parameter. This means, in particular, that downwards steps for which $f(U_n) < f(X_n)$ are always accepted. The BH algorithm prescribes to repeat this basic step until a pre-defined stopping criterion is satisfied. Commonly used stopping criteria for the BH algorithm include, among others, a limit on the number of evaluations of the function f or the absence of improvement over several consecutive iterations [20, 24]. The monotonic basin hopping method introduced in [14] is the BH variant corresponding to the limiting case $T = 0$, in which all steps that increase the energy are rejected.

Algorithm 1: Basin hopping

```

1 Generate a random initial state  $Y_0 \in D$ ;
2  $X_0 = \text{LocalMinimisation}(Y_0)$ ;
3  $n = 0$ ;
4 while Stopping criterion for  $\{X_j\}_{j \leq n}$  is not satisfied: do
5    $Y_n = \text{RandomPerturbation}(X_n)$ ;
6    $U_n = \text{LocalMinimisation}(Y_n)$ ;
7   Generate  $V \sim \text{Uniform}([0, 1])$ ;
8   if  $V < \min \left( 1, \exp \left( -\frac{f(U_n) - f(X_n)}{T} \right) \right)$  then
9      $X_{n+1} = U_n$ ;
10  else
11     $X_{n+1} = X_n$ ;
12  end
13  Increase  $n$  by 1;
14 end

```

Basin hopping can thus be viewed as a random walk on the set of local minima of the energy landscape, which because its transition probabilities favour downhill moves to lower minima, is capable of finding the global minimum and, hence, of solving global optimisation problems. Its transition probabilities depend in a complex way on the current position, the landscape, and the perturbation step. The BH-S algorithm introduced in the next section modifies these transition probabilities, aiming to accelerate optimisation.

2.2 Skipping perturbations and the BH-S algorithm

In this subsection we introduce the BH-S algorithm, which differs from BH only in the perturbation step of line 5 in Algorithm 1. Instead of the random walk perturbation described above, the `RandomPerturbation` procedure described in Algorithm 2 below is applied in order to obtain Y_n . The `LocalMinimisation` and acceptance steps remain identical to those in Algorithm 1.

Given the current state X_n and a fixed probability density q on \mathbb{R}^d , the random walk perturbation of the BH algorithm can be understood as drawing a state Y_n from the density $y \mapsto q(y - X_n)$.

In contrast the *skipping perturbation* of BH-S depends on both the current state X_n and a *target set* $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of states. The target set C_n for the n -th skipping perturbation is the sublevel set of the energy function f at the current point X_n , i.e.,

$$C_n := \{x \in D : f(x) \leq f(X_n)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2)$$

A state Z_1 is drawn according to the density q just as in the random walk perturbation and, if Z_1 does not lie in the target set C_n , further states Z_2, Z_3, \dots are drawn such that X_n, Z_1, Z_2, \dots lie

in order on a straight line, with each distance increment $|Z_{j+1} - Z_j|$ having the same distribution as that of $|Z_1 - X_n|$ conditioned on the line's direction $\frac{Z_1 - X_n}{|Z_1 - X_n|}$. The first state of this sequence to land in the target set C_n becomes the state Y_n . If C_n is not entered before the skipping process is halted, then Y_n is set equal to X_n .

More precisely, let $x = (r, \varphi)$ be polar coordinates on \mathbb{R}^d with the angular part φ lying on the $d - 1$ dimensional unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Write $\varphi \mapsto q_\varphi(\varphi)$ for the marginal density of q with respect to the angular part φ , which we may call the *directional density* (and which we assume is strictly positive). For each $\varphi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denote by

$$q_{r|\varphi}(r|\varphi) := \frac{q_{r,\varphi}(r, \varphi)}{q_\varphi(\varphi)}$$

the *conditional jump density*, i.e., the conditional density of the radial part r given the direction φ . To construct the skipping perturbation, set $Z_0 = X_n$ and draw a random direction $\Phi \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ from the directional density q_φ . A sequence of i.i.d. distances R_1, R_2, \dots is then drawn from the conditional jump density $q_{r|\Phi}$, defining a sequence of modified perturbations $\{Z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ on \mathbb{R}^d by

$$Z_{k+1} := Z_k + \Phi R_{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$$

Since this modification of the BH perturbation is more likely to generate states Z_k lying outside the optimisation domain D , we apply periodic boundary conditions.

If $Z_k \in C_n$ for some $k \leq K$, where K is a pre-defined maximum number of steps called the *halting index*, then we set $Y_n = Z_k$ in Algorithm 1 and continue to the `LocalMinimisation` and acceptance steps. Alternatively if $Z_k \notin C_n$ for all $k \leq K$ we set $Y_n = X_n$. Note that although in [19] the halting index K can be randomised, in the present setting with a known bounded domain D it is sufficient to consider only fixed halting indices.

