
PARTICLE FILTER OPTIMIZATION: A BAYESIAN APPROACH FOR GLOBAL STOCHASTIC OPTIMIZATION

A PREPRINT

 **Mostafa Eslami**

Department of Electrical Engineering
Sharif University of Technology
Azadi Avenue, Tehran
mostafa.eslami@sharif.edu

 **Maryam Babazadeh**

Department of Electrical Engineering
Sharif University of Technology
Azadi Avenue, Tehran
babazadeh@sharif.edu

June 6, 2024

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a novel global optimization algorithm called Particle Filter Optimization (PFO), designed for a class of stochastic problems. PFO leverages the Bayesian inference framework of Particle Filters (PF) by integrating the optimization problem into the PF estimation process. In this context, the objective function replaces the measurement, and a customized transitional prior is developed to function as state dynamics. This dynamic replaces classic acquisition function and grants the PF a local optimization capability, facilitating its transformation towards global optimization. In PFO, the particles serve as agents in the optimization problem. Given the noisy nature of measured outputs, the Unscented Transform (UT) is utilized to estimate the true mean, thereby reducing the impact of erroneous information on particle transitions and weight updates. The algorithm is designed to minimize the introduction of unnecessary parameters and adheres to theoretically validated PF procedures, resulting in a robust heuristic algorithm supported by rigorous theoretical foundations.

Keywords Bayesian Inference · Estimation Theory · Particle Filters · Unscented Transform · Stochastic Optimization

1 Introduction

Global optimization is a subject of tremendous potential application, encompassing numerous fields such as engineering, economics, and artificial intelligence. Despite significant efforts in research and application over the past two decades, progress in the computational aspects of global optimization has not matched the advancements in digital computing power and the breadth of possible applications. This discrepancy can be attributed to the wide gap between theoretical developments and practical applications, particularly between mathematical and heuristic methods [1].

The practical importance of global optimization, coupled with its inherent complexity, has led to the development of numerous approaches for constructing global optimization methods. These approaches can broadly be categorized into heuristic and non-heuristic methods, though this dichotomy is often blurred. Heuristic methods, which typically offer acceptable solutions within reasonable timeframes but lack rigorous theoretical foundations, have gained prominence due to the relative underdevelopment of mathematical theory in global optimization compared to local optimization [2]. This active research area has attracted experts from various domains, driven by the need to solve difficult optimization problems encountered in practice.

To bridge the gap between theory and practice in global optimization, it is crucial to integrate both theoretical and empirical approaches. This involves not only addressing well-known textbook test functions but also tackling real-life examples under simplified and clear assumptions and conditions [1].

Heuristic algorithms are generally expected to find solutions that are sufficiently close to the optimal rather than the exact best solution [3]. Among these, stochastic optimization methods are particularly notable. Unlike deterministic optimization, stochastic optimization incorporates randomness in different ways, such as random errors in objective

function evaluations, solutions based on random rules, and probabilistic assumptions about the objective function [2]. This paper focuses on stochastic optimization problems where the objective function evaluations are corrupted by random errors, addressing a class of NP problems denoted by \mathcal{N} . Various stochastic optimization methods and algorithms for this subclass are well-documented in the literature [4, 5].

A promising approach within this realm is Bayesian Optimization (BO), which leverages prior and posterior distributions to find global minima of optimization problems. BO is particularly useful for black-box optimization problems that require expensive simulations or experiments, where the objective function may be noisy or noiseless [6]. BO has seen practical applications across industries, demonstrating its utility in various complex optimization tasks [7, 8, 9]. BO achieves optimization by assigning a prior model to the function, capturing prior beliefs, and then sequentially querying the function at points that maximize the acquisition function, balancing exploration and exploitation.

In addition to Bayesian approaches, estimation theory offers medium-term methods in stochastic optimization by treating the objective function as noisy measurements. Examples include the Heuristic Kalman Algorithm (HKA) [10] and the Simulated Kalman Filter (SKF) [11], both of which use Kalman filters to estimate optimal solutions. However, these methods often fall short in guaranteeing convergence to global minima, primarily due to their heuristic nature and limitations in handling complex, multi-modal optimization problems [12].

This paper proposes a novel optimization approach that utilizes prior optimization variables and posterior objective function distributions. It introduces a new method for search space prediction and a theoretically validated measurement likelihood for updating the positions of optimization variables. One of the key innovations is the application of a dynamical system approach instead of the traditional acquisition function used in Bayesian optimization. The dynamics of the black-box optimization function, influenced by the natural tendency of its output towards a minimum state, replace the static acquisition function. This tendency is directed using a utility function over the distribution of sigma points, identified through the Unscented Transform (UT), to determine the mean and covariance at selected search space points. Given that the output measurements are noisy, UT effectively estimates the true mean [13]. UT also helps reduce the impact of incorrect information on particle transitions and weight updates in the Particle Filter (PF).

