

Accuracy Can Lie: On the Impact of Surrogate Model in Configuration Tuning

Pengzhou Chen, Jingzhi Gong, Tao Chen

Abstract—To ease the expensive measurements during configuration tuning, it is natural to build a surrogate model as the replacement of the system, and thereby the configuration performance can be cheaply evaluated. Yet, a stereotype therein is that the higher the model accuracy, the better the tuning result would be, or vice versa. This “accuracy is all” belief drives our research community to build more and more accurate models and criticize a tuner for the inaccuracy of the model used. However, this practice raises some previously unaddressed questions, e.g., are the model and its accuracy really that important for the tuning result? Do those somewhat small accuracy improvements reported (e.g., a few % error reduction) in existing work really matter much to the tuners? What role does model accuracy play in the impact of tuning quality? To answer those related questions, in this paper, we conduct one of the largest-scale empirical studies to date—running over the period of 13 months 24×7 —that covers 10 models, 17 tuners, and 29 systems from the existing works while under four different commonly used metrics, leading to 13,612 cases of investigation. Surprisingly, our key findings reveal that the accuracy can lie: there are a considerable number of cases where higher accuracy actually leads to no improvement in the tuning outcomes (up to 58% cases under certain setting), or even worse, it can degrade the tuning quality (up to 24% cases under certain setting). We also discover that the chosen models in most proposed tuners are sub-optimal and that the required % of accuracy change to significantly improve tuning quality varies according to the range of model accuracy. Deriving from the fitness landscape analysis, we provide in-depth discussions of the rationale behind, offering several lessons learned as well as insights for future opportunities. Most importantly, this work poses a clear message to the community: we should take one step back from the natural “accuracy is all” belief for model-based configuration tuning.

Index Terms—Search-based software engineering, software configuration tuning, performance optimization, configurable systems, model-based optimization, heuristic algorithms, hyperparameter tuning, fitness landscape analysis.



1 INTRODUCTION

MODERN software systems are often designed with great flexibility, containing a vast number of configuration options to satisfy diverse needs [77], [99]. Yet, this flexibility comes with a cost: it has been shown that the system configuration, if not set appropriately, can cause devastating issues to the performance (e.g., throughput, runtime, or latency), leaving the full potential of a system untapped. For example, a study found that 59% of the severe performance bugs worldwide are caused by poor configuration [42]; Jamshidi and Casale [45] reveal that the best configuration of streaming software STORM lead to a throughput which is $480\times$ better than that of the default one. Therefore, configuration tuning that aims to search for the optimal configuration according to a performance attribute at deployment time is of high importance during the software quality assurance phase.

However, simply traversing the entire configuration space to find the optimum is unlikely to succeed, due to two reasons: (1) the number of configuration options, and hence the resulting configuration space, has been increasing dramatically [99]. For instance, even after the performance-sensitive configuration options have been elicited, the com-

piler SAC still involves 59 options, leading to a space of possible configurations up to 3.14×10^{28} . (2) Measuring the configurations on the system demands considerable time and resources and hence it is profoundly expensive [19], [22], [45], [70]. For example, Chen and Li [19], [22] report that it can take up to 166 minutes to measure a single configuration on the database system MARIADB.

Over the past decades, researchers have designed sophisticated heuristic tuners to address the above challenges, rooting from different research communities such as databases [108], algorithms [63], machine learning [10], and big data [56]. Examples include `BestConfig` [108] that leverages local search with recursive bounds and `ConEx` [56] that uses Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling. Those approaches, termed *model-free tuners*, share one common ground: they solely rely on direct measurement of the systems in guiding the tuning, despite the expectation that, with the help of intelligently designed heuristic, the number of measurements would be drastically reduced for finding the (near-)optimal configuration.

Given the expensive measurement in configuration tuning, a perhaps more natural resolution is to build a surrogate model—the mathematical function that reflects the correlation between configuration and performance—as a replacement of the system itself, hence mitigating expensive profiling directly. Indeed, one recent survey [77] on software configuration concludes that “a large body of work tries to model the configuration of an application, then use this model to suggest an optimal configuration”. Approaches that follow this thread, namely *model-based tuners*, can be aligned with

- Corresponding author: Tao Chen (email: t.chen@bham.ac.uk).
- Pengzhou Chen is with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China, 610056.
- Jingzhi Gong is with the School of Computer Science, University of Leeds, UK, LS2 9JT.
- Tao Chen is with the School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, UK, B15 2TT.

one of the following two categories:

- **Batch model-based tuners, e.g., [2], [5], [17], [18], [23], [60], [79], [101]:** This tuner type refers to the model-free tuners where the direct system measurement is seamlessly replaced by a surrogate model, which is trained under a batch of previously measured configuration samples in advance. The model prediction steers the tuning process while no other measurements are involved throughout the tuning.
- **Sequential model-based tuners, e.g., [11], [43], [70], [88], [92], [104]:** This is the type of tuner that sophisticatedly synergizes a model with the tuner, in which the model is updated progressively with newly measured configurations and it also predicts configuration performance to influence the search direction in tuning.

Since the models guide the tuning directions within model-based tuners, it is natural to believe that their accuracy (measured by some forms of prediction errors [40], [70]) to the real system is crucial. Indeed, while model-based tuners are rarely compared with model-free tuners in a fair manner, it is not uncommon to see similar claims below:

“ Shortly after 28 samplings, the fine-tuned regression can accurately fit the target. This explains why the tuner can find the global optimum in a few shots. ”
— Wang et al. [92]

This is a clear example where the accuracy of the model is used to explain its usefulness to the configuration tuning. At the same time, the claim of insufficient model accuracy is also commonly the motivation for proposing a new model to be equipped with a model-based tuner:

“ We see that the average errors of models built by Response Surface, Artificial Neural Network, Support Vector Machine, and Random Forest are 23%, 27%, 14%, and 18%, respectively. We believe that performance models with such high errors cannot accurately identify the optimal configurations. ”
— Yu et al. [101]

Yet, in another example, Zhu et al. [108] criticize the model-based tuners for the inaccuracy of the surrogate model therein, hence arguing that the model-free counterparts should be favored:

“ Although the prediction is improving as the number of samples increases, Gaussian Process’s predictions about best points are hardly accurate....methods like Co-Training Model Tree and Gaussian Process cannot output competitive configuration settings. ”
— Zhu et al. [108]

The above, together with the other vast majority of work on configuration performance modeling that solely seeks to improve model accuracy [24], [34], [37], [39], [40], [80], implies that the community tends to believe *the accuracy is the key that strongly impacts whether mode-based tuners should be favored over their model-free counterparts (i.e.,*




Fig. 1: Exemplified accuracy (MAPE) and achieved tuning performance under (a) batch and (b) sequential model-based tuners with different models. Each point denotes the results of a model under one run (10 models \times 30 runs).

the model-free tuners), as it is the dominant factor in the usefulness of a model for configuration tuning.

Nevertheless, despite the widely followed general belief, we have never had a thorough understanding of how the models impact the tuning process. In fact, a few preliminary works [69], [70] and our years of experience have hinted that the above belief can be inaccurate or even misleading. For example, Figure 1 shows the tuning performance led by models with diverse accuracy, measured by Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE)¹, under the aforementioned two types of model-based tuners over 30 runs. Clearly, in Figure 1a, it is difficult to say for sure that a better accuracy (smaller MAPE) would lead to better performance (smaller runtime). The correlation between model accuracy and the tuned configuration performance does not exhibit clear patterns, as they change in a rather non-linear and non-monotonic manner. In contrast, for the case in Figure 1b, there is a clear trace that a better accuracy actually leads to worse performance (higher latency of the system), which is even more counter-intuitive to the general belief.

Therefore, it raises a question to the current research that follows the “accuracy is all” belief when leveraging a model to guide the tuning: what roles do the model and its accuracy play in the configuration tuning?

1.1 Contributions

To better understand the above doubt, in this paper, we conduct a systematic, large-scale empirical study that covers 10 models, 17 tuners, and 29 systems from the existing works while under four different metrics, leading to 13,612 cases of investigation. Our findings are surprising and even counter-intuitive, from which the key and most unexpected observation is probably *the accuracy can lie*, suggesting that the current practice that relies on the “accuracy is all” belief is likely to be misleading. Therefore, the results conjecture that we should take one step back from using accuracy as the key driver of model-based configuration tuning. Specifically, we make several contributions to the community as follows.

¹ MAPE is a popular residual metric of accuracy that computes the percentage of absolute errors relative to the actual values [34], [39], [40], [80].

1.1.1 New Findings

We reveal findings that have not been previously explored in a systematic way:

- 1) Compared with the model-free counterparts under a sufficient and fair budget, models are helpful for sequential model-based tuners with up to 72% cases and a maximum of $5\times$ tuning improvements, but they tend to have marginal impacts or can even be harmful to the tuning quality of batch model-based tuners.
- 2) The originally chosen model in sequential model-based tuners can be considerably improved in 46% of the cases by simply switching to the other “newly created” tuner-model pairs; while for 50% cases they have marginal difference.
- 3) The most/least accurate model can only serve as an indication of the best/worst tuning quality in between 14% and 45% of the cases.
- 4) The correlations between model accuracy and the goodness of tuning are far from being positively strong as implied in the belief: up to 97% of the cases, they are mostly negligible, or sometimes, even negative, i.e., worse accuracy can lead to better tuning results.
- 5) The necessary accuracy change to create significant tuning improvement varies depending on the range of the model’s accuracy, e.g., for the model with a MAPE falls in $[30, 40]$, it needs at least 13.3% improvement for having considerably better tuning performance. Notably, the better the accuracy, the smaller the accuracy change is needed to considerably enhance the tuning.

1.1.2 New Interpretations

By means of representative examples, we demonstrate a way to explain the reasons behind the most unexpected results from our empirical study, using the concepts/metrics from fitness landscape analysis [75]. In particular, such an analysis provides new interpretations of the following questions observed from the results of the empirical study:

- 1) Why is the model useful (useless) to the tuning quality?
- 2) Why better model accuracy does not always lead to superior tuning quality?
- 3) Why does a better accuracy need a smaller change to significantly influence the tuning?

1.1.3 New Insights and Opportunities

Deriving from the observations and analysis, we summarize a few lessons learned that provide insights for future research opportunities in the field:

- 1) While models help to significantly reduce overhead, they are only useful for tuning quality under progressive updates when the budget is sufficient and fair, hence exploring efficient online model learning is a promising research direction.
- 2) Manually selecting a model beforehand makes it difficult to find the optimal choice for tuning, hence the combination of model-tuner pair selection and

tuning the configuration can form a new bi-level optimization problem that demands automation.

- 3) The community should shift away from the accuracy-driven research for model-based configuration tuning. A new question would be: what other (efficient) proxies, alongside accuracy, can better measure the model usefulness for tuning quality. Further, models should incorporate code patterns that cause the landscape sparsity and ruggedness.
- 4) It makes little sense to claim the benefit of a certain % of accuracy improvement alone; at least, one should refer to the minimum accuracy changes discovered in this work. This calls for a more systematic procedure to examine and interpret the meaningfulness of the change in model accuracy.

1.2 Open Science and Organization

To promote open science practices, all source code, data, and supplementary materials of this work can be publicly accessed at our repository: <https://github.com/ideas-labo/model-impact>.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the necessary preliminaries and background of this work. Section 3 describes our empirical research methodology. Section 4 presents the results with a detailed analysis. Section 5 discusses the possible rationale behind the findings, followed by a summary of the lessons learned and future opportunities in Section 6. Sections 7 and 8 present the threats to validity and related work, respectively. Finally, Section 9 concludes the paper with pointers for future work.

2 PRELIMINARIES AND BACKGROUND

In this section, we discuss the necessary preliminaries and backgrounds that underpin our empirical study.

2.1 Software Configuration Tuning

A configurable software system often comes with a set of critical configuration options to tune, for example, STORM allows one to change the `num_splitters` and `num_counters` for better latency or throughput [19], [70]. c_i denotes the i th option, which can be either a binary or integer variable, among n options for a software system. The goal of configuration tuning is to search for better software configurations, from the space of \mathcal{C} and with a given budget, that optimizes the performance objective f under the given benchmark condition²:

$$\operatorname{argmin} f(\mathbf{c}), \quad \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$. The measurement of f depends on the target system and the performance attribute, for which we make no assumption about the characteristics in this work.

A key difficulty of tuning configuration is the expensive measurement: Zuluaga et al. [109] report that it takes hours to merely measure a fraction of the configuration space. As a result, exhaustively profiling the system when tuning the configuration is often unrealistic, if not impossible.

2. Without loss of generality, we assume minimizing scenarios which can be converted to maximizing via additive inverse.




Fig. 2: Illustrating the different types of tuners for configuration tuning in one tuning run.