For clarity, in the remainder of the paper we will understand the BH algorithm to mean setting $K = 1$ in Algorithm 2. In all simulations we set the perturbation q to be a spherically symmetric and Gaussian with standard deviation σ , although other choices are possible (see the discussion in Section 4.1 of [19]). In the next section we explore for which types of energy function f BH-S offers an advantage over BH, and also discuss the choice of halting index.

Algorithm 2: `RandomPerturbation` subroutine for BH-S

Input : State $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$

Output: Randomly perturbed state $Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$

- 1 Set $Z_0 = X_n$;
- 2 Generate an initial perturbation W distributed according to the density $w \mapsto q(w - X_n)$;
- 3 Calculate the direction

$$\Phi = \frac{(W - X_n)}{\|W - X_n\|} ;$$

Set $k = 1$ and $Z_1 := W$;

- 4 **while** $f(Z_k) > f(X_n)$ **and** $k < K$ **do**
 - 5 | Generate an independent distance increment R distributed as $\|W - X_n\|$ given Φ ;
 - 6 | Set $Z_{k+1} = Z_k + \Phi R$;
 - 7 | Increase k by one ;
 - 8 **end**
 - 9 Set $Y_n := Z_k$;
-

3 Empirical results

In this section we aim to explore on which types of optimisation problem BH-S tends to outperform BH and *vice versa* using a set of benchmark energy landscapes with known global minima from [6, 10, 29].

To facilitate discussion of landscape geometry we initially restrict attention to two-dimensional energy functions, before considering higher dimensions in Section 3.6.

In Subsection 3.3 we show that, if an energy landscape has *distant basins* (recall that with the word ‘basin’ we refer to the neighbourhood of a local minimum) then BH-S tends to offer an advantage. Otherwise, as described in Subsection 3.4, BH is to be preferred since any benefit from BH-S is then typically outweighed by its additional computational overhead. We also explore the effect of the state space dimension d on the performance of both algorithms and offer guidance on tuning the BH-S method, including strategies to improve exploration of challenging energy landscapes.

3.1 Methodology

For each benchmark energy landscape, we compare the performance of BH-S to that of BH with temperature $T = 1$, in both cases taking the density q of the initial perturbation as the centred Gaussian

$$q \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \cdot I_d), \quad (3)$$

where I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix and the parameter σ allows for tuning, as follows. Both the BH and BH-S algorithms are run on a set of uniformly distributed initial states $I := \{X_0^{(n)} \in D, n = 1, \dots, |I|\}$. These initial states are used sequentially until the computational budget of 300 seconds of CPU time has elapsed, and the corresponding set of final states is recorded. To account for numerical tolerance, we consider a run to have successfully identified the global minimum $x^* \in D$ if its final state lies in $\mathcal{G} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x^*\| \leq 10^{-5}\}$ (this choice excludes all non-global minima for all benchmark landscapes).

The performance of each algorithm is then assessed with respect to two metrics:

- **Reliability**, defined as the proportion of runs terminating in \mathcal{G} ,
- **Efficiency**, defined as the number of runs terminating in \mathcal{G} .

We write ρ_c and ρ_s for the reliability of the BH and BH-S algorithms respectively, while ϵ_c and ϵ_s denote their respective efficiencies. The BH and BH-S algorithms are individually tuned for each function by selecting σ and K to maximise their efficiency.

In order to understand the role played by the skipping perturbation, we also record diagnostics on the average size of perturbations. For each new state $X_{n+1} \neq X_n$ accepted in Algorithm 1, define the *perturbation distance* J as $\|Y_n - X_n\|$, the Euclidean distance between the state X_n at step n and its perturbation Y_n . For each run of an algorithm, the mean \bar{J} of these perturbation distances is recorded. Then for each 300 second budget, the *expected mean jump distance* v is the average $v := N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^N \bar{J}^{(n)}$, where N is the number of runs realised within the time budget. For the BH-S algorithm, v is calculated separately for the accepted random walk perturbations (that is, those for which $Y_n = Z_1$ in Algorithm 2) and the accepted skipping perturbations (those for which $Y_n = Z_k$ with $k \geq 2$ in Algorithm 2), denoting these by v_1 and v_s respectively.

The simulations were conducted on a single core using Python 3.7, using the `basinhopping` routine in SciPy version 1.6.2 for the BH algorithm. Results for all considered landscapes are presented in the Appendix. Jupyter notebook files used to conduct simulations are available at <https://github.com/ahw493/Basin-Hopping-with-Skipping>.

3.2 Exploratory analysis

As an exploratory comparison between BH and BH-S, their relative efficiency ρ_s/ρ_c and reliability ϵ_s/ϵ_c were calculated for each benchmark energy landscape and plotted in Figure 1.