This local and probabilistic search space prediction covers both promising and non-promising areas by rigorously applying filter theory. The PF agents are employed due to their global optimization capabilities and potential for parallel computing [14]. PFs, which are Sequential Monte-Carlo (SMC) based filters, utilize particle representations of probability densities [15]. In PF, the particles act as agents or populations in heuristic optimizations, probabilistically identifying local minima and collectively moving towards global minima while retaining a non-zero probability of exploring unvisited spaces. Particles gain weight through the posterior likelihood of output (measurements). To adapt PF from state estimation to optimization, the likelihood posterior is redefined based on the deviation between global minima and particle-measured values. The robust theoretical foundation of PF allows for narrowing the gap between mathematical theory and practical application, though the pragmatic selection of the weight update equation is still required. The proposed optimization algorithm is named Particle Filter Optimization (PFO).

This paper is structured as follows. Section 3 defines the stochastic optimization problem under study and outlines a series of assumptions pertinent to the problem. Next, heuristic optimization algorithms are introduced, with a focus on Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [16]. This introduction sets the stage for the estimation-based optimization scheme using the Particle Filter (PF), discussed in Section 4. At the end of this section, the proposed Particle Filter Optimization (PFO) algorithm is presented. Section 5 tests the implemented PFO on several predefined stochastic problems. This section introduces a novel choice for transitional prior or local update distribution, surveys multiple examples to evaluate PFO performance, and includes a random sampling-based parameter sensitivity analysis.

2 Nomenclature

| | |
|---|---|
| \mathbb{R}^n | Real values of dimension n |
| x | Optimization variable |
| \mathcal{N} | Class of general stochastic optimization problem with randomness in evaluation of objective function $h(x)$ |
| \mathcal{C} | Sub-class of \mathcal{N} with additive noise $v(x)$ to $h(x)$ |
| $H(x)$ | Black-boxed objective function and member of \mathcal{C} , i.e. $H(x) = h(x) + v(x)$ |
| x_k | Evaluated optimization variable at iteration k -th |
| \hat{x}_k | Estimation of x at iteration k -th |
| y_k | Measure of objective function at iteration k -th, i.e. $y_k = H(x_k)$ |
| \hat{y}_k | Estimation of measurement objective function at iteration k -th |
| $p(A B)$ | Conditional power density function of A given B , the same definition is true for $q(A B)$ |
| w_k | Weight of particles at iteration k -th |
| $(\cdot)^i$ | Superscript i refers to i -th particle |
| P^{xx} | Covariance matrix of random variable x at iteration k -th |
| C^{xy} | Cross covariance matrix of random variables x and y |
| $\underline{\lambda}(A)$ | Minimum eigenvalue of matrix A |
| $\overline{\lambda}(A)$ | Maximum eigenvalue of matrix A |
| $\mathcal{N}(a, Q)$ | Normal distribution of average a and covariance Q |
| $\mathcal{X}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_x}$ | Sigma point j of random variable x in UT |
| $\mathcal{Y}^j \in \mathbb{R}$ | Transformed sigma point \mathcal{X}^j |

3 Problem Statement

Let the problem under study be denoted by \mathcal{C} , and let $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ be the domain of allowable values for the optimization variable x . The problem \mathcal{C} aims to find the value(s) of the vector $x \in \mathbb{D}$ that minimize a noisy scalar-valued loss function $h(x)$. Stochastic search and optimization are involved if there is random noise in the measurement of $h(x)$ or if there is a random choice made in the search direction as the algorithm iterates toward a solution [17]. Clearly, \mathcal{C} is a subset of the general stochastic optimization class \mathcal{N} . Let \hat{x}_k be the generic notation for the estimate of x at the k -th iteration. Due to the definition of stochastic optimization, \hat{x}_k will always be a random vector. The following notation will be used throughout this paper to represent a noisy measurement:

$$H(x) = h(x) + v(x) \quad (1)$$

where $v(x)$ is the noise content in the measurement $h(x)$. The noise is considered a function of x . Let y_k be defined as the evaluated value of $H(x_k)$ at the k -th iteration, i.e., $y_k = H(x_k)$. Therefore, the objective value at the estimated optimization variable is denoted by \hat{y}_k , i.e., $\hat{y}_k = H(\hat{x}_k)$. Throughout this paper, we assume that only the measurements are available, and the true knowledge of $H(x)$ and its analytic description is missing. The following summarizes the assumptions in the definition of problem \mathcal{C} .

Assumption 1. The analytic expression of $H(x)$ is not available, but its point-wise evaluations are measured.

Assumption 2. The measurement noise is normal, and its covariance is known to be R .

The problem defined here belongs to a sub-class of NP problems that are fast to check but slow to solve. Since we cannot guarantee that all problems in \mathcal{N} are reducible to \mathcal{C} in polynomial time, the problem may not be a member of the associated NP-complete class, although some references consider it to be NP-complete [2]. Nonetheless, the problem is still hard to solve and general enough to be considered a sub-class of \mathcal{N} .

Conjecture 1. The class \mathcal{C} problems are a sub-class of \mathcal{N} and NP.