2.2 Model-free Tuners

Model-free tuners represent the most straightforward way to address the problem of software configuration tuning as shown in Figure 2a: designing intelligent heuristics, guided by direct measurement from the systems, to explore the configuration space and exploit the information to generate new directions of search [10], [56], [63], [108]. The configuration with the best-measured performance is used. The key focus has been on controlling the behavior of the tuners in exploring and exploiting the search space without having to traverse all of it. For example, works exist that leverage local search that discovers configurations around the best ones found so far [108]. Other tuners [56] emphasize jumping out of local optima—an area in the configuration space where there are one (or more) configurations being optimal around the neighboring ones, but are sub-optimal with respect to the globally best configuration.

Since the model-free tuners have relied on direct measurement of the systems, which provides the most accurate guidance in the tuning, it has been reported that it needs a substantial amount of trial-and-error before converging to some promising configurations [10], [11]. This can be undesirable when the measurement of configurations is rather expensive.

2.3 Model-based Tuners

Given the fact that measuring even a single configuration can be expensive, a natural resolution is to use a surrogate model that delegates the systems in the tuning process. In the past decade, there have been numerous studies that propose more and more accurate configuration performance models, primarily leveraging deep/machine learning algorithms, such as decision tree [39], random forest [62], deep neural network [34], [40], and hierarchical interaction neural network [24]. Those models, if used appropriately, can be paired with different tuners, thereby significantly reducing the cost of evaluating a configuration as the better or worse between configurations can be compared directly using model prediction.

Broadly, there are two types of model-based tuners, namely batch model-based tuners and sequential model-based tuners, for which we elaborate below.

2.3.1 Batch Model-based Tuners

The batch model-based tuners [2], [5], [18], [23], [60], [79], [101] are inherent extensions from the model-free tuners, where the direct system measurements are replaced by model evaluations; the tuner itself remains unchanged. The optimal configuration with the best performance predicted by the model is then returned. This provides several advantages, for example, the newly proposed surrogate model can be paired with arbitrarily model-free tuners, in which the designed behaviors of the tuning algorithms can be preserved while an accurate model can be directly exploited. There is often no necessary inter-dependency between the model and tuner, since naturally model-free tuners rarely make assumptions about the internal structure of the system to be measured, providing a perfect foundation for it to be replaced by a model. However, the only additional step is that a high-quality model needs to be trained/built in advance with a good amount of measured configuration samples in order to effectively guide the tuning.

Figure 2b shows the pipeline of the batch model-based tuners. The term “batch” refers to the fact that the model therein is trained/built with a set of training samples beforehand, but it would never be changed throughout the entire tuning run. Of course, the surrogate model can be updated when a newly measured set of data samples becomes available, but the updated model would only influence the next newly started tuning run.

Model evaluation is almost certainly cheaper than system measurement, the actual saving depends on the training data size, the model, and the system though. For example, even in some of the worst cases, a model evaluation merely takes half a minute [81] as opposed to hours that are needed to measure a configuration on systems like MARIADB [22]. Albeit the evaluation of configuration becomes much cheaper in batch model-based tuners, it might still be unrealistic to exhaustively traverse all configurations. As we will show in Section 3.2, the search space of a system can go beyond a million, rendering the problem intractable even in the presence of a surrogate model. Yet, batch model-based tuners can still benefit from the sophisticatedly designed heuristics of the model-free tuners during the tuning process, hence allowing them to deal with the intractability. Indeed, even with the reduced evaluation overhead, says 30 seconds per evaluation, heuristics that require 100 evaluations to obtain a promising configuration would remain

much more preferred than the others that need a double evaluation to achieve the same, as this still leads to a saving of almost an hour for the entire tuning.

2.3.2 Sequential Model-based Tuners

The sequential model-based tuners [11], [43], [70], [88], [92], [104], in contrast, also rely on a surrogate model to determine the better or worse configurations while enabling a cheap exploration of the configuration space. However, after an initial model is trained/built with limited samples, it additionally permits new measurements of configuration on the system and updates the model using every new sample as the tuning proceeds, creating influence in guiding the current tuning run. The optimal configuration returned in the end is the one with the best-measured performance. In general, work on sequential model-based tuners often relies on a variant of Bayesian Optimization [31], where the heuristic is guided by an acquisition function (e.g., Expected Improvement) that leverages the model prediction to identify the configuration to be measured next, which is most likely to improve performance while being uncertain enough to train and improve the model accuracy.

Indeed, the nature of sequential model-based tuners (and the acquisition function) might introduce a dependency between the model and the tuner, i.e., not all the models can quantify the uncertainty of the configurations, thereby models might not be compatible without some amendments. However, existing work has successfully exploited different surrogate models in sequential model-based tuners beyond the defaulted Gaussian Process Regression. For example `Flash` [70] has been using a decision tree while `BOCA` [11] has relied on random forest.

Figure 2c shows the workflow of sequential model-based tuners. Clearly, the tuning progress does not only influence the configuration found but also the accuracy of the surrogate model. The term “sequential” implies the fact that the model is updated by sequentially obtained new measurements and then guides the search direction of the next configuration to measure.

2.4 The “Accuracy is All” Belief

Since the surrogate model serves as the delegate of the actual system that guides the tuner, it is natural to believe that better accuracy emulates the real system better, and hence should lead to superior tuning results [92], [101], [108]. In addition to the examples and quotations mentioned in Section 1, there is an increasingly active research field, namely configuration performance learning [35], [74], that proposes sophisticated models with the main purpose of improving their accuracy. For example, to date, when using the common MAPE as the metric³, the prediction accuracy for system `VP9` has been pushed up to 0.44% by a state-of-the-art model `HINNPerf` [24] published at TOSEM’23, which is statistically better than the 0.86% MAPE of the other already rather accurate model `DECART` [39]. Yu et al. [101] also claim that since the proposed model can improve the accuracy by up to 22.4%, hence it should be more useful than the others for tuning configuration. Therefore, all of those imply a general belief:

3. Note that there are other accuracy metrics apart from MAPE.

“Accuracy is All” Belief

“Regardless of how the model is applied for configuration tuning, the higher the model accuracy, the more useful it becomes for improving the tuning quality and vice versa.”

As such, it is not hard to anticipate that future research and design choices on configuration tuning (and configuration performance modeling) will still be strongly driven by the model accuracy when a surrogate model is involved. Yet, our experience and preliminary results (as discussed in Section 1) question this practice, e.g., is the % MAPE improvement in the aforementioned case really that important for configuration tuning? In what follows, through a large-scale empirical study, this work challenges the above belief and provides an in-depth understanding of the role of the surrogate model and its accuracy for configuration tuning.

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

We now delineate the methodology of our empirical study.

3.1 Research Questions

To provide a more in-depth understanding of the aforementioned “accuracy is all” belief, in this paper, we answer several important research questions (RQs). In particular, we seek to first confirm the benefit and usefulness of using a model for configuration tuning against the model-free counterparts by examining:

RQ1: *How useful is the model for tuning quality?*

Indeed, some work did compare a small set of model-based tuners with selected model-free counterparts to showcase the benefits of models [11], but their scale is rather limited and they are often based on a biased budget, e.g., only tens of measurements are considered, which would be more beneficial to model-based tuners.

Since the sequential model-based tuners are commonly paired with a specifically chosen/designed model, *one would expect that such a model should help the most in tuning quality compared with the alternatives for the majority of the cases*. Subsequently, it is natural to ask:

RQ2: *Do the chosen models work the best on tuning quality?*

Both **RQ1** and **RQ2** provide a more thorough high-level understanding of the necessity and benefit of using a model to tune configuration. However, it remains unclear what role the model accuracy plays in terms of the tuning quality. Often, one would be interested in whether the most (least) accurate model can lead to the best (worst) tuning results, hence the next question we seek to answer is:

RQ3: *Dose the goodness of the model consistent with the resulted tuning quality?*

If the “accuracy is all” belief is correct, the normal intuition is that the model accuracy should be a good indication of the tuning quality for most cases.

As a next step, an extended question that encourages finer-grained investigations therein would be:

TABLE 1: Details of the subject systems ordered by their sizes of configuration/search space \mathcal{S}_{space} . ($|\mathcal{B}|/|\mathcal{N}|$) denotes the number of binary/numeric options, \mathcal{S}_{train} and \mathcal{S}_{test} are the training size and testing size for batch model-based tuners, respectively.

System	Version	Workload	Domain	Performance	$ \mathcal{B} / \mathcal{N} $	Scale	\mathcal{S}_{space}	Ref.	Budget	\mathcal{S}_{train}	\mathcal{S}_{test}
BROTLI	1.0.7	Compressing a 1 GB file	File Compressor	Runtime (s)	1/2	Small	3.08×10^2	[95]	203	55	253
LLVM	3.0	LLVM's test suite	Compiler	Runtime (ms)	10/0	Small	1.02×10^3	[40]	182	50	974
LRZIP	0.10	Community compression benchmark	File Compressor	Runtime (s)	11/0	Small	2.04×10^3	[67]	184	55	136
XGBOOST	12.0	Two standard datasets	Machine Learning Tool	Runtime (min)	11/0	Small	2.04×10^3	[47]	278	55	1000
NOC-CM-LOG	1.0	Coremark benchmark workload	Database	Runtime (s)	1/3	Small	2.38×10^3	[70]	129	55	204
DEEPARCH	2.2.4	UCR Archive time series dataset	Deep Learning Tool	Runtime (min)	12/0	Small	4.10×10^3	[48]	207	60	1000
BDB_C	18.0	Benchmark provided by vendor	Database	Latency (s)	16/0	Small	6.55×10^4	[40]	259	80	1000
HSQLDB	19.0	PolePosition 0.6.0	Database	Runtime (ms)	18/0	Small	2.62×10^5	[95]	149	90	774
DCONVERT	3.0	transform resources at different scales	Image Scaling	Runtime (s)	17/1	Large	1.05×10^7	[67]	335	289	1000
7Z	9.20	Compressing a 3 GB directory	File Compressor	Runtime (ms)	11/3	Large	1.68×10^8	[95]	382	363	6827
APACHE	21.0	ApacheBench 2.3	Web Server	Maximum load (# users)	14/2	Large	2.35×10^8	[95]	271	392	1304
HSMGP	1.0	Perform one V-cycle	Stencil-Grid Solver	Latency (ms)	11/3	Large	2.97×10^8	[40]	218	363	1000
MONGODB	4.4	Yahoo! cloud serving benchmark	Database	Runtime (ms)	14/2	Large	3.77×10^8	[72]	278	392	1000
POSTGRESQL	22.0	PolePosition 0.6.0	Database	Runtime (ms)	6/3	Large	1.42×10^9	[95]	298	108	1890
EXASTENCILS	1.2	Three default benchmarks	Code Generator	Runtime (ms)	7/5	Large	1.61×10^9	[95]	416	224	8583
KANZI	5.0	All cpp files of TMV	File Compressor	Runtime (ms)	31/0	Large	2.14×10^9	[95]	237	160	1000
JUMP3R	1.0	All cpp files of TMV	Audio Encoder	Runtime (s)	37/0	Large	1.37×10^{11}	[95]	232	185	1000
MARIADB	10.5	Sysbench	Database	Runtime (ms)	8/3	Large	5.31×10^{11}	[72]	226	192	780
POLLY	3.9	The gemm program from polybench	Code Optimizer	Runtime (s)	39/0	Large	5.50×10^{11}	[24]	285	195	5980
SQLITE	3.0	Benchmark provided by vendor	Database	Runtime (s)	39/0	Large	5.50×10^{11}	[40]	206	195	1000
VP9	1.0	2 encoding Big Buck Bunny trailer (s)	Video Encoder	Runtime (s)	41/0	Large	2.20×10^{12}	[24]	271	205	21579
SPARK	3.0	HiBench	Data Analytics	Throughput (MB/s)	5/8	Large	2.55×10^{12}	[6]	326	200	1000
HIPACC	0.8	A set of partial differential equations	Image Processing	Latency (ms)	31/2	Large	3.30×10^{12}	[40]	371	1008	1247
REDIS	6.0	Sysbench	Database	Requests per second	1/8	Large	5.78×10^{16}	[6]	298	192	1000
STORM	0.9.5	Randomly generated benchmark	Data Analytics	Latency (s)	0/12	Large	2.83×10^{23}	[54]	263	288	1000
SAC	1.0	An n-body simulation	Compiler	Runtime (s)	52/7	Large	3.14×10^{28}	[80]	316	2704	6247
HADOOP	3.0	HiBench	Data Analytics	Throughput (MB/s)	2/7	Large	1.27×10^{29}	[6]	297	192	1000
TOMCAT	8.0	Sysbench	Web Server	Requests per second	0/12	Large	7.93×10^{34}	[6]	282	288	1000
JAVAGC	7.0	DaCapo benchmark suite	Java Runtime	Runtime (ms)	12/23	Large	2.67×10^{41}	[40]	289	1922	1000

RQ4: How do the model accuracy and tuning quality correlated?