Landscapes in the first quadrant of Figure 1 represent cases where the BH-S algorithm exhibits both greater reliability and greater efficiency than BH. The common feature among these landscapes, which




Figure 1: Scatterplot of relative efficiency $\mathcal{E} = \ln(\epsilon_s/\epsilon_c)$ versus relative reliability $\mathcal{P} = \ln(\rho_s/\rho_c)$ for the BH and BH-S algorithms on benchmark energy landscapes

are plotted in the Appendix, might be called *distant basins*: that is, basins separated by sufficient Euclidean distance that the random walk performed by the BH algorithm is unlikely to transition directly between them. While indirect transitions between such basins may be possible, they require a suitable combination of steps to be made. Such indirect transitions may carry significant computational expense, for example if suitable combinations of steps are long or relatively unlikely. In the BH-S algorithm, by contrast, the linear sequence of steps taken by the skipping perturbation enables direct transitions even between distant basins.

Conversely, landscapes lying in the lower-left quadrant of Figure 1 represent cases where the BH-S algorithm is both less reliable and less efficient than BH. As explored more extensively later in Subsection 3.4, for each of these landscapes, if the energy of the state X_n is close to the global minimum value $f(x^*)$ then the corresponding sublevel set C_n has almost zero volume. This means that even if the skipping perturbation traverses the distance between basins, the states Z_1, \dots, Z_k are unlikely to fall in C_n due to its small volume. Since the BH algorithm is non-monotonic, it does not suffer from the same issue and outperforms BH-S for these landscapes.

Figure 1 displays a positive correlation between relative efficiency and relative reliability. However for several landscapes (which lie near the vertical axis) the performance of BH and BH-S cannot be clearly distinguished on the basis of reliability alone. As confirmed by the Appendix, this is typically because both algorithms have reliability close to 100%. Nevertheless the algorithms differ in their efficiency, with BH-S observed to be more efficient than BH for each such landscape. One surface also lies in each of the second and fourth quadrants.

Further exploratory analysis is provided in Table 1, which indicates average CPU time spent on the perturbation versus the local minimisation steps for each algorithm. To facilitate comparisons between the two algorithms, in each case the total time spent is normalised by the algorithm's efficiency (as defined in Section 3.1). This demonstrates that the BH algorithm invests a large majority of processor time in the local minimisation step, with relatively little devoted to the perturbation step. While the ratio between processor time spent on local minimisation and perturbation is more problem-dependent

Table 1: CPU time spent on the perturbation and local minimisation steps by the BH and BH-S algorithms for the test functions discussed in Sections 3.3–3.5, normalised by efficiency.

		$\frac{\text{Time spent}}{\text{Efficiency}}, \text{ s}$			
		BH		BH-S	
Location in Figure 1	Function	Perturbation	Local Minimisation	Skipping Perturbation	Local Minimisation
First quadrant (Section 3.3)	Egg-holder	0.72	6.76	0.73	0.19
	Modified Rosenbrock	0.46	13.53	0.22	0.10
Third quadrant (Section 3.4)	Mishra-03	0.02	1.75	1.74	3.21
	Whitley	0.01	0.68	4.92	1.58
Special cases (Section 3.5)	Rosenbrock	0.01	0.13	0.05	0.01
	Styblinski	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.01

for BH-S, the balance appears to be shifted in favour of perturbation.

The BH-S perturbation step is more expensive by construction, since it requires between 1 and K evaluations of the energy function f (depending on the sublevel set of the current state), whereas each BH perturbation requires just one evaluation of f . However in Table 1, for the Damavandi, Schwefel, Modified Rosenbrock and Egg-holder functions for which BH-S works well (cf. Figure 1), after normalisation the BH-S algorithm spent approximately the same or less CPU time than BH on perturbation, in addition to spending less time on local minimisation. Thus for these landscapes which favour BH-S, perturbation steps were not only less frequent for BH-S (again, after normalisation by efficiency) than BH, but the monotonic BH-S perturbations also reduced the total computational burden arising from the local minimisation step.

Conversely it was noted above that for landscapes in the third quadrant of Figure 1, if the energy of the state X_n is close to the global minimum value $f(x^*)$ then the corresponding sublevel set C_n has almost zero volume. This represents the worst case for the BH-S perturbation: if the states Z_1, \dots, Z_k all lie outside the sublevel set then the perturbation requires the maximum number k of evaluations of the energy function, but nevertheless the perturbed state Y_n is rejected and $X_{n+1} = X_n$, so the optimisation procedure does not advance. Indeed for the Mishra-03 and Whitley functions in Table 1, the efficiency normalised CPU time invested in perturbations is two orders of magnitude greater for BH-S than for BH. For these landscapes, the efficiency normalised computational burden from local minimisation is also observed to be greater for BH-S than for BH, although the reasons for this are less clear.

Guided by the exploratory analysis of Figure 2, in Sections 3.3–3.5 we study both algorithms’ performance on specific energy landscapes in greater detail.

3.3 Landscapes favouring the BH-S algorithm

Figure 2 plots two landscapes from the first quadrant of Figure 1—that is, landscapes which favour the BH-S algorithm over BH. For each landscape, the sublevel set of a level above the global minimum $f(x^*)$ is also plotted. The Modified Rosenbrock energy function is given by

$$f(x) = 74 + 100(x_2 - x_1^2)^2 + (1 - x_1)^2 - 400 \exp \left[- \frac{(x_1 + 1)^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2}{0.1} \right],$$

and we take the domain $D = [-2, 2]^2$, with global minimum $x^* = (-0.95, -0.95)$ [6].