A heuristic algorithm is designed to solve problems more quickly and efficiently than traditional methods by sacrificing optimality, accuracy, precision, or completeness for speed. Heuristic algorithms are often used to solve NP-complete problems, a class of decision problems where no known efficient way to find a solution quickly and accurately exists, although solutions can be verified when given. Heuristics can produce a solution individually or be used to provide a good baseline and be supplemented with optimization algorithms. They are most often employed when approximate solutions are sufficient and exact solutions are computationally expensive [18]. Such algorithms can find very good results without any guarantee of reaching the global optimum; often, there is no other choice but to use them.

There are generally two phases in solving NP problems using heuristic algorithms:

- Phase I (Diversification): This is a global exploration step. The algorithm explores the entire domain to determine potentially good subregions for future investigation.
- Phase II (Intensification): This is a local exploitation step. Local optimization algorithms are applied to determine the final solution.

For example, Algorithm 1 belongs to the Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) algorithm [3]. PSO is based on the observation that groups of individuals work together to improve not only their collective performance on some tasks but also each individual's performance. It propagates its optimization variables' particles based on probabilistic velocity updates. Velocity is likely to change based on the best individual, neighbors, or global experiences. The level of influence is parameterized and determines the balance between diversification and intensification (lines 4 to 11). At the end of this part of the algorithm, the new position of the particles updates to the minimum solution found so far for each. Finally, at line 12, the global minimum solution will be the corresponding solution to the lowest objective value of the best individuals.

It is evident that this algorithm cannot find the minima of \mathcal{C} problems because it cannot differentiate between the noise content of a measurement and the true value of the objective. Despite probabilistic velocity updates, the local minimum and global minimum functions are deterministic. Therefore, the literature emerged on developing PSO for noisy data optimization [19]. Additionally, to empirically solve an optimization problem, the balance scenario should be skewed through optimization steps, generally with large diversification at the start and higher intensification at the end. Therefore, inevitably, the degree of best influences should be adapted to the problems. This may result in an unstable algorithm or getting stuck in local minima. It is also worth noting that the best influence factors (i.e., ϕ_b , ϕ_n , and ϕ_g) are randomly selected, and there is no statistical relationship between them or the velocities (next solutions or particle positions). We will see in the next sections that the velocity update equation is similar to the transitional prior in Particle Filter (PF), and the best individual selection is equivalent to particle weight updates based on measurement likelihood probability.

```

Data:  $N$  [Number of particles]
Result:  $g$  [global best solution],  $y_b$  [function value at best solution]
1  $x_i \sim (x_{max} - x_{min})U[0, 1] + x_{min}$ ;
2  $v_i \sim (v_{max} - v_{min})U[0, 1] + v_{min}$ ;
3 while termination criteria do
4   for  $i = 1 : N$  do
5      $H_i = \sigma$  nearest neighbors of  $x_i$ ;
6      $h_i = \arg \min_x \{h(x) : x \in H_i\}$ ;
7     Generate random vectors  $\phi_p$ ,  $\phi_n$  and  $\phi_g$ ;
8      $v_i = v_i + \phi_p \cdot (b_i - x_i) + \phi_n \cdot (h_i - x_i) + \phi_g (g - x_i)$ ;
9      $x_i = x_i + v_i$ ;
10     $b_i = \arg \min \{h(x_i), h(b_i)\}$ ;
11  end
12   $g = \arg \min \{h(\mathbf{b})\}$ ;
13   $y_b = h(g)$ 
14 end

```

Algorithm 1: Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) Algorithm – an example of heuristic optimization

4 Particle Filter Optimization (PFO)

Importance sampling is a general Monte-Carlo (MC) integration method that provides a recursive solution to nonlinear filtering problems using a Bayesian approach. The key idea in the PF is to represent the required posterior density function by a set of random samples with associated weights. Then, estimates are computed using these samples and weights. Samples evolve based on a proposal density function $q(x_k | x_{k-1}, y_k)$, and weight updates are based on the following equation:

$$w_k^i \propto w_{k-1}^i \frac{p(y_k | x_k^i) p(x_k^i | x_{k-1}^i)}{q(x_k^i | x_{k-1}^i, y_k)}. \quad (2)$$

The choice of importance density is one of the most critical issues in the design of a particle filter. The optimal importance density function that minimizes the variance of importance weights is $p(x_k | x_{k-1}^i, y_k)$ [20]. This posterior

can be written for particle i as:

$$p(x_k^i | x_{k-1}^i, y_k) = \frac{p(y_k | x_k^i, x_{k-1}^i) p(x_k^i | x_{k-1}^i)}{p(y_k | x_{k-1}^i)}. \quad (3)$$