Again, following the belief, we would expect that there should be an overwhelmingly strong and positive correlation between them for most cases.

A crucial issue with the “accuracy is all” belief is that research on newly proposed models is solely driven by accuracy comparison [24], [34], [39], [40], [80], [92], [101], but whether a certain extent of the accuracy change is significant or not for configuration tuning is often unclear. Therefore, the last question we aim to answer is:

RQ5: How much accuracy change do we need?

From this, we hope to provide some figures that can serve as references for future research on surrogate models for configuration tuning.

3.2 Configurable Systems

3.2.1 System Selection

We select the software systems and their benchmarks used by the most notable works from the key venues in software and system engineering. After extensively surveying the systems, we conduct a screening of them following two criteria:

- To balance the generality of our study and the realism of the efforts required, we select the system with the most number of options as the representative for systems from the same origin, e.g., BDB_C and BDB_J are both the variants of the Berkeley database system written in C and Java, respectively. In that case, only BDB_C is used as it has more configuration options.
- For the same systems where different sets of relevant configuration options have been used, we select the one with the highest number of options. For

example, STORM is a configurable system that has been studied in many prior studies, and we use the instance with 12 options to tune which is the most complicated case.

Table 1 shows the final set of 29 configurable systems considered in this study. It is clear that those systems come from various domains with diverse performance attributes that are of concern; can exhibit only 3 options in the tuning (BROTLI) or can be as complex as having up to 59 options to tune (SAC). The search space also varies, ranging from 308 to 2.67×10^{41} . It is worth noting that, even for those with relatively small search space, the measurement of a single configuration can still be time-consuming. For instance, it can take up to 166 minutes to measure one configuration on MARIADB [22], and a single run of measurement for DEEPARCH might even be a couple of hours [48].

When tuning under a surrogate model, we pragmatically consider those systems with less than a million configurations to search as “small” systems, because the space can be reasonably covered when the measurements are replaced by model evaluations. Otherwise, we treat the systems as “large” ones, i.e., they tend to be intractable as exhaustively traversing the entire space is expensive even with a cheaply evaluated model.

To the best of our knowledge, such a comprehensive set of configurable systems results in one of the largest-scale studies in this area⁴.

3.2.2 Option, Benchmark and Performance Selection

The configuration options, their possible values, workload/s/benchmarks, and target performance metric have been

4. Among the related empirical studies, Cao et al. [8] include six systems; Zhang et al. [102] study MYSQL and POSTGRESQL only. In contrast, we cover 29 systems. MCBO [27] and Grosnit et al. [38] 4,000 and 3,958 cases, respectively, while we investigate 13,612 cases in our work. Note that apart from the scale, none of the above seek to provide a thorough understanding of how the models (and their accuracy) can impact configuration tuning.

TABLE 2: Specification of the surrogate models considered in our study. SPLConqueror is basically LR while DT is the same as DECART. However, SPLConqueror considers the interaction between options as the terms while LR does not; DECART involves hyperparameter tuning while DT uses the defaults.

Model	Type	Domain	Characteristics	Ref.	Used by
Support Vector Regression (SVR)	Machine learning	General	Good for high dimensionality but can be sensitive to its parameters	[82]	[34]
Linear Regression (LR)	Machine learning	General	Fast execution but only suitable for independent linear relationships	[66]	[34]
Gaussian Process (GP)	Machine learning	General	Providing uncertainty estimates but only suitable for low dimension	[76]	[50]
Decision Tree (DT)	Machine learning	General	Easy to interpret but can be overfitting and instable	[83]	[70]
Random Forests (RF)	Machine learning	General	High accuracy and stable but can be complex and difficult to explain	[62]	[11]
DECART (DCT)	Machine learning	Configurable systems	Handling non-linear relationships with tuned parameters but can overfit	[39]	[40]
SPLConqueror (SPL)	Machine learning	Configurable systems	Handling option interactions but mainly work linearly	[80]	[24]
DaL	Machine/Deep learning	Configurable systems	Efficiently addressing sample sparsity but can be expensive to train	[34]	[34]
DeepPerf (DeP)	Deep learning	Configurable systems	Accurate for sparse options but sensitive to hyperparameters	[40]	[24]
HINNPerf (HIP)	Deep learning	Configurable systems	High accuracy through hierarchical modeling but hard to tune	[24]	[34]

carefully selected as exactly the same as those studied in previous works of the corresponding systems [7], [41], [47], [55], [67], [71], [73], [96]. As such, in this regard, we did not use our own selection criteria but followed what has been widely acknowledged in the community.

Notably, it is well-known that not all options might significantly contribute to the performance—this is known as the sparsity problem in configuration performance learning [34], [40]. Practically, it would be difficult to obtain a thorough understanding beforehand regarding which options are more significant to the performance (especially given the expensive measurements). In fact, some configuration performance models have been proposed to tackle exactly such (e.g., DeepPerf [40] and DaL [34]), such that they are capable of learning a model where only those more influential options would contribute to the performance prediction while those less relevant ones would have minimal impact (via, e.g., regularization or data division). Some other models, such as SPLConqueror [80], would be more vulnerable to the sparsity problem but we regard this as a natural limitation of the proposed model rather than a problem that can be addressed fundamentally.

The strategy of measuring the performance follows exactly the same setting as previous work [7], [41], [47], [55], [67], [71], [73], [96]. For example, when tuning SQLITE, the workloads are generated by SYSBENCH, which is a standard benchmark for testing performance. Similarly, the performance is also measured by SYSBENCH as a final overall result after processing some workloads. Further, the system is rebooted when measuring different configurations, ensuring that none of them would benefit from the cache. The measurements are also taken as the average/median of 3 to 23 repeats depending on the specific system as used in prior work [7], [41], [47], [55], [67], [71], [73], [96]. To expedite the experiments and verify accuracy, we also use the same configuration datasets measured in previous research.

3.3 Surrogate Models and Configuration Tuners

3.3.1 Models

Table 2 shows the 10 surrogate models we considered in this work. Those models are either commonly used by model-based tuners [11], [18], [43], [60], [70], [88], [92], [104], e.g., GP and DT, or are state-of-the-art ones from the field of configuration performance learning [24], [34], [39], [40], [80], e.g., DeepPerf and HINNPerf, covering the key venues from both software engineering and system engineering communities. We also cater to the diverse nature of the

models, as they either belong to statistical machine learning or deep learning; and distinct application domains, since they could be designed for general purpose, e.g., RF, or are specifically tailored to handle the characteristics of configuration data, e.g., DaL [34].

While we aim to cover the most common and state-of-the-art models, some of them are intentionally omitted due to their various restrictions and inflexibility:

- We rule out k NN since it is a lazy model, i.e., the overhead occurs at the prediction rather than training, which causes unacceptable long running time when paired with some tuners that leverage excessive model evaluations, e.g., FLASH. This is because, in our experiments, the prediction happens much more often than the training.
- Perf-AL, a deep learning model specifically designed to learn configuration performance, is also omitted due to its prohibitive training time required for training the adversarial neural network. Besides, hyperparameter tuning further complicates the process and the default values suggested by the authors did not lead to any useful models on our systems.
- We remove KRR due to its lengthy training process and high similarity to SVR, which is part of the model considered.

It is, however, worth noting that our set of models is comparable to those considered in recent empirical studies on modeling configuration performance [13], [33], [46], [64].

3.3.2 Tuners

We consider up to 17 tuners in our study, including 8 sequential model-based ones, 8 model-free/batch model-based ones, and one that is specifically used as a batch model-based tuner (Brute-force) when the configuration space is tractable, as shown in Table 3.

To ensure good coverage, we select the most notable work from software engineering (e.g., FLASH [70] and SWAY [10]), system engineering (e.g., OtterTune [88] and Tuneful [29]), general parameter optimization (e.g., SMAC [43] and ParamILS [44]), and commonly used baselines, such as Random and Brute-force. Those tuners could aim for any configurable systems/parameter optimization in general or they might be originally designed for a particular type of system, such as database systems or big data systems, but are generic enough to work on a configurable system of any type without substantial extension. They also come with a diverse set of underlying designs, containing different option reduction methods, search

TABLE 3: Specification of the tuners considered in our study.

Tuner	Type	Domain	Option Reduction	Surrogate Model	Acquisition	Search Heuristic	Ref.
BOCA	SMBT	Compilers	Random Forest	Random Forest	Maximum Expected Improvement	Local search that focus on important options	[11]
ATconf	SMBT	Big data systems	N/A	Gaussian Process	Minimize Lower Confidence Bound	Dropping options and exhaustive search	[26]
FLASH	SMBT	Configurable systems	N/A	Decision Tree	Maximum Mean	Trying all configurations	[70]
OtterTune	SMBT	Database systems	Lasso	Gaussian Process	Maximum Upper Confidence Bound	Random sampling and exploration with gradient descent	[88]
ResTune	SMBT	Database systems	Pre-selection	Gaussian Process	Maximum Expected Improvement	Exhaustive search	[104]
ROBOTune	SMBT	Data analytics	Random Forest	Gaussian Process	Maximum Hedge	Exhaustive search	[52]
SMAC	SMBT	Parameter optimization	N/A	Random Forest	Maximum Expected Improvement	Random sampling and exploration around good configurations	[43]
Tuneful	SMBT	Data analytics	Sensitivity analysis	Gaussian Process	Maximum Expected Improvement	Exhaustive search	[29]
BestConfig	MFT/BMBT	Database systems	N/A	N/A	N/A	Local search with recursive bound	[108]
Irace	MFT/BMBT	Parameter optimization	N/A	N/A	N/A	Iterated race and focusing on good options	[63]
GGA	MFT/BMBT	Configurable solvers	N/A	N/A	N/A	Gender separation with genetic algorithm	[3]
ParamILS	MFT/BMBT	Parameter optimization	N/A	N/A	N/A	Iterated recursive bound with parameter values	[44]
Random	MFT/BMBT	General	N/A	N/A	N/A	Random search	-
GA	MFT/BMBT	General	N/A	N/A	N/A	Genetic algorithm	[57]
SWAY	MFT/BMBT	Parameter optimization	N/A	N/A	N/A	Prune half of candidate based on the representatives	[10]
ConEx	MFT/BMBT	Big data systems	N/A	N/A	N/A	Evolutionary Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling strategy	[56]
Brute-force	BMBT	General	N/A	N/A	N/A	Trying all configurations	-

heuristics, and acquisition functions (for sequential model-based tuners). While most batch model-based tuners can find a model-free counterpart, *Brute-force* is the only exception. This is because even though the system might be tractable, the expensive measurements prevent any tuner from covering the entire space. However, with the help of a surrogate model, traversing the space might become plausible. As a result, for those “small” systems (recall Section 3.2), we do not need sophisticated heuristics but only the *Brute-force* tuner is considered.

However, like the selection of surrogate models, we have to omit certain tuners for different reasons:

- We rule out *SCOPE* [53] and *OnlineTune* [105] because they are specifically designed to ensure the safety of a configurable system—a property that is beyond the scope of this work.
- We do not consider *HyperBand* [59] and its extension *BOHB* [28]. This is because they assume significantly different fidelity/cost when measuring a hyperparameter, which is a property that not all configurable systems would have.
- Tuners that assume multiple performance objectives [23] or leverage on multi-objectivization for a single performance objective [12], [14], [19], [22] are also omitted since not all systems studied have more than one meaningful performance objective.
- There are omissions due to the lack of publicly available artifacts and the difficulty of re-implementing the tuners. For example, we do not utilize *LOCAT* [98] due to the absence of public source code and we rule out *LlamaTune* [50] since its source code is out of date, which compromises the usability.

Despite the above omissions, to the best of our knowledge, the selected ones remain leading to the largest set of tuners considered in the field of configuration tuning. For all parameters of the tuners, we set those exactly the same as used in their corresponding work.

We also have to slightly improve a few tuners to enable them to work effectively on all systems considered: since *FLASH* uses exhaustive search on the model to find the next configuration to measure without any option/space reduction, it might not be scalable to all “large” systems. To tackle this, for each system, we cap the exhaustive search therein with the maximum number of configurations that is commonly explored in the literature [12]. Certain tuners, e.g., *ResTune*, *ATConf*, *ROBOTune* and *Tuneful*, are designed for continuous variables only while most of

the configurable systems have discrete options. To deal with this incompatibility, whenever the tuner needs to measure an invalid configuration that does not meet the possible values of the options, we measure the performance of the most similar valid configuration, which is quantified by using normalized Euclidean distance, as its performance value. In other words, we make the shape that covers a valid configuration and its neighboring invalid configuration flat in the configuration landscape (as they have the same performance value), hence helping to prevent the tuner from being trapped at local optima. Yet, if one of those invalid configurations happens to be the best one returned by the end of tuning, then they are converted back into its most similar valid configuration. In this way, we do not need to largely change those tuners while allowing them to work effectively on the systems considered.