Figure 2: Examples of energy landscapes from the first quadrant of Figure 1

The Egg-Holder energy function is

$$f(x) = -(x_2 + 47) \sin \left(\sqrt{|x_2 + \frac{x_1}{2} + 47|} \right) - x_1 \sin \left(\sqrt{|x_1 - (x_2 + 47)|} \right),$$

and we take the domain $D = [-512, 512]^2$, with global minimum at $x^* = (512, 404.2319)$ [10].

From Figure 2a, the modified Rosenbrock function has two basins: a larger basin with a U-shaped valley and a smaller, well-shaped basin. To transition from the minimum of the valley to the minimum of the well, the BH algorithm would require a relatively large perturbation step landing directly in the well, otherwise the local optimisation procedure would take it back to the minimum of the valley. Even for an optimal choice of σ , which would require *a priori* knowledge about the landscape, such perturbations would be unlikely.

In contrast, if the initial point X_0 lies at the minimum of the valley, the BH-S algorithm aims to skip across the domain and enter its sublevel set C_0 as defined in (2). From Figure 2c, this will correspond to entering an approximately circular basin near the point $(-1, -1)$ in the domain. By Algorithm 2, the skipping perturbation has the potential to enter that basin provided that the straight line issuing from X_0 in the initial direction Φ in Algorithm 2 intersects it. In particular, this ability is robust to the choice of standard deviation σ provided that the halting index K is chosen appropriately (see the discussion on tuning in Subsection 3.7 below).

Table 2: Reliability ρ and efficiency ϵ of the BH and BH-S algorithms, with and without the application of periodic boundary conditions, for the test functions discussed in Sections 3.3–3.5.

Location in Figure 1	Function	Boundary Condition	ρ_c	ϵ_c	ρ_s	ϵ_s
First quadrant (Section 3.3)	Egg-Holder	Periodic	1.8%	77	29.4%	280
		Non-periodic	1.4%	58	81.7%	815
	Modified Rosenbrock	Periodic	18.8%	783	100%	1249
		Non-periodic	17.2%	597	96.7%	321
Third quadrant (Section 3.4)	Mishra-03	Periodic	77.9%	811	6.2%	78
		Non-periodic	49.6%	474	68.4%	576
	Whitley	Periodic	90.1%	137	13.9%	33
		Non-periodic	86.8%	138	13.4%	34
Special cases (Section 3.5)	Rosenbrock	Periodic	100%	942	100%	1376
		Non-periodic	100%	1006	100%	1524
	Styblinski	Periodic	99.7%	366	99.9%	932
		Non-periodic	99.4%	526	92.3%	784

From Figure 2b the Egg-Holder function has multiple basins, many of which have near-global minima. Figure 2d shows that the deepest basins lie in four groups, one group per corner of the domain. Within each group, the basins are close in the Euclidean distance and so perturbations are likely to enter different basins within that group. Also, the basins in each group have similar depths (that is, similar local minimum energies), making the acceptance ratio in Algorithm 1 high for such within-group perturbations. As a result the BH algorithm is likely to walk regularly between within-group local minima. Also from Figure 2b, the Egg-Holder function has shallower basins distributed throughout its domain. As discussed in Subsection 3.2 these provide an indirect, although potentially computationally expensive, route for BH to cross between the four groups of Figure 2d.

However between groups the Euclidean distance is large, creating the same challenge for BH as with the modified Rosenbrock function: even for optimally chosen σ , which would require *a priori* knowledge of the landscape, transitions between groups are relatively rare.

In contrast, the BH-S algorithm is capable of moving between the four groups in Figure 2d provided the initial direction Φ of its skipping perturbation intersects a different group. The likelihood of such an intersection is increased by both the length of the skipping chain and the use of periodic boundary conditions in the BH-S algorithm, and is again robust with respect to the choice of standard deviation σ .

Regarding the application of periodic boundary conditions to the domain D , we have argued that they are natural for BH-S, since otherwise long skipping chains would tend to exit the domain D . In contrast, they are not implemented for the BH algorithm in the results of Figure 1 and Table 3. One may therefore ask whether it is their use, rather than the skipping perturbation of BH-S, which yields any observed improvement. To explore this, Table 2 illustrates the effect of imposing periodic boundary conditions on the performance of both the BH and BH-S algorithms. Interestingly the performance of BH-S on the Egg-Holder landscape is improved without their use (a fact which appears to be driven by the proximity of its global minimiser x^* to the boundary). In general, it is clear from Table 2 that for both algorithms their benefit or disbenefit is problem-dependent and the skipping perturbation

explains a distinct and material part of the observed improvements relative to BH.