Substituting this equation into (2) yields:

$$w_k^i \propto w_{k-1}^i p(y_k | x_{k-1}^i). \quad (4)$$

These series of equations utilize sampling from the optimal proposal density and $p(y_k | x_{k-1}^i)$, which requires their analytical expressions. The analytical evolution of these posteriors is difficult in most cases, except for some special Gaussian problems [20]. Therefore, suboptimal methods that approximate the optimal importance density have been developed. The most popular choice is the transitional prior for the proposal density, i.e., $p(x_k | x_{k-1}^i)$. Substituting this into (2) yields:

$$w_k^i \propto w_{k-1}^i p(y_k | x_k^i). \quad (5)$$

This type of PF is known as the Bootstrap Particle Filter (BPF), also known as the Sequential Importance Resampling (SIR) filter. BPF suffers from the lack of measurement in the transitional prior, which leads to the generation of unnecessary particles that are not in interest of the likelihood distribution. In the initial iterations, only a few particles will be assigned a high weight, causing particle degeneration. However, the assumptions on the BPF are very weak:

Assumption 3. The state dynamics and measurement functions need to be known.

Assumption 4. It is required to be able to sample realizations from the process noise distribution and from the prior.

Assumption 5. The likelihood function needs to be available for point-wise evaluation (at least up to proportionality).

A generic algorithm for BPF is presented in Algorithm 2. These weak assumptions and the suboptimal choice of proposal density have encouraged researchers to slightly manipulate the generic procedure to obtain more efficient filters as variants of BPF. Methods like resampling, roughening, and regularizing have been developed for practical applications [15]. Methods exist to encourage the particles to be in the right place (in the region of high likelihood) by incorporating the current observation. One such method is the auxiliary particle filter (ASIR), which introduces intermediate distributions between the prior and likelihood [21]. The basic idea in ASIR is to perform the resampling step at time $k-1$ (using the available measurement at time k), before the particles are propagated to time k . In this way, the ASIR filter attempts to mimic the sequence of steps carried out when the optimal importance density is available [15].

The allowance for mimicking the optimal importance density via current measurement, along with the aforementioned assumptions, are the building blocks of the proposed optimization algorithm in this paper.

| |
|---|
| <pre> Data: N [Number of particles], $p(x_k x_{k-1}^i)$ and $p(y_k x_k^i)$ Result: \hat{x}_k and P_k^{xx} 1 $x_0^i \sim (x_{max} - x_{min})U[0, 1] + x_{min}$; 2 $w_0^i = 1/N$; 3 for $i = 1 : N$ do 4 Draw $x_k^i \sim p(x_k x_{k-1}^i)$; 5 Calculate $\tilde{w}_k^i = w_{k-1}^i p(y_k x_k^i)$; 6 end 7 $w_k^i = \tilde{w}_k^i / \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{w}_k^i$; 8 $\hat{x}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i x_k^i$; /* this is a MMSE estimation */ 9 $P_k^{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i (x_k^i - \hat{x}_k)(x_k^i - \hat{x}_k)^T$; /* this is empirical covariance matrix */ </pre> |
|---|

Algorithm 2: Bootstrap Particle Filter (BPF)

4.1 Proposition

An alternative intuition for the PF presented here demonstrates a close connection between estimation and optimization problems. The PF propagates the last found representative of states (x_{k-1}^i - optimization variables) through a transitional prior, i.e., $p(x_k^i | x_{k-1}^i)$, then harvests the most promising estimates by comparing the actual measurement (y_k) and estimated output (\hat{y}_k) based on the likelihood posterior. Since the states of the system under estimation are more

likely to follow their dynamical trajectory, propagation through the transitional prior makes sense. However, if we could propagate based on the knowledge of the last obtained measurements, generating more particles close to the true solution could enhance estimation performance.

Now consider an optimization problem with the last placed agents at x_{k-1}^i (particles in PF). Analogous to the estimation problem, we want to find the best x_k^i based on current and past observations (measurements) of objective values. In other words, an optimal optimizer should assign the best trajectory to each particle to promisingly travel from a random initial place to the global minimum. This trajectory equals the system dynamics or perhaps the transitional prior in estimation. A small change in the perception of likelihood in estimation theory transforms the PF algorithm into a global minima optimizer. Let the likelihood be defined as the probability of error in the measured output and estimated global minimum (i.e., $y_k - \hat{y}_k$). In other words, we assign weight to the particles based on their distance between the measured and estimated objective values, while the estimated objective value is likely to converge to the global minimum due to transitional prior local decisions. Let us hereafter name the proposed optimizer the Particle Filter Optimization algorithm, or PFO for short.

PFO acts as a global optimizer with unique diversification and intensification phases. In PSO, the particles evolve through a velocity update influenced by the best individual and group observations, and then a deterministic minimizer selects the bests. Therefore, the influences are not adapted to the past and current observations. Unlike PSO, the degree of influence and weight assignment in PFO are all probabilistic, making it smarter and more robust. Also, the diversification phase in PFO is coupled with intensification and guarantees a non-zero probability of searching unexplored domains of the search space. In PFO, the most weighted particles are responsible for global minimum estimation. In other words, particles with higher uncertainty are likely to explore the search space for possible new minima, while lower uncertain particles weight up based on the current estimated solution and exploit for improvement in the current solution. Simply, they present the advantages of PF that appear in PFO.