3.3.3 Pairing Model-based Tuners with Models

Due to the nature of model-free tuners, they can be naturally paired with arbitrary surrogate models, as long as those models are trained with a batch of configuration samples in advance. As mentioned, this forms the foundation of batch model-based tuners, where the tuning is guided by the model rather than real measurement of the systems as in the case of its model-free counterpart, but the tuner and search itself are the same. Since a model is trained in advance, all batch model-based tuners share the said model under each system.

We can do the same arbitrary model pairing for the sequential model-based tuners, but the setting becomes slightly more complicated because they also need to update the model sequentially as new measurement(s) of configurations, which are decided by the tuner, become available. In particular, a key part of this type of model-based tuner is the acquisition function that determines which next configuration to measure. In essence, most sequential model-based tuners (e.g., *BOCA* [11] and *OtterTune* [88]) leverage acquisition function to balance the exploitation and exploration of the tuners via the performance and uncertainty of the configurations predicted by a surrogate model, respectively. Exploitation focuses on the better configuration as predicted while exploration emphasizes the most unknown configurations inferred, which might not be better but could improve the surrogate model and allow the tuner to jump into new regions in the configuration landscape. All surrogate models would be able to predict the performance of a configuration, but not every one of them can quantify its uncertainty, except GP and RF.

To mitigate the above and allow sequential model-based tuners to be paired with any surrogate model as its batch model-based counterpart, we take inspiration from RF which can naturally quantify uncertainty. RF , as a bagging-based ensemble model, has been used to quantify the uncertainty of a configuration with the variance of the prediction made by all sub-models of decision trees [11]. Therefore, when pairing with a tuner that needs to quantify the uncertainty of a configuration, we train 10 models (except GP and RF) based on the data partitioned by bagging, and measuring their prediction variance as the uncertainty for exploration. The actual prediction of a configuration for exploitation is still the model trained with all the data available.

In summary, recall that Figure 2 illustrates the patterns of different relationships between the key components in configuration tuning, particularly for the tuner and model. Tables 2 and 3 basically illustrate the concrete techniques/algorithms that one can use as the model and tuner, respectively, which can be arbitrarily replaced according to one of the patterns in Figure 2 (if applicable). As such, with the model-based tuners, we have $10 \text{ models} \times (8 \text{ sequential model-based tuners} + 9 \text{ batch model-based tuners}) = 170$ tuner-model pairs, together with the 8 model-free tuners, leading to 178 instances to be considered in our study.

3.4 Sample Sizes and Budgets

3.4.1 Hot-start Sample Size for Sequential Model-based Tuners

While the sequential model-based tuners can conduct a *cold start* with a surrogate model learned under the one-shot setting, i.e., the surrogate model is directly used by a tuner without pre-training, they impose a high risk of measuring unreliable configurations at the beginning, which negatively affects the outcome. Therefore, those tuners often follow a *hot-start* manner where the surrogate model is well-trained with a certain number of measured configuration samples [11], [43], [70]. A larger hot-start sample size means that more configurations are randomly measured initially, allowing for a more precise initialization of the model and, consequently, being more favorable for finding new configurations. However, an increased sample size also comes with higher measurement costs. In this work, we turn to the literature of the eight sequential model-based tuners considered for identifying a common practice of setting the hot-start sample size, we found that existing work generally uses a fixed size across the systems, but the number can vary, e.g., two samples for BOCA [11] and five samples for ResTune [104]. To ensure a reasonable balance between building a reliable initial model and the additional measurement cost, we set a hot-start size of 20 as suggested previously, which is also the most commonly used setting we found among the sequential model-based tuners [29], [52], [70]. The data is then collected via conducting random sampling⁵ on the measured dataset.

5. Admittedly, random sampling is only one choice among the other sampling methods, but it is widely accepted as a default due to its simplicity and parameter-free nature [4], [8], [9], [11], [24], [41], [56]. The experiment is repeated 30 runs with random seeds, hence preventing the samples from being concentrated in certain parts.

Noteworthy, we found that the budget size is much more important and influential to the tuning results compared with the hot start size, and hence we decided to adapt the budget according to system complexity but leave the hot start size fixed for all systems.

3.4.2 Training Sample Size for Batch Model-based Tuners

As mentioned, the batch model-based tuners require the surrogate model to be trained in advance with measured configurations. In particular, since the model would not be updated in the same configuration cycle again, the size required is often larger than that of the sequential model-based tuner. To identify the training set from the measured dataset, we follow random sampling to obtain the training samples, together with the most common method for determining the corresponding size as below [34], [40]:

- **Binary systems:** for binary system, we randomly sample $5n$ configurations, where n is the dimension of options. Note that $5n$ is often the largest size used from prior work [34], [40].
- **Mixed systems:** for systems that come with both binary and numeric options, we use the sampling strategy from SPLConqueror [80] to determine the size with the parameters that lead to the largest number as considered in existing work [34], [40].

The system-specific training sample sizes are shown in Table 1. The above serves as the standard method to provide sufficient training data for building a sufficiently good model beforehand.

3.4.3 Tuning Budget

In this work, we measure the tuning budget using the number of measurements as suggested by many prior works [19], [22], [45], [70]—over 60% of the tuners studied have suggested such. In particular, the number of measurements comes with several advantages:

- It eliminates the interference of clock time caused by the running software system under tuning at the same machine.
- The measurements of configuration are often the most expensive part throughout configuration tuning.
- It is independent of the underlying implementation details such as programming language and the version of libraries.

Since the ideal budget can differ depending on the tuner, model, and system, we seek to find a budget that ensures our study is conducted fairly where all tuners would have the chance to reach their best state. To that end, under each system, we perform pilot experiments as follows:

- 1) Run all sequential model-based tuners (which are equipped with their original surrogate models) and model-free tuners. We do not pair the sequential model-based tuners with other models since the heuristics in tuning the acquisition function remain unchanged regardless of the model. We also omit the batch model-based ones as their search/optimization behavior is identical to those of model-free

tuners or only seeks to traverse the entire space, i.e., *Brute-force*.

- 2) We set a maximum consecutive count, i.e., 100 consecutive measurements. We say a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner has reasonably converged if no better configuration can be found after 100 new and consecutively measured configurations have been explored and force the tuner-model pair/model-free tuner to terminate.
- 3) We find the biggest required budget upon which a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner can be terminated among the others.
- 4) Repeat the above five times with different random seeds and use the maximum budget therein.

The above setting guarantees that all the tuner-model pairs and model-free tuners can reasonably converge, achieving their best possible state on a system, which is a common way to fairly compare optimization processes in software engineering [20], [21], [32]. The budgets found are shown in Table 1. For each system, all the sequential model-based tuners and model-free tuners would have the same budget for configuration measurements. In particular, the budget needs to deduct the amount used for any hot-start sampling. The budget is also used as the number of model evaluations for the batch model-based tuners since it is the only factor that influences their convergence and search behaviors. Particularly, under each tuning run, we follow the common practice that only the unique configurations would consume the budget [19], [22], [45], [70].

Note that, to expedite the experiments, we store and reuse the measurements of configurations that have already been measured across different experiment runs as adopted in prior work [19], [22].

3.5 Metrics

To answer our RQs, we define two types of metrics: one for measuring the accuracy of the surrogate model and the other for quantifying the quality of configuration tuning.

3.5.1 Accuracy of Surrogate Models

Accuracy is undoubtedly the most common metric that reflects the goodness of models. Measuring the accuracy of models for the batch model-based tuners is straightforward but it becomes slightly more complicated for the sequential model-based ones, in which the model evolves. In this work, we measure the model accuracy in sequential model-based tuners every 10 new measurements and use the average of those accuracy values as the final accuracy for the model.

To choose the accuracy metrics, we turn to the literature on configuration performance learning and model-based tuning, from which we found the two metrics, namely mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) [34], [40], [101], [108] and rank difference (μ RD) [69], [70], are predominately used from their categories (residual and ranked) when measuring the accuracy of the surrogate model for configuration performance.

MAPE: As a popular residual metric for measuring accuracy, MAPE (a.k.a. MRE or MMRE) computes the percentage of absolute errors relative to the actual values. Formally, MAPE is calculated as:

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{y_i - \hat{y}_i}{y_i} \right| \cdot 100\% \quad (2)$$

where n is the number of testing samples; \hat{y}_i and y_i correspond to the model-predicted and true performance value of a configuration, respectively. Since MAPE measures the error, the smaller the MAPE, the better the accuracy.

It is not hard to understand that MAPE is independent of the performance scale, therefore enabling cross-comparisons of models built for different systems and performance attributes. In contrast to other common metrics such as root means square error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE), MAPE has its unique advantage: it is more scale-robust compared with MAE while it is more resilient to outliers and is more interpretable than RMSE.

μ RD: Since the residual nature of MAPE might impose rather fine-grained discrimination between the model accuracies, Vivek et al. [70] propose a relaxed version of the accuracy metric, namely rank difference μ RD, seeking to provide a more coarse-grained quantification of the accuracy.

In a nutshell, μ RD computes the number of pairs in the test data where the performance model ranks them incorrectly and measures the average rank difference. It can be calculated using equation (3) :

$$\mu RD = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{rank}(y_i) - \text{rank}(\hat{y}_i)| \quad (3)$$

in which *rank* denotes the function that produces the rank value of a performance value among the others in the testing data; n signifies the number of testing samples. y_i corresponds to the true performance value of the configuration, and \hat{y}_i stands for the predicted performance value for the same configuration.

However, we observed an issue with μ RD: both the ranks of the predicted and true performance are highly dependent on the testing sample size n , but the original μ RD only factors in a single n . As illustrated in Figure 3a, this still causes the original μ RD metric to be highly sensitive to n , thereby preventing it from fairly comparing and averaging the accuracy across different systems (which is important for **RQ4**). To mitigate such, we additionally divide μ RD by a further n in this work, i.e., $\frac{1}{n} \times \mu$ RD, thereby better standardizing it by further eliminating the influence of sample sizes brought by the ranks of both y_i and \hat{y}_i . Clearly, from Figure 3b, $\frac{1}{n} \times \mu$ RD is more robust to n than its origin.

3.5.2 Testing Data for Accuracy Metrics

To determine the testing samples of the accuracy metrics, we follow the typical procedure for configuration performance learning [24], [34], [35], [39], [40], [74], [80], excluding those used for training/updating the model. Specifically, for each system, we prepare a dataset that contains the most measured valid configurations as consistent with prior work [24], [34], [39], [40], [80]; this avoids the need to cover the entire search space which can be intractable. After ruling out the samples used for training, we then randomly test 10% configurations from all those measured ones if that 10% of which is greater than 1,000. Otherwise, we test all the remaining configurations measured or 1,000 randomly




Fig. 3: Comparing μRD and its better standardized version under Decision Tree for system 7Z.

TABLE 4: The p -values from the U-Test when comparing the MAPE (of all models) under our method of setting the testing sample size and that under using all remaining samples on the five largest systems over 30 runs.

System	Model									
	DT	RF	LR	SVR	GP	SPL	DCT	DeP	HIP	DaL
STORM	1.00	0.85	0.95	0.54	0.90	0.97	0.74	0.85	0.97	0.95
SAC	0.81	0.63	0.83	0.82	0.45	0.99	0.26	0.94	0.97	0.70
HADOOP	0.46	0.58	0.36	0.86	0.25	0.31	0.90	0.77	0.67	0.67
TOMCAT	0.82	0.53	0.80	0.40	0.76	0.84	0.98	0.53	0.75	0.43
JAVAGC	0.46	0.60	0.60	0.62	0.70	0.61	0.74	0.95	0.94	0.84

TABLE 5: The p -values from the U-Test when comparing the μRD (of all models) under our method of setting the testing sample size and that under using all remaining samples on the five largest systems over 30 runs.