It can be observed from Table 3 that the expected mean jump distances v_s and v_c (defined in Subsection 3.1) typically satisfy $v_s \gg v_c$ for landscapes in the first quadrant of Figure 1. This confirms quantitatively the success of BH-S in hopping between distant basins. The cost of this feature is that the BH-S skipping perturbation is more computationally intensive than the random walk perturbation of BH.

Without skipping (that is, using the halting index $K = 1$ in Algorithm 2), BH-S would reduce to the monotonic basin hopping method of [14] and the *initial* perturbation W of Algorithm 2 would simply be either accepted or rejected. One may therefore also ask whether this increase in the expected mean jump distance is induced by the skipping mechanism of BH-S, or simply by its monotonicity. To address this, recall that Algorithm 2 first perturbs the current state X_n to give an initial perturbation $Z_1 := W$. Then if $f(W) > f(X_n)$, the initial perturbation is modified to Z_2 , and so on, until either a state Z_k is generated with $f(Z_k) \leq f(X_n)$ or skipping is halted. If such a Z_k is found then it may be accepted by setting $X_{n+1} = Z_k$ or rejected. The Appendix records the proportion of accepted BH-S perturbations $X_{n+1} = Z_k$ for which $k > 1$. Indeed, for many landscapes in the first quadrant of Figure 1 this proportion is 100%. That is, for such landscapes, each accepted perturbation X_{n+1} required the skipping mechanism since none of the initial perturbations had lower energy than the current state X_n .

3.4 Landscapes favouring the BH algorithm

Figure 3 plots two landscapes from the third quadrant of Figure 1, on which the BH algorithm outperforms BH-S, each with two sublevel sets above the global minimum $f(x^*)$. The Mishra-03 function is

$$f(x) := \sqrt{|\cos(\sqrt{|x_1^2 + x_2^2|})| + 0.01(x_1 + x_2)},$$

and the domain $D = [-10, 10]^2$ gives $x^* = (-8.466, -10)$ [10]. The Whitley function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(\frac{(100(x_i^2 - x_j)^2 + (1 - x_j)^2)^2}{4000} - \cos(100(x_i^2 - x_j)^2 + (1 - x_j)^2 + 1) \right),$$

has global minimum $x^* = (1, 1)$ on the domain $[0, 1.5]^2$ [10].

From Figure 3a, the Mishra-03 function is highly irregular and has many basins which appear almost point-like. Figure 3e confirms that the situation outlined in Section 3.2 applies to this landscape. That is, for states X_n with energy close to the global minimum value $f(x^*)$, the corresponding sublevel set C_n has almost zero volume and the states Z_1, Z_2, \dots , of Algorithm 2 are unlikely to fall in C_n .

The deepest basins of Mishra-03 form groups arranged in concentric circular arcs. Since the Euclidean distances both within and between these groups are relatively small, the BH algorithm is able to move frequently both within and between groups without requiring precise tuning of the standard deviation parameter σ . In particular, it outperforms BH-S on this landscape.

Similarly from Figure 3d, the deepest basins of the Whitley function can be seen either as forming one group, or as a small number of groups close to each other. Thus, as for Mishra-03, the BH algorithm is able to move frequently between them while nevertheless being robust to the choice of the standard deviation parameter σ . As with Mishra-03, however, from Figure 3f the sublevel sets C_n corresponding to near-global minimum states X_n have low volume. Thus it is more challenging for BH-S to transition between the deepest basins, and BH outperforms BH-S on this landscape.

These limitations of the BH-S routine can be mitigated by alternating between a monotonic and non-monotonic perturbation step. In Subsection 3.8 we provide a discussion on how this alternating perturbation can be implemented.




Figure 3: Examples of energy landscapes favouring the BH algorithm

3.5 Special cases

It was noted in Section 3.2 that for several landscapes lying near the vertical axis, both BH and BH-S algorithms have reliability close to 100%. For these surfaces BH-S typically has greater efficiency simply because of its monotonicity, since no further computational effort is expended on local optimisation once the global optimum is reached. The Holder Table and Carrom Table landscapes have multiple distant ‘legs’, each leg being the basin of a global minimum point. In this case, the ability of BH-S to skip between distant basins is not reflected in either its efficiency or its reliability, although it would

clearly be beneficial if the goal was to identify the number of global minima in the landscape.

3.6 Scaling with dimension

In this section we aim to illustrate the performance of the BH-S algorithm as the dimension of the optimisation problem increases. For this we focus on Schwefel-07, a landscape with ‘distant basins’ which is also defined for higher dimensions. It is given by the function $f_d : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where

$$f_d(x) = 418.9829 \times d - \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \sin(\sqrt{|x_i|}),$$

and has global minimum $(421.0)^d$ on the domain $D_d = [-500, 500]^d$ [10].




Figure 4: Comparison of BH and BH-S performance when applied to the Schwefel-07 function while varying the dimension d of the domain D . We set $\sigma = 20$ for both algorithms and the BH-S has halting index $K = 50$. These parameters were close to optimal for both algorithms. Each simulation used a CPU time budget of 300s.