Due to the probabilistic manner of PFO in diversification and intensification, and the randomness in problem \mathcal{C} , it is vital that the local optimizer or transitional prior does not provide false information and does not miss the search space between iterations. Such a transitional prior will be introduced next, following a brief introduction to the algorithm itself.

4.2 PFO Algorithm

As discussed in previous sections, the PFO is a global optimization algorithm that may be classified as heuristic or metaheuristic. It can solve class- \mathcal{C} problems and is population or particle-based. Its algorithm is similar to the Particle Filter (PF), with small deviations as demonstrated in Algorithm 3. Specifically, lines 5 to 9 and line 14 are appended. These lines are just overhead calculations for the transitional prior and the best empirical objective value estimate so far (i.e., \hat{y}_k), respectively. Other appended lines are supplementary calculations for deriving the exit and termination conditions (i.e., P_k^{xx} and P_k^{yy}).

The algorithm begins with an initial uniform distribution of particles in the domain \mathbb{D} with equal weights. Then, based on the transitional prior, the positions of the particles are updated, mimicking the optimal proposal density. This is done by feeding the current best estimate information into the transitional prior. As described earlier, the new positions of the particles should not deliver false information to the likelihood density. Therefore, the Unscented Transform (UT) is utilized to estimate the true mean and covariance of the generated particles. These modified measures are passed to the likelihood density to form new weights. Simply, the nearest solutions to the last best estimate will probably gain higher weight, while others will lose their weight. The weighted particles participate in the next best solution estimate, while declined particles will explore the space for possible new solutions. This cycle does not have any end, so empirical criteria for termination must be defined. Hence, as input to the algorithm for the degree of uncertainty in the final found solution, the empirical covariances P_k^{xx} and P_k^{yy} are introduced. The performance, robustness, and parameter sensitivity of this algorithm are checked for several example functions in the following section. First, in the next subsection, the transitional prior or local update function will be explained in detail.

```

Data:  $N$  [Number of particles],  $p(x_k|x_{k-1}^i)$ ,  $p(y_k|x_k^i)$ ,  $P_k^{xx}$  and  $P_k^{yy}$ 
Result:  $\hat{x}_k, \hat{y}_k$ 
1  $x_0^i \sim (x_{max} - x_{min})U[0, 1] + x_{min}$ ;
2  $w_0^i = 1/N$ ;
3 for  $i = 1 : N$  do
4   Draw  $x_k^i \sim p(x_k|x_{k-1}^i)$ ; /* this is local update function to find best neighbors */
5    $P_k^{x^i} = (x_k^i - \hat{x}_{k-1})(x_k^i - \hat{x}_{k-1})^T + Q$ ;
6    $\mathcal{X}^j = x_k^i \pm \left( \sqrt{(\lambda + n_x)P_k^{x^i}} \right)_j$ ;  $j = 1 : (2n_x + 1)$ ; /*  $(A)_j$  is the  $j$ th row of  $A$  */
7    $\mathcal{Y}^j = h(\mathcal{X}^j)$ ;
8    $y_k^i = \sum_{j=1}^{2n_x+1} \mathcal{W}^j \mathcal{Y}^j$ ;
9    $P_k^{y^i} = \sum_{j=1}^{2n_x+1} \mathcal{W}^j (\mathcal{Y}^j - y_k^i)(\mathcal{Y}^j - y_k^i)^T + R$ ;
10  Calculate  $\tilde{w}_k^i = w_{k-1}^i p(y_k|x_k^i)$ ;
11 end
12  $w_k^i = \tilde{w}_k^i / \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{w}_k^i$ ;
13  $\hat{x}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i x_k^i$ ; /* this is a MMSE estimation for best global solution */
14  $\hat{y}_k = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i y_k^i$ ; /* this is a MMSE estimation for best global objective value */
15  $P_k^{xx} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i (x_k^i - \hat{x}_k)(x_k^i - \hat{x}_k)^T$ ; /* this is empirical covariance matrix */
16  $P_k^{yy} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_k^i (y_k^i - \hat{y}_k)(y_k^i - \hat{y}_k)^T$ ; /* this is empirical covariance matrix */

```

Algorithm 3: Particle Filter Optimization (PFO) Algorithm

4.3 Transitional prior / Local update function

In PFO, the $p(x_k^i|x_{k-1}^i)$ can be any arbitrary density function that satisfies the following conditions:

- Condition 1.** the transitional prior should encourage particles near the best estimated solution for exploitation,
- Condition 2.** the transitional prior should encourage particles far from the best estimated solution for exploration,
- Condition 3.** the transitional prior should contain uncertainty or noise content to escape from possible high cycles and ensure a non-zero probability for unexplored areas in the search space,
- Condition 4.** the transitional prior should span the search space between iterations (the particles' motions should be smoothed and not miss the search space).