System	Model									
	DT	RF	LR	SVR	GP	SPL	DCT	DeP	HIP	DaL
STORM	0.18	0.43	0.37	0.82	0.43	1.00	0.22	0.26	0.18	0.26
SAC	0.50	0.22	0.18	0.15	0.82	0.91	0.76	0.50	0.74	0.43
HADOOP	0.22	0.37	0.74	0.26	0.37	0.74	0.43	1.00	0.22	0.50
TOMCAT	0.65	0.31	0.18	0.22	0.18	0.18	0.31	0.65	0.18	0.82
JAVAGC	0.74	0.31	0.18	0.65	0.82	0.37	0.58	0.50	0.12	0.26

sampled ones whichever is smaller. The testing sample sizes have been illustrated in Table 1. To verify that, we conduct significance tests on the model accuracy tested from our setting against that tested under all remaining samples of the five largest systems over 30 runs, as shown in Table 4 (for MAPE) and Table 5 (for μRD) of this letter. As can be seen, under all models and systems, we have $p > 0.05$, meaning that there are no statistically significant differences between the results using the above two strategies that set the testing sample sizes in the testing.

3.5.3 Tuning Quality

In this work, we are concerned with two aspects of the tuning quality, namely effectiveness and efficiency.

Performance: Naturally, we use the measured performance of the best configuration returned by a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner to quantify the effectiveness. Notably, according to Table 1, some of those performance attributes are to be minimized (e.g., the latency for MARIADB) while others are to be maximized (e.g., the throughput for HADOOP).

Efficiency: While a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner can perform well in terms of effectiveness, it remains undesirable if it needs to consume a large budget to do so. Efficiency hence measures the speed of convergence of a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner towards a promising configuration. Following the same metrics as used in prior work [19], [30], we compute efficiency, r , as below:

$$r = \frac{m}{b} \quad (4)$$

Specifically, the procedure for calculating r is:

- 1) For each set of the tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners to be compared⁶, find a baseline, b , as the smallest number of measurements (up to the budget) that the worst tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners⁷ (among all tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners considered) need to reach its best average (over 30 runs) of the performance (says T).
- 2) For every tuner-model pair/model-free tuner in the set, find the smallest number of measurements, m , at which the concerned performance is at least the same as T .
- 3) The efficiency r of a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner, or in other words the speedup of a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner over the worst counterpart, is reported.

If a tuner-model pair/model-free tuner has $r < 1$, then we say the tuner-model pair/model-free tuner has better budget efficiency than the worst-performed tuner-model pair/model-free tuner in the set; if we have $r > 1$ then it is less efficient; $r = 1$ simply means they have the same efficiency. The value of r naturally quantifies the extent of efficiency improvement/degradation against the worst-performed tuner-model pair/model-free tuner.

Note that, since the tuning for batch model-based tuners does not involve additional measurements but model evaluations, we calculate its efficiency based on the model evaluation throughout the tuning. However, the best performance would still be a measured value of the best-predicted configuration, yet this is for evaluation purposes only (e.g., when comparing and obtaining T).

3.6 Statistical Validation

While the metrics provide a convenient means to answer our RQs, it remains unclear whether the gap between the results is of significance over repeated runs. To that end, we apply different statistical tests and correlation analysis indicators to validate our results.

3.6.1 Mann-Whitney U-Test

To verify pairwise comparisons of the metrics for accuracy and tuning quality, we use Mann-Whitney U-Test—a non-parametric and non-paired test that has been recommended for software engineering research [93]. We set a confidence

6. This excludes `Brute-force` (a batch model-based tuner) as it will certainly find the optimal configuration.

7. The worst tuner-model pair/model-free tuner is determined by using the Scott-Knott ESD test [86] and the average performance value (if there are multiple tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners in the worst rank).




Fig. 4: The architecture and workflow of our empirical study.

level as $\alpha = 95\%$, meaning that if the comparison results in $p < 0.05$ then the difference is statistically significant. Noteworthy, as a non-paired test, the Mann-Whitney U-Test bears weak statistical power, i.e., the statistical significance needs to be strong in order to be detected.

3.6.2 Scott-Knott Effect Size Difference (ESD) Test

When comparing multiple tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners or models, we leverage the non-parametric version of the Scott-Knott Effect Size Difference (ESD) test [85]. In a nutshell, Scott-Knott ESD test sorts the list of treatments (the tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners or models) by their median values of the metric. Next, it splits the list into two sub-lists with the largest expected difference [97]. For example, suppose that we compare A , B , and C , a possible split could be $\{A, B\}$, $\{C\}$, with the rank (r) of 1 and 2, respectively. This means that, in the statistical sense, A and B perform similarly, but they are significantly better than C . Formally, Scott-Knott ESD test aims to find the best split by maximizing the difference Δ in the median before and after each split:

$$\Delta = \frac{|l_1|}{|l|} (\bar{l}_1 - \bar{l})^2 + \frac{|l_2|}{|l|} (\bar{l}_2 - \bar{l})^2 \quad (5)$$

whereby $|l_1|$ and $|l_2|$ are the sizes of two sub-lists (l_1 and l_2) from list l with a size $|l|$. \bar{l}_1 , \bar{l}_2 , and \bar{l} denote their median metric value.

During the splitting, we apply a statistical hypothesis test H to check if l_1 and l_2 are significantly different. This is done by using bootstrapping and Cliff's delta effect size [25]. If that is the case, Scott-Knott ESD test recurses on the splits. In other words, we divide the approaches into different sub-lists if both bootstrap sampling and effect size test suggest that a split is statistically significant (with a confidence level of 99%) and with a good effect measured by Cliff effect size. The sub-lists are then ranked based on their median metric.

In contrast to other non-parametric statistical tests on multiple comparisons (e.g., Kruskal-Wallis test [65]), Scott-Knott ESD test offers the following unique advantages:

- It does not require posterior correction, as the comparisons are essentially conducted in a pairwise manner.
- It does not only show whether some treatments are statistically different or not, but also indicates which one is better than another, i.e., by means of ranking, while avoiding overlapping groups.

3.6.3 Spearman's Rank Correlation

We leverage Spearman's rank correlation (ρ) [68], which is a widely used indicator in software engineering [13], [94], to quantify the relationship between two metrics. Specifically, Spearman's rank correlation measures the nonlinear monotonic relation between two random variables and we have $-1 \leq \rho \leq 1$. $|\rho|$ represents the strength of monotonic correlation and $\rho = 0$ means that the two metrics do not correlate with each other in any way; $-1 \leq \rho < 0$ and $0 < \rho \leq 1$ denote that the monotonic correlation is negative and positive, respectively.

To interpret the strength of Spearman's rank correlation, we follow the common patterns below, which have also been widely used in software engineering [94]:

- **negligible:** $0 \leq |\rho| \leq 0.09$
- **weak:** $0.09 < |\rho| \leq 0.39$
- **moderate:** $0.39 < |\rho| \leq 0.69$
- **strong:** $0.69 < |\rho| \leq 1$

We also assess the statistical significance of the ρ value using z-score under a confidence level of 95%, i.e., the correlation is significant only when $p < 0.05$.

3.7 Procedure of Empirical Study

The workflow and procedure of our empirical study have been depicted in Figure 4. As can be seen, a tuner-model pair

for model-based tuners or a model-free tuner is used on all systems considered. The best configuration returned by the tuner-model pairs/model-free tuners would be then evaluated/analyzed using the metrics and statistical validation presented in Sections 3.5 and 3.6. In particular, depending on the type of tuners, there can be different considerations and prerequisites:

- **Sequential model-based tuners:** Each tuner of this type is paired with all 10 surrogate models, including the one that was originally chosen for the tuner and other replacement models. We set two key values beforehand: the hot-start sample size and the budget of measurements, as specified in Section 3.4.
- **Batch model-based tuners:** Each batch model-based tuner is also paired with all 10 surrogate models. We fixed the training sample size and budget as determined in Section 3.4.
- **Model-free tuners:** Since the model-free tuners do not rely on models, they are run directly by measuring the system given a budget. Yet, the budget can vary based on the **RQ** and which tuner type they are compared with (see Section 4.1).

As such, our study covers $2 \text{ accuracy metrics} \times 29 \text{ systems} \times (10 \text{ models} \times 8 \text{ sequential model-based tuners} + 10 \text{ models paired with the batch model-based tuners})^8 = 5,220$ cases for accuracy. For the tuning quality, we have $2 \text{ tuning quality metrics} \times [(21 \text{ large systems} \times 80 \text{ instances} + 8 \text{ small systems} \times 10 \text{ instances for batch model-based tuner-model pairs}) + (29 \text{ systems} \times 80 \text{ instances for sequential model-based tuner-model pairs}) + 29 \text{ systems} \times 8 \text{ instances}] = 8392$ cases. In total, the above leads to 13,612 cases of investigation—to the best of our knowledge, this is the largest-scale study to date on this topic for software configuration tuning. To mitigate stochastic noise, we repeat each experiment 30 times with varying seeds.

Notably, when comparing two tuners (or tuner-model pairs), we say one wins (or loses) only if its results are better (or worse) with statistical significance; otherwise, we say the comparison is a tie.

All experiments were run in parallel on two high-performance servers each with Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS, two Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 50 cores CPU @ 2.30GHz (with two Nvidia A100 80GB GPU support for training deep learning-based models), and 500GB memory over the period of 13 months, 24×7 —roughly 9,490.01 GPU/CPU hours.

4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this section, we summarize and discuss the results obtained.

4.1 RQ1: How Useful is the Model for Tuning Quality?

4.1.1 Method

To answer **RQ1**, we respectively compare the sequential and batch model-based tuners, paired with all possible models,

8. Since the model evolves depending on the sequential model-based tuners, a model’s accuracy need to be evaluated on each specific tuner. For the batch model-based tuners, we only evaluate the accuracy of 10 models independent to the tuners as they essentially share the same trained model.




Fig. 5: Comparing the best tuner-model pair against the best model-free tuner under each system for all 29 cases (30 runs). We count how many cases the best tuner-model pair wins, loses, or ties.

against their model-free counterparts. Since there are many tuner-model pairs and model-free tuners to compare, for each system, we select the best representative from each tuner type. To that end, we run Scott-Knott ESD test on each tuning quality metric, and use the one that is ranked the first as the representative; if there is more than one pair/tuner in the best rank, we choose the one with the best average quality. It is worth noting that, when comparing model-free tuners with sequential model-based tuners, they are set with the budget identified in Section 3.4. In contrast, when comparing them with batch model-based tuners, their budget is set as the same as the training sample size used by the batch model-based ones, which is already a large figure compared with existing work. This is because only the measurement of systems is expensive in configuration tuning while the other factors are relatively marginal, hence matching them in that aspect ensures a fairer comparison. Since there are 29 systems, we have 29 cases under each metric.

The pairwise comparisons are verified by the Mann-Whitney U-test. All other settings are the same as discussed in Section 3. In particular, we summarize the result under a case as follows:

- **Win:** This means a model-based tuner has better results than the model-free counterpart while the comparison is statistically significant.
- **Loss:** This means a model-based tuner has worse results than the model-free counterpart while the comparison is statistically significant.
- **Tie:** This means the model-based tuners and the model-free counterpart have no statistically significant difference regardless of the average deviation in performance value.

4.1.2 Results

From Figure 5, for sequential model-based tuner, it is clear that the models are overwhelmingly helpful against the counterpart when the model is absent. Even with the statistical test, out of the 29 cases, the sequential model-based tuner still wins over the model-free counterpart on

TABLE 6: Comparing the best tuner-model pairs of sequential model-based tuners and their best model-free counterparts over 30 runs. $\Delta\%$ refers to the ratio of $\frac{f-b}{f} \times 100$ (or $\frac{b-f}{f} \times 100$ if the quality metric is to be maximized) such that b and f are the values of the tuning quality metric for a model-based tuner and corresponding model-free tuner, respectively. \dagger and $*$ denote $p < 0.001$ and $0.001 \leq p < 0.05$, respectively. Regardless of statistical significance, blue cells indicate that the pairs under model-based tuners lead to better average performance than their model-free counterparts; red cells mean the tuner-model pairs have worse average performance. Statistically significant comparisons are highlighted in bold. There is a STORM case where the performance value is too small as a decimal value, and hence showing as 0; but the % of difference can still be very large.