From Figure 4a, the reliability and also the efficiency of both algorithms decrease approximately linearly with increased dimension. Recall that relative to BH, the strength of BH-S lies in its ability to transition directly between distant basins. From Algorithm 2, in order to transition directly to the global minimum basin, it is necessary for the line from the current state in the random direction Φ to intersect that basin. As Φ is drawn from a space of dimension $d - 1$, heuristically this becomes less likely as d increases.

In contrast, the BH algorithm should rely to a greater extent on indirect transitions from its current state to the global minimum. By statistical independence, the probability of a particular indirect transition is the product of the probabilities of its constituent steps. Since the probability of each step decays with dimension as discussed above for BH-S, this suggests that the performance of BH will degrade more rapidly with dimension than BH-S.

This is borne out in Figure 4a, where BH fails to locate x^* within the 300 second budget for any dimension $d \geq 4$, while BH-S continues to locate x^* (albeit with decreasing reliability and efficiency) until dimension $d = 11$. Indeed, the reliability of BH-S for this landscape is above 50% for dimensions $d \leq 7$.


3.7 Tuning

Both BH and BH-S have the parameter σ , the standard deviation of the centred Gaussian density q used to generate the initial perturbation. As noted above, the initial perturbation is analogous to a

Metropolis-Hastings (MH) proposal in MCMC. The MH literature highlights the importance of tuning such proposals, guided either by theory or by careful experimentation [5, 17]. Following this analogy, in this section we explore the choice of σ and also of the BH-S halting index K . To facilitate this discussion we restrict attention to the two-dimensional Egg-Holder function.


Figure 5 plots the reliability and efficiency of both BH and BH-S as σ varies between 0 and 300 (recall that the domain $D = [-512, 512]^2$; also, we set $K = 25$ for BH-S). Clearly, for both algorithms σ should not be very small (≤ 10). In that case the random walk step W is likely to land in the same basin as the current point X_n , so that the local optimisation step maps the perturbation back to X_n and the algorithms do not advance.

We note first from Figure 5 that both the reliability and efficiency of the BH algorithm increase approximately linearly within this range as σ increases. As discussed in Section 3.3, this reflects the fact that as σ increases, direct transitions between the four groups of deepest basins become more likely. In contrast, and again confirming the discussion in Section 3.3, both the efficiency and reliability of BH-S appear to be rather robust to the choice of σ .



(a) Percentage of trials which successfully reported the correct global minimum

(b) Total number of trials which successfully reported the correct global minimum.



(c) Total perturbation steps conducted during the 300s time budget.

Figure 5: Comparison of individually tuned BH-S and BH performances on the Egg-holder function. Set-up: CPU time budget of 300 seconds; stopping criteria: 50 perturbations; the halting index for skipping perturbation is set to $K = 25$ for all simulations.

Figure 6 illustrates the impact on reliability and efficiency of the choice of halting index K . From Algorithm 2, the maximum linear distance covered by the skipping procedure is $\sum_{k=1}^K R_k$, where each R_k is distributed as the radial part of a centred Gaussian with standard deviation σ . This suggests that K should not be too small, and the plot of efficiency in Figure 6b indicates that K should be at least 5 in our example (by default we take $K = 25$).

It is seen that provided ($K \leq 5$), increasing K tends to increase reliability while decreasing ef-




Figure 6: Performance and efficiency results for the BH-S applied to the Egg-holder function for various combinations of K and σ . A CPU time budget of 300s was applied to all simulations.

iciency. This reflects the fact that larger K allows the skipping procedure to travel further, thus increasing the likelihood of a direct transition to the global minimum basin, after which the BH-S algorithm would stop due to its monotonicity. In this way, greater K increases reliability. On the other hand, greater K increases the length of unsuccessful skipping trajectories. That is, each time the perturbed state Y_n of Algorithm 2 is not accepted (after the local minimisation step of Algorithm 1), the landscape is evaluated up to K times without advancing the optimisation. This implies that increased K also typically leads to decreased efficiency.

The tuning considerations discussed above for the BH-S algorithm can be summed up as follows. It should first be checked that σ is large enough that the initial perturbation regularly falls outside the basin of the current state X_n . Having selected σ , K should then be taken large enough that the skipping procedure regularly enters the sublevel set C_n . A practical suggestion here is to choose K so that $K\sigma$ exceeds the diameter of the domain D .




Figure 7: Performance of the BH-S algorithm on the Schwefel-07 function for different combinations of domain dimension d and perturbation variance σ . Note: the halting index was set to $K = 50$ with a CPU time budget of 300s for all simulations.

Figure 7 confirms these guidelines in higher dimensions, by plotting the BH-S reliability and efficiency in dimensions up to 10 as σ varies with the fixed choice $K = 50$. It confirms that these performance metrics are relatively robust to the value of σ , provided that σ is sufficiently large.