Since the UT is utilized to pass the true mean and covariance to the likelihood density, one option is to use covariance ellipsoids. Let the augmented state vector be defined as:

$$\xi = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X}^1 & \mathcal{Y}^1 \\ \mathcal{X}^2 & \mathcal{Y}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{X}^{2n_x+1} & \mathcal{Y}^{2n_x+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{X}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_x}$ and $\mathcal{Y}^j \in \mathbb{R}$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2n_x + 1$ are sigma points and their transformed values after UT, respectively. Using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [22], the covariance matrix of ξ , denoted by C_{xy} , contains the information on data spreads in the generalized-space (the space augmented by optimization variables with the output variable). Using the covariance matrix for each particle allows us to satisfy the first two conditions, i.e., Conditions 1 and 2, because the distant particle from the estimated minima has a higher spread (its covariance matrix's largest eigenvalue is high), which means more exploration. On the other hand, the particle near the estimated minima has less data spread (its covariance matrix's largest eigenvalue is low), hence exploits the area. It just requires a smart move to possibly span the space between iterations in quest of Condition 4.

It can be empirically done using eigenvalue/eigenvector structure analysis. Figure 1 displays the proposed method for particle motions in 2D (it's readily generalizable for higher dimensions). As this figure demonstrates, based on the direction of data spread (sign of corresponding off-diagonal element in the covariance matrix) and based on the position

of the ellipsoid mean value (center) with respect to the estimated solution, the step size is half of the largest/smallest eigenvalue ($\bar{\lambda}(C_{xy})/2$ or $\underline{\lambda}(C_{xy})/2$). Then, if the ellipsoid contains the estimated solution, the minimum of the largest/smallest eigenvalue and the distance between the ellipsoid center and estimated solution, i.e., $|d_{k-1}^i|$, will be the step size of particle i at step k . In both scenarios, the direction of particle motion will be toward the estimated solution.

To avoid high cycles and ensure a non-zero probability for unvisited places in the search space, satisfying Condition 3, a zero-mean noise with normal distribution and covariance Q is added to the transitional prior. Therefore, the particle's local update function or transitional prior can be written as:

$$x_k^i \sim N(x_{k-1}^i + |l_{k-1}^i| d_{k-1}^i, Q) \quad (7)$$

To provide empirical insight into the particle motions under the command of this transitional prior, Figure 2 illustrates particle covariance ellipsoids, sigma points (\times markers), and their mean value (\square markers) for 9 steps in an example problem for $N = 5$ (problem number 2 in Table 1). The $*$ marker shows the best solution found at iterations with the corresponding sigma point and covariance ellipsoid in black. The red circle represents the actual minima.

Roughly speaking, these plots show that the magnet and blue particles are exploring the area until iteration 7 and then settle down near the estimated minima. At the same time, the cyan, gray, and yellow particles are exploiting to find a better solution near the actual best.




Figure 1: Local update function or state transitional prior function




Figure 2: Particle motions in iterations




5 Evaluation of PFO Through Example Sets


5.1 Example Set 1

Performance and robustness of the proposed PFO algorithm are tested using the example functions presented in Table 1. The robustness is checked through 10 Monte Carlo trials. The algorithm parameters presented in this table are tuned ad-hoc. Figures 3 to 6 display the problem's data spread and the best-found solution in (a), while (b) demonstrates the statistical RMSE for each step over the Monte Carlo trials. The plots indicate high confidence in finding the global minima within pre-determined uncertainty bounds.

| Functions | k_{max} | N | λ | Q | P_{min}^{xx} | P_{min}^{yy} | R |
|--|-----------|------|-----------|------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| $H_1(x) = -\sin(x)(x-2)^2 + v$ | 100 | 1200 | 1 | 1e-8 | 1e-5 | 1e-5 | 0.5 |
| $H_2(x) = (x-1)^2 + v$ | 100 | 200 | 1 | 1e-8 | 1e-5 | 1e-5 | 0.5 |
| $H_3(x) = (x-1)^2 + \cos(10(x-0.1)) + v$ | 30 | 500 | 1 | 1e-8 | 5e-5 | 5e-5 | 0.5 |
| $H_4(x) = -\sin(x)(x-2)^2 + vx$ | 50 | 1000 | 1 | 1e-8 | 3e-5 | 3e-5 | 0.5 |

Table 1: Example functions

Figure 3: Result of PFO for function $H_1(x)$ Figure 4: Result of PFO for function $H_2(x)$ Figure 5: Result of PFO for function $H_3(x)$




Figure 6: Result of PFO for function $H_4(x)$


5.2 Example Set 2: CEC 2005 Benchmark

The IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC) annually reports benchmark functions to evaluate proposed new optimization algorithms. In this paper, the PFO is tested for functions number 1 and 4 introduced in the 2005 technical report [23], i.e., $f_1(x)$ and $f_4(x)$. In this technical report, 25 benchmark functions are provided, and experiments are conducted on some real-parameter optimization algorithms. Although the introduced functions are not in the class of target noisy functions in this paper, normal noise can deliberately be added to the output. On the other hand, its performance can be compared with other algorithms for zero noise with some minor modifications. However, due to its computational overhead for uncertainty treatment, the algorithm is not best suited for non-noisy measurements. It is likely to have a longer runtime compared to other heuristic algorithms such as PSO. Hence, the low-dimensional case, e.g., $D = 1$, is the focus of this comparison. Table 2 contains the parameter set examined in the comparison. Figs. 7 to 10 illustrate the algorithm's performance.