System	Performance						Efficiency					
	Sequential	Model	Performance	Model-free	Performance	$\Delta\%$	Sequential	Model	Efficiency	Model-free	Efficiency	$\Delta\%$
BROTLI	FLASH	DeP	0.54±0.00	R_search	1.46±0.01	169.00% [†]	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.01	SWAY	0.19±0.05	1421.69% [†]
LLVM	ROBOTune	DaL	199.68±0.00	ParamILS	199.91±0.24	0.11% [†]	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.01	GGA	0.43±0.26	2949.30% [†]
LRZIP	ResTune	RF	3.12±0.00	ConEx	3.12±0.00	0.02%	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.01	ConEx	0.36±0.23	3493.17% [†]
XGBOOST	FLASH	DeP	10.32±0.00	ParamILS	11.39±2.15	10.43% [*]	OtterTune	DeP	0.13±0.08	ParamILS	0.31±0.24	131.47% [*]
NOC-CM-LOG	ATConf	RF	4.31±0.00	BestConfig	4.31±0.00	0.00%	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.00	ParamILS	0.13±0.05	1219.58% [†]
DEEPARCH	FLASH	DeP	1.05±0.00	GGA	1.05±0.00	0.10% [†]	FLASH	RF	0.11±0.15	GGA	0.43±0.24	297.07% [†]
BDB_C	SMAC	DT	0.35±0.00	ConEx	0.35±0.00	0.19% [†]	SMAC	GP	0.08±0.06	ParamILS	0.32±0.19	331.56% [†]
HSQLDB	BOCA	SPL	248.20±0.00	BestConfig	248.23±0.07	0.01% [*]	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.00	BestConfig	0.34±0.31	5016.25% [†]
DCONVERT	FLASH	DaL	1.76±0.00	GGA	1.80±0.02	2.38% [†]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.03±0.02	ParamILS	0.34±0.27	1132.27% [†]
7Z	SMAC	DCT	4238.93±35.88	GGA	4272.85±38.87	0.80% [*]	OtterTune	DaL	0.28±0.25	ParamILS	0.37±0.31	33.94%
APACHE	SMAC	RF	170.82±0.03	GA	170.80±0.11	0.01%	SMAC	GP	0.02±0.01	GGA	0.43±0.25	2056.01% [†]
HSMGP	OtterTune	HTP	100.31±0.00	GGA	100.51±0.38	0.19% [*]	ROBOTune	SPL	0.02±0.02	ParamILS	0.21±0.13	814.74% [†]
MONGODB	SMAC	RF	206356.00±0.00	BestConfig	206723.43±548.92	0.18% [†]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.02±0.01	BestConfig	0.47±0.37	2726.02% [†]
POSTGRESQL	FLASH	DeP	45999.31±49.26	GA	50680.19±12.07	10.18% [†]	FLASH	GP	0.01±0.00	SWAY	0.26±0.13	4743.40% [†]
EXASTENCILS	FLASH	DeP	4646.99±4.55	ConEx	4658.07±28.37	0.24%	ROBOTune	GP	0.46±0.25	ParamILS	0.41±0.32	-10.65%
KANZI	FLASH	DeP	3.56±0.00	ConEx	3.76±0.20	5.55% [†]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.06±0.02	ParamILS	0.24±0.14	343.38% [†]
JUMP3R	OtterTune	DT	0.60±0.00	GGA	0.63±0.03	5.17% [†]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.04±0.05	ParamILS	0.21±0.14	411.69% [†]
MARIADB	RestTune	LR	55.97±0.00	BestConfig	56.09±0.30	0.21% [†]	SMAC	GP	0.01±0.01	BestConfig	0.32±0.29	4022.32% [†]
POLLY	SMAC	RF	4.25±0.02	BestConfig	4.26±0.01	0.10%	ROBOTune	SVR	0.07±0.06	BestConfig	0.19±0.23	192.60% [†]
SQL	RestTune	RF	12.57±0.09	BestConfig	12.51±0.00	-0.42% [*]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.06±0.05	BestConfig	0.05±0.07	-10.91% [*]
VP9	ATConf	SPL	41.26±0.00	BestConfig	41.28±0.13	0.06%	SMAC	SPL	0.17±0.09	ParamILS	0.16±0.06	-4.11%
SPARK	FLASH	RF	3427.07±59.91	BestConfig	3370.70±60.49	1.64% [†]	SMAC	GP	0.05±0.02	ParamILS	0.13±0.08	162.00% [†]
HIPACC	FLASH	SVR	21.18±0.00	BestConfig	21.17±0.00	-0.03% [†]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.05±0.02	ParamILS	0.12±0.06	156.33% [†]
REDIS	FLASH	SPL	86005.16±1585.10	R_search	85960.53±1148.89	0.05%	SMAC	GP	0.06±0.03	ConEx	0.25±0.22	356.11% [†]
STORM	OtterTune	GP	≈ 0	ConEx	≈ 0	200.00%	SMAC	DeP	0.04±0.02	ConEx	0.36±0.30	914.43% [†]
SAC	SMAC	DCT	0.39±0.00	BestConfig	0.39±0.00	-0.68% [*]	ROBOTune	SVR	0.03±0.02	BestConfig	0.02±0.06	-6.36% [*]
HADOOP	FLASH	GP	1416.67±13.50	SWAY	1410.57±16.97	0.43%	ATConf	SPL	0.30±0.15	ParamILS	0.30±0.13	2.19%
TOMCAT	FLASH	DT	1338.49±26.87	R_search	1332.90±29.22	0.42%	OtterTune	RF	0.16±0.12	GA	0.35±0.37	122.32% [†]
JAVAGC	FLASH	DCT	395.57±0.25	GGA	402.27±3.28	1.69% [†]	FLASH	RF	0.10±0.06	ParamILS	0.19±0.15	88.31% [*]

16 cases; draws on 10, and loses only on 3 in terms of performance. For efficiency, the best model-tuner pair has a remarkable win on 21 cases with 6 and 2 cases of tie and loss, respectively. Looking at the detailed results in Table 6⁹, the model can help the sequential model-based tuner to achieve a maximum of 160% performance improvement and up to 50× better for efficiency.

We also found that the best tuner-model pair for the sequential model-based tuners is system-dependent for both performance and efficiency; the same applies to the model-free tuners. However, Flash and SMAC/ROBOTune appear to be often part of the best tuner-model pair for performance and efficiency, respectively. For the model-free counterparts, both the BestConfig and ParamILS tend to be more competitive than the others.

The divergence of tuning quality between the two types of tuner appears to be larger on small systems (e.g., BROTLI) than the others. This is possible since being small in terms of the search space does not necessarily mean that they are simple, because the landscape can still be radically complex to be modeled and contain many local optima traps.

Finding 1

Models can considerably improve the sequential model-based tuner over its model-free counterpart in 16 (up to 160% improvement) and 21 (up to 5× better) out

9. If we were to match the table and the Figure 5, a win/loss in the figure corresponds to a colored cell in the table with bold texts; a tie in the figure reflects any remaining cells in the table.

of 29 cases for performance and efficiency, respectively, demonstrating its usefulness in guiding the tuning when they can be continuously updated.

In contrast, we observe rather different results when comparing batch model-based tuners with the model-free ones. From Figure 5, we see that the best tuner-model pair from the batch type is commonly worse than the best model-free counterpart for performance. While it appears to be better than model-free tuner in efficiency, the improvements are often not statistically significant. In particular, the batch model-based tuner loses 28 cases with 1 tie for performance; it wins 6 cases and loses 1 case, together with 22 ties, for efficiency. The detailed results in Table 7 show that the degradation of batch model-based tuner over the model-free one can be up to 200%. Such a discrepancy, compared with the results of sequential model-based tuners, is due to the fact that the models are not updated progressively during tuning when used for batch model-based tuners.

As for the generally best tuner-model pair under batch model-based tuners, again, we found no generally best one across the systems. For both types of tuners, the BestConfig and ParamILS remain robust on both tuning quality metrics. Again, the quality divergence tends to be larger on the small systems compared with the others due to the same reason mentioned before.

TABLE 7: Comparing the best tuner-model pairs of batch model-based tuners and their best model-free counterparts over 30 runs. The format is the same as Table 6.

System	Performance						Efficiency					
	Batch	Model	Performance	Model-free	Performance	$\Delta\%$	Batch	Model	Efficiency	Model-free	Efficiency	$\Delta\%$
BROTLI	Brute-force	SVR	1.55±0.05	BestConfig	1.47±0.01	-4.91% [†]	Brute-force	SVR	0.19±0.00	SWAY	0.25±0.03	35.16%
LIVM	Brute-force	RF	203.54±2.88	ParamILS	199.92±0.25	-1.78% [†]	Brute-force	HIP	0.04±0.00	ParamILS	0.43±0.33	985.48%
LRZIP	Brute-force	SVR	3.68±0.74	Random	3.14±0.02	-14.46% [†]	Brute-force	SVR	0.05±0.00	ConEx	0.30±0.24	460.09%
XGBOOST	Brute-force	RF	33.61±15.08	ParamILS	14.87±6.84	-55.75% [†]	Brute-force	RF	0.02±0.00	SWAY	0.41±0.32	2167.55%
NOC-CM-LOG	Brute-force	SVR	4.36±0.04	ParamILS	4.31±0.00	-1.17% [†]	Brute-force	SVR	1.00±0.00	ParamILS	0.22±0.13	-77.74%
DEEPARCH	Brute-force	RF	1.29±0.45	SWAY	1.09±0.12	-15.20% [†]	Brute-force	RF	0.33±0.00	SWAY	0.41±0.31	24.37%
BDB_C	Brute-force	RF	0.38±0.03	BestConfig	0.36±0.00	-5.75% [†]	Brute-force	HIP	0.16±0.00	BestConfig	0.40±0.35	150.33%
HSQLDB	Brute-force	RF	248.80±0.43	ParamILS	248.29±0.10	-0.21% [†]	Brute-force	RF	0.12±0.00	BestConfig	0.35±0.28	182.97%
DCONVERT	GGA	DT	1.89±0.06	GGA	1.80±0.02	-4.69% [†]	BestConfig	DeP	0.08±0.03	ParamILS	0.33±0.25	314.72% [†]
7Z	ConEx	DaL	4502.71±174.88	GGA	4270.68±36.02	-5.15% [†]	BestConfig	RF	0.48±0.33	ParamILS	0.34±0.31	-28.05%
APACHE	ParamILS	GP	168.91±0.68	GA	170.80±0.11	-1.12% [†]	ParamILS	LR	0.20±0.10	GGA	0.36±0.22	78.95%*
HSMGP	ConEx	HIP	102.43±1.64	ConEx	100.47±0.20	-1.92% [†]	ParamILS	HIP	0.09±0.04	ParamILS	0.17±0.09	95.64%*
MONGODB	BestConfig	HIP	208786.93±1540.66	BestConfig	206561.38±386.20	-1.07% [†]	ParamILS	LR	0.20±0.15	ConEx	0.40±0.19	99.51% [†]
POSTGRESQL	GA	RF	51025.81±233.26	ParamILS	50690.25±19.25	-0.66% [†]	Random	RF	0.27±0.26	ConEx	0.19±0.12	-29.34%
EXASTENCILS	ParamILS	RF	4841.37±113.92	ParamILS	4671.02±99.33	-3.52% [†]	ParamILS	DeP	0.65±0.33	ParamILS	0.30±0.22	-54.37% [†]
KANZI	ParamILS	RF	4.79±1.26	ConEx	3.80±0.20	-20.61% [†]	ParamILS	RF	0.24±0.21	ParamILS	0.27±0.18	12.91%
JUMP3R	ParamILS	SVR	0.64±0.06	GGA	0.63±0.04	-2.12% [†]	ParamILS	SVR	0.13±0.10	ParamILS	0.22±0.16	71.75%*
MARIADB	GA	RF	57.51±1.22	BestConfig	56.11±0.38	-2.43% [†]	ParamILS	LR	0.21±0.16	BestConfig	0.24±0.25	13.20%
POLLY	BestConfig	DaL	4.76±0.60	BestConfig	4.26±0.02	-10.51% [†]	BestConfig	GP	0.19±0.26	BestConfig	0.17±0.20	-11.27%
SQL	GA	DaL	13.11±0.30	BestConfig	12.51±0.00	-4.58% [†]	BestConfig	DeP	0.04±0.04	BestConfig	0.05±0.07	33.12%
VP9	BestConfig	RF	42.39±1.18	BestConfig	41.28±0.13	-2.61% [†]	BestConfig	DeP	0.05±0.02	BestConfig	0.14±0.19	205.60%
SPARK	GA	SPL	3095.87±99.26	BestConfig	3355.47±52.27	-8.39% [†]	ParamILS	LR	0.12±0.05	ParamILS	0.13±0.07	11.30%
HIPACC	ParamILS	RF	21.24±0.08	BestConfig	21.17±0.00	-0.31% [†]	BestConfig	DeP	0.10±0.12	ParamILS	0.10±0.05	-2.49%
REDIS	Random	LR	73750.87±4036.21	Random	85716.19±1162.73	-16.22% [†]	ParamILS	HIP	0.26±0.10	ConEx	0.28±0.24	8.22%
STORM	ConEx	RF	≈ 0	BestConfig	≈ 0	-200.00% [†]	BestConfig	DeP	0.11±0.03	BestConfig	0.29±0.23	155.03% [†]
SAC	SWAY	DT	0.41±0.02	BestConfig	0.39±0.00	-3.94% [†]	BestConfig	SPL	0.01±0.03	BestConfig	0.02±0.05	32.64%
HADOOP	irace	HIP	1313.47±39.33	SWAY	1405.13±18.03	-6.98% [†]	ParamILS	DaL	0.26±0.16	ParamILS	0.34±0.18	33.20%
TOMCAT	BestConfig	SVR	1164.20±56.09	Random	1332.96±29.15	-14.50% [†]	ParamILS	GP	0.22±0.07	GA	0.34±0.36	58.10%
JAVAGC	ParamILS	RF	407.33±5.65	GGA	401.15±2.18	-1.52% [†]	ParamILS	HIP	0.12±0.09	ParamILS	0.11±0.06	-14.26%




Fig. 6: Comparing the original model in the sequential model-based tuner against the best alternative model when tuning under each combination of system and tuner for all 232 cases (30 runs). We count how many cases the origin wins, loses, or ties.