3.8 Alternating BH-S and BH

In this section we explore a hybrid approach which is intended to overcome the challenges identified in Section 3.4 for the monotonic BH-S algorithm by regularly including non-monotonic BH steps. Figure 8 plots the reliability and efficiency metrics for this hybrid algorithm on various landscapes, as the ratio between BH-S and BH steps varies.




Figure 8: Performance of the hybrid algorithm with varying proportions of BH to BH-S steps.

It can be seen that for the Mishra-03 and Whitley functions of Section 3.4, this hybrid improves both reliability and efficiency compared to BH-S. Indeed, the performance of a 1:1 ratio of BH and BH-S steps is comparable to that of BH for these landscapes. Further, on the landscapes of Section 3.3, this 1:1 ratio achieves performance superior to that of BH and somewhat comparable to that of BH-S. Thus if little is known about the problem’s energy landscape *a priori*, these results indicate that the 1:1 hybrid is to be preferred.

4 Discussion and future work

Basin hopping with skipping (BH-S) is a global optimisation algorithm inspired by both the basin hopping algorithm and the skipping sampler, an MCMC algorithm. As such, the MCMC literature also suggests potential extensions of this work. In adaptive MCMC parameter tuning is an online procedure driven by the progress of the chain [2]. A similar idea has been proposed for BH in [7] and is part of the of the SciPy implementation of the BH method. We believe it could be interesting as future work to devise an adaptive scheme for the halting index K and the standard deviation σ , possibly reducing in this way the amount of tuning required to implement BH-S.

During the preparation of this paper we also explored the idea of sampling several directions and skipping in all of them simultaneously. As a negative finding, we report that preliminary results were clear that computational effort is best spent searching over a single, rather than multiple, directions. Our heuristic explanation is that the line is the shortest route between two sets, and so is the most efficient way to cover distance. An alternative, more sophisticated approach would be to introduce multiple BH-S particles which explore the energy landscape in a coordinated way. This could for instance be inspired by selection-resampling procedures as in sequential Monte Carlo sampling [18], or by an optimisation procedure such as particle swarm optimisation [11].

References

- [1] I. Andricioaei, J.E. Straub, and A.F. Voter. Smart darting Monte Carlo. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 114(16):6994–7000, 2001.

- [2] Yves F. Atchade and Jeffrey S. Rosenthal. On adaptive markov chain monte carlo algorithms. *Bernoulli*, 11(5):815–828, 2005.
- [3] S. Brooks, A. Gelman, G. Jones, and X. Meng. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*. CRC press, 2011.
- [4] Q. Duan and D. Kroese. Splitting for optimization. *Computers & Operations Research*, 73:119–131, 2016.
- [5] D. Gamerman and H. Lopes. *Markov chain Monte Carlo, stochastic simulation for bayesian inference*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2nd edition, 2006.
- [6] A. Gavana. Infinity global optimization benchmarks and *AMPGO*, 2013.
- [7] Ralf Gehrke. *First-principles basin-hopping for the structure determination of atomic clusters*. PhD thesis, Freie Universität Berlin, 2009.
- [8] R. Huang, L. Bi, J. and Li, and Y. Wen. Basin hopping genetic algorithm for global optimization of ptco clusters. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 2020.
- [9] P. Jain and A. M. Agogino. Global optimization using the multistart method. *Journal of Mechanical Design*, 115(4):770–775, December 1993.
- [10] M. Jamil and X. S. Yang. A literature survey of benchmark functions for global optimisation problems. *International Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation*, 4(2):150, 2013.
- [11] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart. Particle swarm optimization. In *Proceedings of ICNN’95 - International Conference on Neural Networks*, volume 4, pages 1942–1948 vol.4, 1995.
- [12] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598):671–680, 1983.
- [13] S. Lan, J. Streets, and B. Shahbaba. Wormhole Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. In *Proceedings of the 28th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1953–1959, 2014.
- [14] R. H. Leary. Global optimization on funneling landscapes. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 18(4):367–383, 2000.
- [15] D. Liu and J. Nocedal. On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 45:503–528, 1989.
- [16] R. Martí. Multi-start methods. In *Handbook of Metaheuristics*, pages 355–368. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- [17] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953.
- [18] Pierre Del Moral, Arnaud Doucet, and Ajay Jasra. Sequential monte carlo samplers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(3):411–436, 2006.
- [19] J. Moriarty, J. Vogrinc, and A. Zocca. A Metropolis-class sampler for targets with non-convex support. *arXiv:1905.09964v2*, 2020.
- [20] B. Olson, I. Hashmi, K. Molloy, and A. Shehu. Basin hopping as a general and versatile optimization framework for the characterization of biological macromolecules. *Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, 2012:1–19, December 2012.