| Functions | k_{max} | N | N_{thr} | λ | Q | P_{min}^{xx} | P_{min}^{yy} | R |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| $H_5(x) = f_1(x) + v$ | 100 | 500 | $N/2$ | 1 | $1e-8$ | $1e-8$ | $1e-8$ | 10 |
| $H_6(x) = f_1(x)$ | 100 | 500 | $N/2$ | 1 | $1e-8$ | $1e-16$ | $1e-16$ | 0 |
| $H_7(x) = f_4(x) + v$ | 100 | 500 | $N/2$ | 1 | $1e-8$ | $1e-8$ | $1e-8$ | 10 |
| $H_8(x) = f_4(x)$ | 100 | 500 | $N/2$ | 1 | $1e-8$ | $1e-16$ | $1e-16$ | 0 |

Table 2: Two CEC 2005 example functions' parameter table

Figure 7: Result of PFO for function $H_5(x)$ Figure 8: Result of PFO for function $H_6(x)$ Figure 9: Result of PFO for function $H_7(x)$

Figure 10: Result of PFO for function $H_8(x)$

Here, the PFO is compared to the PSO. Since in both benchmark functions and PSO algorithm the measurement is deterministic, some minor modification in the PFO is necessary to be able to compare them fairly. The modification should take place at lines 13 and 14 in Algorithm 3, where minimum global solutions and their associated measurements are computed. Since the measurement is deterministic, or at least deterministic in the direction of the minima, the best global solution is selected based on Maximum a Posteriori (MAP) estimation of the likelihood. It should be noted that the deterministic selection of the global minimum completely alters the PFO and ruins its implication. It is also assumed that the algorithm is aware of the optimal solution to check the termination condition, i.e., terminal error less than $1e-8$. Table 3 contains the chosen parameter set of the PSO algorithm (based on homework 5), and Table 4 shows the comparison between PSO and PFO for 25 Monte Carlo trials. It is evident that PSO performs better than PFO even though the best solution is found with both of them. Instead, PSO is unable to find the minima of functions in class- \mathcal{C} .

| Functions | N | v_{max} | $\phi_{P,max}$ | $\phi_{N,max}$ | $\phi_{G,max}$ | w_{max} | w_{min} |
|-----------|-----|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| $H_6(x)$ | 150 | 2.26 | 0.37 | 3.68 | 7.4 | 0.9 | 0.25 |
| $H_8(x)$ | 150 | 7.18 | 0.32 | 7.0 | 8.05 | 0.9 | 0.15 |

Table 3: PSO parameters

| FES | Criteria | $H_6(x)$, PSO | $H_6(x)$, PFO | $H_8(x)$, PSO | $H_8(x)$, PFO |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1e3 | 1st (best) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| | 7th | 0.0000 | 0.0007 | 0.0000 | 0.0051 |
| | 13th (median) | 0.0006 | 0.0023 | 0.0004 | 0.0103 |
| | 19th | 0.0019 | 0.0091 | 0.0013 | 0.0256 |
| | 25th (worst) | 0.0053 | 0.0561 | 0.0060 | 0.3606 |
| | mean | 0.0012 | 0.0096 | 0.0011 | 0.0416 |
| | std | 0.0016 | 0.0151 | 0.0016 | 0.0819 |
| | 1e4 | 1st (best) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 7th | | 0.0000 | 0.0008 | 0.0000 | 0.0055 |
| 13th (median) | | 0.0000 | 0.0026 | 0.0000 | 0.0095 |
| 19th | | 0.0000 | 0.0086 | 0.0000 | 0.0270 |
| 25th (worst) | | 0.0000 | 0.0556 | 0.0002 | 0.3410 |
| mean | | 0.0000 | 0.0097 | 0.0000 | 0.0409 |
| std | | 0.0000 | 0.0149 | 0.0000 | 0.0792 |

Table 4: Comparison of PSO and PFO for functions $H_6(x)$ and $H_8(x)$

5.3 Parameter analysis

In order to analyze the effect of parameter selection on the optimization error, a random sampling method is utilized [24]. Results of random sampling for 200 samples are depicted in Figure 11. The results suggest the following conjectures in parameter selection.

Conjecture 2. It is likely to reach a better solution with *lower* maximum number of iterations and unscented transform scaling factor (k_{max} and λ) when the number of particles and state transition covariance (N and Q) are *high*. Results suggest a correlation between k_{max} and N , and between λ and Q .

Conjecture 3. It is likely to reach a better solution with *higher* maximum number of iterations and unscented transform scaling factor (k_{max} and λ) when the number of particles and state transition covariance (N and Q) are *low*.