Finding 2

Conversely, models generally have marginal or even harmful impact on the tuning quality of batch model-based tuner, as out of the 29 cases, they lose on 28 cases on performance while drawing or losing on 23 cases for efficiency against the model-free one.

4.2 RQ2: Do the Chosen Models Work the Best on Tuning Quality?

4.2.1 Method

Another interesting investigation related to the model usefulness is to explore whether the fixed model, originally chosen for sequential model-based tuners (so-called origin), is indeed the optimal setting in terms of tuning quality, e.g., whether the CART used in FLASH is the best option. To

that end, under each combination of system and tuner, we compare the best representative from all tuner-model pairs (selected in the same way as RQ1 according to a quality metric) against the original tuner-model pair. In total, we have 29 systems \times 8 sequential model-based tuners = 232 cases to discuss for each metric. Other settings are the same as RQ1.

4.2.2 Results

Surprisingly, from Figure 6, we see that the origins in sequential model-based tuners are often not as effective as we expected, as compared with some arbitrarily new tuner-model pairs, they lose on 46% of the cases (106/232) with 50% tie (116/232) on performance. Similar results can also be observed for efficiency: the origin has 32% (74/232 cases) loss and 66% (153/232 cases) tie.

Specifically, Tables 8 and 9 show the detailed results on different systems. Clearly, the performance can be improved by up to 286.62% when we simply replace OtterTune’s GP with DECART under KANZI. Likewise, the efficiency improvement can reach up to 699.63% by modifying OtterTune’s GP to DaL under EXASTENCILS. All of the above suggests that the originally chosen tuner-model pairs for sequential model-based tuners are far away from being optimal on any single metric of the tuning quality.

We also see that, relatively, the tuning quality of certain tuners can be more significantly improved by replacing the original model. This means that the impact of model replacement depends on the tuner’s nature, e.g., OtterTune relies on gradient descent that works on the landscape predicted by the model to explore the configuration space, thereby any subtle change of the landscape caused by the model replacement can be much more influential to its behaviors. We also observe that there has been no consistent pattern regarding the systems, as the models can be sensitive to the characteristics of configuration data, e.g., sparsity.




Fig. 7: Counting the number of cases where the best (worst) model chosen based on accuracy matches with the model that leads to the best (worst) tuning quality with 30 repeats. \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{W} refer to the scenario of best and worst representative, respectively. M&P, R&P, M&E, and R&E respectively denote the combined metric set of MAPE-performance, μ RD-performance, MAPE-efficiency, and μ RD-efficiency.

Finding 3

The original model used in sequential model-based tuners has marginal difference or can be significantly improved (for over 95% of the cases) compared with some other, “newly created” tuner-model pairs.

4.3 RQ3: Does the Goodness of Model Consistent with the Resulted Tuning Quality?

4.3.1 Method

To understand RQ3, for each combination of the system and model-based tuner, we select representatives of the best and worst according to a metric. Those are chosen using Scott-Knott ESD test and the average metric value as before. Our goal is to analyze whether the best/worst model, selected by using an accuracy metric, can still lead to the best/worst tuning outcome after the model is used to guide the tuning, assessed by one of the tuning quality metrics. As a result, for sequential model-based tuners, we have $29 \text{ systems} \times 8 \text{ tuners} = 232$ cases under an accuracy-quality metric set. Similarly, for the batch model-based tuners, there are $21 \text{ large systems} \times 8 \text{ tuners} + 8 \text{ small systems} = 176$ cases¹⁰ per accuracy-quality metric set. Other settings are the same as before.

4.3.2 Results

For sequential model-based tuners, as from Figure 7, we see a rather low consistency between the model accuracy and the model’s tuning performance: there are 16% and 18% matched cases (36 and 42 out of 232 cases) on the best representative for MAPE and μ RD, respectively. This is similarly low for the worst representative, exhibiting 16% and 23% for MAPE and μ RD (38 and 53 out of 232 cases), respectively. An even lower percentage of matching can be found between model accuracy and tuning efficiency, leading to 26 and 22 out of 232 cases for MAPE and μ RD,

10. Note that for small systems, only Brute-force is needed as the space can be reasonably covered.

respectively, under best representative; 37 and 60 out of 232 cases for MAPE and μ RD, respectively, under worst representative.

The results tend to be more positive for the batch model-based tuners (Figure 7) in terms of performance, but there are still less than 50% of the cases show a match on both MAPE and μ RD for the best representative. Similar results can be seen for the scenario of the worst representative: the percentage becomes rather low again when considering efficiency —16% and 19% for MAPE and μ RD (28 and 34 out of 176 cases), respectively, for the best representative. This becomes 17% and 23% for the worst representative on MAPE and μ RD (30 and 40 out of 176 cases), respectively.

The deviated matching between sequential and batch model-based tuners is not hard to understand, as the model continues to evolve in the former while it remains fixed for the latter. Therefore, the most/least accurate model could be more indicative and stable of their best/worst performance for batch model-based tuners than that of their sequential counterparts. Yet, for efficiency, the consistency remains low due to the sparse nature of configuration tuning.

Tables 10 and 11 and illustrate the detailed results. We see that, when using certain tuners, it is more likely to have a good consistency between model accuracy and tuning quality of the model than others, e.g., OtterTune, ParamILS and ConEx. The reason behind this can be dependent on how well the tuner balances exploitation and exploration by leveraging the model (see Section 3.3.3). Interestingly, we observed that even for Brute-force, there is still a considerable number of mismatched cases. This is because while the overall accuracy might be high, the best-predicted configuration might still be rather erroneous, which prevents it from being effective in guiding the tuning. We will further examine how accurate is enough in RQ5. It is also clear that certain systems lead to more matched cases depending on the tuner type, e.g., MONGODB for sequential and MARIADB for batch model-based tuners. This is due to the tuning landscape of the systems: if the landscape emulated by the model happens to be well-described by the accuracy, then its better or worse is more likely to be consistent with the best/worst tuning quality¹¹.

Finding 4

The sequential model-based tuners lead to generally inconsistent best/worst match between the accuracy and tuning quality of the model (matching in less than 20% of the cases). The batch model-based tuners, in contrast, have similar results for efficiency but are likely to be more consistent in performance. However, the matching cases are merely up to 45%.

4.4 RQ4: How Do the Model Accuracy and Tuning Quality Correlated?

4.4.1 Methods

For RQ4, our goal is to study the detailed correlation between the changes in accuracy and that of the tuning quality

11. Detailed data can be found at: https://github.com/ideas-labo/model-impact/blob/main/RQ_supplementary/RQ3/supplement.pdf.

TABLE 8: Comparing the original models and the best new models in terms of performance for sequential model-based tuners over 30 runs. $\Delta\%$ refers to the ratio of $\frac{f-b}{f} \times 100$ (or $\frac{b-f}{f} \times 100$ if the quality metric is to be maximized) such that b and f are the values of the tuning quality metric when using the best new model and the original model, respectively. In \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O} , \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{O} denote the best new model and the original model, respectively. Blue cells indicate that the original model wins while red cells mean the original model loses. Statistically significant comparisons are highlighted in bold and the best model for a system is underlined. Other formats are the same as Table 6.

System	BOCA		ATConF		FLASH		OtterTune		ResTune		ROBOTune		SMAC		Tuneful	
	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$
BROTLI	DT/RF	-0.42%	HIP/GP	1.54% [†]	DeP/DT	-6.43% [†]	DCT/GP	-0.49% [†]	DaL/GP	-0.69% [†]	RF/GP	-14.34% [†]	HIP/RF	0.32%	DaL/GP	-0.66% [†]
LLVM	HIP/RF	-0.00%	DeP/GP	0.01%	GP/DT	0.00%	DaL/GP	-0.04% [*]	HIP/GP	-0.03% [*]	DaL/GP	-0.20% [†]	DCT/RF	-0.01%	HIP/GP	-0.07%
LRZIP	HIP/RF	-0.10%	RF/GP	0.00%	RF/DT	0.00%	DT/GP	-6.18% [†]	RF/GP	-0.01%	DCT/GP	-0.18% [†]	DT/RF	0.00%	RF/GP	0.14%
XGBOOST	DT/RF	2.47%	SPL/GP	6.60%	DeP/DT	-6.95% [†]	DeP/GP	-23.59% [†]	LR/GP	5.40% [*]	RF/GP	-53.34% [†]	DT/RF	-1.24%	DeP/GP	-13.66%
NOC-CM-LOG	GP/RF	0.00%	RF/GP	-1.82% [†]	DaL/DT	0.00%	RF/GP	-0.07%	DeP/GP	-0.38% [†]	DeP/GP	-0.38% [†]	DeP/RF	0.00%	HIP/GP	-1.83% [†]
DEEPARCH	DeP/RF	-0.08%	HIP/GP	-0.05%	DeP/DT	-0.00%	RF/GP	-0.18% [†]	RF/GP	-0.00%	HIP/GP	-7.30% [†]	DT/RF	-0.13%	DaL/GP	-1.23% [†]
BDB_C	LR/RF	-1.56% [†]	SPL/GP	0.27%	DeP/DT	-5.02%	DeP/GP	-1.57% [†]	DeP/GP	0.31%	RF/GP	-2.19% [†]	DT/RF	-0.00%	HIP/GP	-2.23%
HSQLDB	SPL/RF	-8.02% [†]	LR/GP	0.01%	RF/DT	0.00%	DaL/GP	-0.08% [†]	SPL/GP	-0.04% [†]	HIP/GP	-0.08% [†]	DT/RF	0.00%	SPL/GP	-0.04% [†]
DCONVERT	GP/RF	-1.06% [†]	DaL/GP	0.15%	DaL/DT	-0.66%	DT/GP	-0.78% [†]	DaL/GP	-0.13%	HIP/GP	-3.68% [†]	DT/RF	0.04%	DaL/GP	-1.90%
Zz	HIP/RF	-4.62% [†]	DaL/GP	-4.21% [†]	DeP/DT	-30.98%	DeP/GP	-23.97% [†]	DaL/GP	-31.28% [†]	RF/GP	-7.87% [†]	DCT/RF	-0.45%	DaL/GP	-31.28% [†]
APACHE	DaL/RF	-0.01%	DT/GP	-0.03%	LR/DT	-0.15% [†]	HIP/GP	-0.30% [†]	DaL/GP	-0.00%	DT/GP	-0.10% [†]	DT/RF	0.04%	DaL/GP	-0.00%
HSMGP	LR/RF	-1.37% [†]	SPL/GP	0.04% [*]	HIP/DT	-0.05%	HIP/GP	-3.26% [†]	LR/GP	0.02% [*]	HIP/GP	-1.14% [†]	HIP/RF	-0.09%	LR/GP	-0.02% [*]
MONGODB	SPL/RF	-0.13% [†]	RF/GP	-0.12% [†]	SPL/DT	0.00%	DCT/GP	-2.46% [†]	DaL/GP	-0.04%	HIP/GP	-1.47% [†]	DT/RF	0.01%	LR/GP	-0.52%
POSTGRESQL	SVR/RF	-0.02%	DaL/GP	-0.02% [*]	DeP/DT	-0.11% [†]	DT/GP	-0.18% [†]	RF/GP	-0.01%	DaL/GP	-0.06% [†]	DCT/RF	-0.03%	RF/GP	-0.01%
EXASTENCILS	DeP/RF	-0.57%	RF/GP	-1.10% [†]	DeP/DT	-3.56% [†]	DeP/GP	-13.51% [†]	RF/GP	0.58% [†]	HIP/GP	1.36%	DeP/RF	0.25% [†]	RF/GP	-0.27% [†]
KANZI	SPL/RF	-71.47% [†]	SVR/GP	-0.54%	DeP/DT	-0.26%	DCT/GP	-286.62% [†]	SPL/GP	4.53% [†]	HIP/GP	-96.37% [†]	HIP/RF	-25.41% [†]	SPL/GP	-1.41%
JUMP3R	GP/RF	-9.81% [†]	SPL/GP	0.65%	DeP/DT	0.00%	DT/GP	-0.18% [†]	SPL/GP	0.45%	RF/GP	-14.69% [†]	SVR/RF	-11.21% [†]	SPL/GP	-1.38%
MARIADB	SPL/RF	-7.98% [†]	SPL/GP	0.16%	SPL/DT	-0.94% [†]	DCT/GP	-0.72% [†]	LR/GP	-0.72% [†]	DeP/GP	-0.63%	DCT/RF	-0.89%	DT/GP	-0.33%
POLLY	DCT/RF	-0.04%	RF/GP	-2.53% [†]	DCT/DT	-2.81%	HIP/GP	-0.11%	DaL/GP	7.68%	RF/GP	-50.53% [†]	DT/RF	0.16%	DaL/GP	-7.81%
SQL	SVR/RF	-0.02%	DeP/GP	-1.15% [†]	LR/DT	-0.18%	LR/GP	-0.39%	RF/GP	-2.47% [†]	RF/GP	-2.22% [†]	SPL/RF	-1.29% [†]	RF/GP	-1.93% [†]
VP9	DaL/RF	0.06%	SPL/GP	-0.62% [†]	LR/DT	-1.92% [†]	DT/GP	-4.78% [†]	SPL/GP	-3.47% [†]	RF/GP	-6.59% [†]	DCT/RF	-0.17%	SPL/GP	-3.47% [†]
SPARK	DaL/RF	-0.37%	DT/GP	-1.06% [†]	RF/DT	-0.33%	RF/GP	-1.64% [†]	RF/GP	-2.40% [†]	DaL/GP	-2.14% [†]	DT/RF	0.02%	DaL/GP	-2.43% [†]
HIPACC	SVR/RF	-0.16% [†]	LR/GP	0.07% [*]	SVR/DT	-0.26%	DaL/GP	-0.31% [†]	SPL/GP	-0.09%	DaL/GP	-0.68%	SVR/RF	0.02%	SPL/GP	-0.10%
REDIS	SVR/RF	-0.75% [†]	DaL/GP	-0.96%	SPL/DT	-0.14%	HIP/GP	-2.90% [†]	HIP/GP	-0.20%	SVR/GP	-0.56%	DT/RF	-0.47%	DaL/GP	0.17%
STORM	LR/RF	-200.00%	LR/GP	200.00%	DaL/DT	0.00%	LR/GP	200.00%	LR/GP	0.00%	LR/GP	-197.73% [†]	DeP/RF	-200.00%	DeP/GP	-17371.43%
SAC	DCT/RF	-7.75% [†]	DaL/GP	-5.89% [†]	DaL/DT	-0.82%	HIP/GP	-8.42% [†]	DT/GP	-11.95% [†]	RF/GP	-19.93% [†]	DCT/RF	-2.46%	DeP/GP	-8.76%
HADOOP	DT/RF	-0.24%	DT/GP	-1.23% [†]	GP/DT	-1.09% [†]	DT/GP	-0.27%	DT/GP	-0.73%	LR/GP	-0.43%	SPL/RF	-0.51%	HIP/GP	-0.65%
TOMCAT	SVR/RF	0.33%	DT/GP	-0.41%	DaL/DT	0.09%	DT/GP	-1.43% [†]	DT/GP	0.08%	RF/GP	-0.70% [†]	DCT/RF	-0.24%	DaL/GP	-0.43%
JAVAGC	SPL/RF	-0.30%	DeP/GP	-0.93%	DCT/DT	-0.26% [†]	DCT/GP	-8.71% [†]	LR/GP	-0.08%	HIP/GP	-5.31% [†]	SPL/RF	0.33%	LR/GP	-7.12% [†]