- [21] M. Paleico and J. Behler. A flexible and adaptive grid algorithm for global optimization utilizing basin hopping Monte Carlo. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2020.
- [22] E. Pompe, C. Holmes, and K. Łatuszyński. A framework for adaptive MCMC targeting multimodal distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(5), October 2020.
- [23] G. O Roberts, J. Rosenthal, et al. General state space markov chains and mcmc algorithms. *Probability surveys*, 1:20–71, 2004.
- [24] G. Rondina and J. Da Silva. Revised basin-hopping monte carlo algorithm for structure optimization of clusters and nanoparticles. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9):2282–2298, 2013. PMID: 23957311.
- [25] R. Rubinstein. The cross-entropy method for combinatorial and continuous optimization. *Methodology and computing in applied probability*, 1(2):127–190, 1999.
- [26] M. Schumer and K. Steiglitz. Adaptive step size random search. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 13(3):270–276, June 1968.
- [27] C. Sminchisescu and M. Welling. Generalized Darting Monte Carlo. In Marina Meila and Xiaotong Shen, editors, *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 2, pages 516–523. PMLR, 21–24 Mar 2007.
- [28] C. Sminchisescu, M. Welling, and G. Hinton. A mode-hopping MCMC sampler. Technical report, CSRG-478, University of Toronto, 2003.
- [29] S. Surjanovic and D. Bingham. Virtual library of simulation experiments: test functions and datasets. Retrieved March 9, 2021, from <http://www.sfu.ca/~ssurjano/egg.html>.
- [30] H. Tjelmeland and B.K. Hegstad. Mode jumping proposals in MCMC. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 28(1):205–223, 2001.
- [31] D. Wales and J. Doye. Global optimization by basin-hopping and the lowest energy structures of Lennard-Jones clusters containing up to 110 atoms. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 1997.









Appendix





Table 3 records the results for all landscapes in Figure 1. For each landscape, both BH and BH-S were hand tuned in order to maximise their efficiency as defined in Section 3.1. The following notation is used:

- ρ_c and ρ_s are the reliability of BH and BH-S respectively;
- ϵ_c and ϵ_s are the efficiency of BH and BH-S respectively;
- v_1 is the expected mean jump distance among random walk steps;
- v_s is the expected mean jump distance among skipping transitions, i.e., when $k > 1$;
- \mathbb{P}_s is the probability that, conditional on the BH-S perturbation being accepted, skipping had occurred ($k > 1$);
- ν_1 and ν_s are the expected mean jump distances among random walk steps ($k = 1$) and skipping steps ($k > 1$), respectively.

Table 3: Performance metrics for the BH and BH-S algorithms on all landscapes in Figure 1.

Function	BH				BH-S						
	σ	ρ_c	ϵ_c	ν_1	σ	K	ρ_s	ϵ_s	ν_1	ν_s	\mathbb{P}_s
Carrom Table 	2	99.8	556	1.5	$\sqrt{2}$	10	100	925	2.9	9.4	86.8
Cross in Tray 	2	96.5	446	1.7	$\sqrt{2}$	10	100	676	2.7	9.3	85.1
Cross Leg Table 	0.4	15.5	48	0.8	$\sqrt{2}$	10	12.7	45	1.8	6.6	45.7
Damavandi 	0.1	0.2	3	0.5	0.3	150	32.9	28	N/A	34.9	100
Eggcrate 	1	99.7	377	1	1	10	99.7	647	1.9	7.6	94.8
Egg-holder 	100	2.2	13	12.5	10	25	38.7	116	7.1	178.1	98.6
El Attar Vidyasagar Dutta EAVD 	8	99.6	231	3.2	5	10	63.4	393	4.8	5.8	39.3

	BH				BH-S						
Function	σ	ρ_c	ϵ_c	ν_1	σ	K	ρ_s	ϵ_s	ν_1	ν_s	\mathbb{P}_s
Freudenstein-Roth 	2	82.6	176	1.6	$\sqrt{2}$	10	97.2	551	4.9	11.3	99.5
Holder Table 	2	99.8	453	1.4	$\sqrt{2}$	10	100	695	2.4	9.1	82.4
Keane 	2	47	272	1.8	0.9	25	53.6	301	1.6	12.4	96.6
Mishra-03 	2	65.9	56	1.8	$\sqrt{2}$	10	5.4	17	1.6	12.1	96.7
Modified Rosenbrock 	0.4	5.3	1	0.8	0.4	25	83.8	31	N/A	7.7	100
Price 02 	2	44.4	234	1.8	0.9	25	60.6	208	N/A	17.1	100
Rana 	200	5.5	13	17.6	5	75	20.5	18	1.8	224.5	98.5
Rosenbrock 	0.2	99.3	149	0.6	2	10	100	695	N/A	N/A	0

	BH				BH-S						
Function	σ	ρ_c	ϵ_c	ν_1	σ	K	ρ_s	ϵ_s	ν_1	ν_s	\mathbb{P}_s
Schwefel-07 	10	4.1	38	4	7	25	61.9	275	N/A	181.6	100
Styblinski Tang 	1	99.6	537	1.2	1	10	100	840	N/A	8.7	99.8
Whitley 	0.4	86.4	121	0.7	0.7	50	31.8	21	0.6	17	37.7
Zirilli 	0.2	99.9	707	0.6	$\sqrt{2}$	10	97.9	987	1.9	5.3	49.4