Conjecture 4. A *moderate* choice for maximum number of iterations and unscented transform scaling factor (k_{max} and λ) is likely to result in a better solution when the number of particles and state transition covariance (N and Q) are *moderate*.

Conjecture 5. The patterns given in Conjectures 2 to 4 are more important than the parameter values if a good initial guess is considered in the chain of parameters. This leads to low sensitivity to parameter variations.

Conjecture 6. Conjectures 2 to 5 are the same for optimization errors in each direction (i.e. x , y and (x, y)).




Figure 11: Random sampling results

6 Conclusion

It was provisioned from the beginning to adhere theoretical supports to heuristic global optimization algorithm in stochastic optimization problem. The proposed algorithm in this paper under highlighted assumptions nailed this objective. Although, more work is needed to modify the weight update equation based on given information in the transitional prior to maximize this support. The algorithm benefits from a low number of parameters, which are easily tuned based on basic conjectures. Eventually, two problem sets are attempted by the PFO with promising results and based on Monte-Carlo trials, it has shown robustness. Since the intuition behind the PFO development is based on the uncertainty in the measurements, performance downgrade for deterministic problems is evident. The performance of the PFO is compared with the PSO in noise-free problems. The PSO showed statistically better performance; however, the best-found solution over Monte-Carlos was the same. Indeed, the PSO fails to optimize stochastic class-C problems.

References

- [1] J. Mockus, *Bayesian approach to global optimization: theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012, vol. 37.
- [2] A. Zhigljavsky and A. Zilinskas, *Stochastic global optimization*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007, vol. 9.
- [3] D. Simon, *Evolutionary optimization algorithms*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [4] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [5] K. Marti, *Stochastic optimization methods*. Springer, 2005, vol. 2.
- [6] Z. Chen, S. Mak, and C. J. Wu, “A hierarchical expected improvement method for bayesian optimization,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [7] J. Chen, S. Mak, V. R. Joseph, and C. Zhang, “Function-on-function kriging, with applications to three-dimensional printing of aortic tissues,” *Technometrics*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 384–395, 2021.
- [8] S. Mak, C.-L. Sung, X. Wang, S.-T. Yeh, Y.-H. Chang, V. R. Joseph, V. Yang, and C. J. Wu, “An efficient surrogate model for emulation and physics extraction of large eddy simulations,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 113, no. 524, pp. 1443–1456, 2018.
- [9] T. Dasgupta, C. Ma, V. R. Joseph, Z. Wang, and C. J. Wu, “Statistical modeling and analysis for robust synthesis of nanostructures,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 103, no. 482, pp. 594–603, 2008.
- [10] R. Toscano and P. Lyonnet, “Heuristic kalman algorithm for solving optimization problems,” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1231–1244, 2009.
- [11] Z. Ibrahim, N. A. Aziz, N. A. A. Aziz, S. Razali, M. I. Shapii, S. Nawawi, and M. Mohamad, “A kalman filter approach for solving unimodal optimization problems,” *ICIC Express Lett*, vol. 9, no. 12, pp. 3415–3422, 2015.
- [12] X.-S. Yang, *Nature-inspired metaheuristic algorithms*. Luniver press, 2010.
- [13] D. Simon, *Optimal state estimation: Kalman, H infinity, and nonlinear approaches*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [14] J. Wang, S. C. Clark, E. Liu, and P. I. Frazier, “Parallel bayesian global optimization of expensive functions,” *Operations Research*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 1850–1865, 2020.
- [15] N. Gordon, B. Ristic, and S. Arulampalam, “Beyond the kalman filter: Particle filters for tracking applications,” *Artech House, London*, vol. 830, p. 5, 2004.
- [16] J. Kennedy, “Particle swarm optimization,” *Encyclopedia of machine learning*, pp. 760–766, 2010.
- [17] J. C. Spall, *Introduction to stochastic search and optimization: estimation, simulation, and control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2005, vol. 65.
- [18] S. A. Cook, “An overview of computational complexity,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 400–408, 1983.
- [19] S. Taghiyeh and J. Xu, “A new particle swarm optimization algorithm for noisy optimization problems,” *Swarm Intelligence*, vol. 10, pp. 161–192, 2016.
- [20] A. Doucet, S. Godsill, and C. Andrieu, “On sequential monte carlo sampling methods for bayesian filtering,” *Statistics and computing*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 197–208, 2000.
- [21] M. K. Pitt and N. Shephard, “Filtering via simulation: Auxiliary particle filters,” *Journal of the American statistical association*, vol. 94, no. 446, pp. 590–599, 1999.

-
- [22] I. Jolliffe, *Principal component analysis*. Springer, 2011.
 - [23] P. N. Suganthan, N. Hansen, J. J. Liang, K. Deb, Y.-P. Chen, A. Auger, and S. Tiwari, “Problem definitions and evaluation criteria for the cec 2005 special session on real-parameter optimization,” *KanGAL report*, vol. 2005005, p. 2005, 2005.
 - [24] N. Franken, “Visual exploration of algorithm parameter space,” in *2009 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 389–398.