TABLE 9: Comparing the original models and the best other models in terms of efficiency for sequential model-based tuners over 30 runs. The format and abbreviations are the same as Table 8.

System	BOCA		ATConF		FLASH		OtterTune		ResTune		ROBOTune		SMAC		Tuneful	
	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$	Model (\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{O})	$\Delta\%$
BROTLI	GP/RF	-212.84% [†]	LR/GP	-54.20% [*]	LR/DT	-119.01% [†]	SVR/GP	-10.68%	LR/GP	-85.16% [*]	DaL/GP	-285.96% [†]	GP/RF	-103.42% [†]	SPL/GP	-61.48%
LLVM	HIP/RF	-99.47% [†]	SPL/GP	-34.51%	SPL/DT	-49.54% [†]	LR/GP	-36.24%	SPL/RF	7.39%	SPL/GP	-74.43%	GP/RF	-246.67% [†]	HIP/GP	51.45% [*]
LRZIP	DaL/RF	-16.89%	RF/GP	-11.02%	SVR/DT	-121.95% [†]	SVR/GP	-39.67%	SVR/GP	-5.12%	SVR/GP	15.23%	GP/RF	-96.97% [†]	HIP/GP	-15.04%
XGBOOST	DeP/RF	10.45%	SPL/GP	20.64%	RF/DT	-15.28%	DeP/GP	-102.87% [†]	HIP/GP	12.38%	SVR/GP	6.67%	DeP/RF	-50.49% [*]	SVR/GP	0.77%
NOC-CM-LOG	GP/RF	-73.66% [†]	LR/GP	-312.55% [†]	DeP/DT	-35.62% [†]	DCT/GP	-63.53% [†]	DeP/GP	-199.54% [†]	SPL/GP	-78.53% [†]	GP/RF	-178.28% [†]	HIP/GP	-177.50% [†]
DEEPARCH	DeP/RF	-7.07%	HIP/GP	19.35%	RF/DT	-41.85%	SVR/GP	91.55% [†]	RF/GP	0.93%	SVR/GP	21.80%	DCT/RF	5.91%	RF/GP	-3.75%
BDB_C	DeP/RF	-52.23%	LR/GP	-4.87%	RF/DT	-15.87%	RF/GP	-19.16%	LR/GP	-6.39%	LR/GP	-43.13%	GP/RF	-484.03% [†]	LR/GP	-62.97%
HSQLDB	GP/RF	-25.37%	SPL/GP	-45.80%	DaL/DT	-11.98%	RF/GP	-95.93% [†]	LR/GP	-83.37% [†]	LR/GP	26.48%	GP/RF	-228.43% [†]	LR/GP	-108.50% [*]
DCONVERT	HIP/RF	-15.70%	LR/GP	30.67%	HIP/DT	-54.36%	DT/GP	-47.23%	LR/GP	33.79%	SVR/GP	-62.70%	GP/RF	-63.48%	LR/GP	4.23%
Zz	DaL/RF	-42.70%	DeP/GP	-12.33%	DaL/DT	-66.3%	DaL/GP	-250.06% [†]	DaL/GP	-23.14%	RF/GP	-80.69%	DaL/RF	1.43%	DaL/GP	-224.88% [†]
APACHE	HIP/RF	-5.40%	SPL/GP	-50.95%	GP/DT	-513.92% [†]	LR/GP	4.31%	SVR/GP	-23.33%	HIP/GP	26.36%	GP/RF	-123.10% [†]	SVR/GP	-23.33%
HSMGP	HIP/RF	-284.28% [†]	SPL/GP	-19.79%	HIP/DT	-264.59% [†]	HIP/GP	-69.65%	DaL/GP	-157.18% [†]	SPL/GP	-326.87% [†]	SPL/RF	-281.16% [†]	LR/GP	-159.57% [†]
MONGODB	DaL/RF	2.91%	SPL/GP	-27.70%	LR/DT	-37.96%	DaL/GP	-235.72% [†]	DaL/GP	19.28%	SVR/GP	-52.02%	SPL/RF	-191.32% [†]	LR/GP	-53.78% [†]
POSTGRESQL	LR/RF	-75.54% [†]	HIP/GP	0.46%	GP/DT	-648.50% [†]	RF/GP	-24.70%	DCT/GP	-48.97% [†]	DaL/GP	-69.06%	GP/RF	-276.45% [†]	SPL/GP	-38.33% [†]
EXASTENCILS	DCT/RF	-26.14%	RF/GP	-77.56%	DaL/DT	-22.28%	DaL/GP	-69.63% [†]	RF/GP	51.71%	SVR/GP	5.70%	DaL/RF	29.43%	RF/GP	-38.58%
KANZI	LR/RF	-92.16% [*]	SVR/GP	47.11% [*]	RF/DT	-31.77%	RF/GP	-303.53% [†]	SVR/GP	-25.45%	SVR/GP	-4.98%	SPL/RF	-143.12% [*]	SVR/GP	28.42%
JUMP3R	GP/RF	-116.26% [†]	SPL/GP	-2.76%	DeP/DT	-59.67% [*]	SPL/GP	13.44%	SPL/GP	35.89%	SVR/GP	-14.90%	HIP/RF	-184.12% [†]	SPL/GP	-7.27%
MARIADB	LR/RF	-209.52% [†]	SPL/GP	-33.23%	RF/DT	10.19%	DeP/GP	-58.98%	SPL/GP	-79.81%	HIP/GP	8.10%	GP/RF	-28.91%	SPL/GP	-85.51% [†]
POLLY	DCT/RF	-10.73%	RF/GP	-51.16%	DCT/DT	-26.55%	DeL/GP	-48.72% [†]	RF/GP	-21.90%	SVR/GP	-30.09%	DT/RF	-15.89%	RF/GP	-25.96%
SQL	DT/RF	-42.35%	DeP/GP	-6.70%	DaL/DT	-12.79%	SVR/GP	-7.81%	SPL/GP	59.88% [†]	SVR/GP	-5.05%	GP/RF	-10.96%	SPL/GP	16.55%
VP9	LR/RF	0.55%	SVR/GP	24.16%	RF/DT	-6.54% [†]	RF/GP	-357.24% [†]	LR/GP	24.18%	DeP/GP	-1.43%	SPL/RF	-39.84%	LR/GP	24.29%
SPARK	SPL/RF	-37.77%	SVR/GP	-39.35%	RF/DT	-23.01%	SVR/GP	-6.96%	SPL/GP	-36.75%	SVR/GP	24.80%	GP/RF	-36.93%	SPL/GP	29.56%
HIPACC	GP/RF	-104.79% [†]	SPL/GP	-65.51% [†]	RF/DT	-44.78%	DCT/GP	-56.98%	SPL/GP	-36.00%	SVR/GP	-5.69%	DaL/RF	-48.51%	SPL/GP	-35.79%
REDIS	HIP/RF	-23.64%	LR/GP	-98.74% [†]	GP/DT	-61.32%	HIP/GP	-38.13%	SPL/GP	-49.16%	DeP/GP	-60.97%	DeP/RF	-169.05%	LR/GP	-47.05% [*]
STORM	GP/RF	-133.46% [†]	SPL/GP	39.08%	DeP/DT	-50.80% [†]	SVR/GP	41.03%	HIP/GP	-36.21%	SPL/GP	-28.38%	GP/RF	-349.30% [†]	LR/GP	-91.94% [†]
SAC	DeP/RF	-51.46%	DeP/GP	-81.52% [*]	SPL/DT	-109.67% [†]	HIP/GP	-3.81%	HIP/GP	-67.30% [†]	SVR/GP	-104.1%	GP/RF	-26.48%	DeP/GP	-254.88% [†]
HADOOP	DT/RF	3.97%	SPL/GP	-12.93%	LR/DT	-63.96%	RF/GP	-14.67%	SVR/GP	-16.17%	RF/GP	-4.25%	DaL/RF	28.96% [*]	DeP/GP	-21.81%
TOMCAT	GP/RF	-52.37%	DCT/GP	-11.83%	GP/DT	-39.13%	RF/GP	-17.22%	SVR/GP							

TABLE 12: Spearman correlations between model accuracy and its resulting tuning performance for sequential model-based tuners. † and * denote $p < 0.001$ and $0.001 \leq p < 0.05$, respectively. Blue bars and red bars indicate positive and negative correlation, respectively. The number and bar length show strength.

System	MAPE and Performance								μ RD and Performance							
	BOCA	ATConf	FLASH	OtterTune	ResTune	ROBOTune	SMAC	Tuneful	BOCA	ATConf	FLASH	OtterTune	ResTune	ROBOTune	SMAC	Tuneful
BROTLI	0.36†	-0.53†	-0.02	0.26†	-0.03	0.30†	0.44†	-0.05	0.39†	-0.09	0.32†	0.17†	-0.03	0.21†	0.45†	-0.03
LLVM	0.20†	0.08	0.00	0.13†	0.17*	0.23†	0.74†	0.06	0.27†	0.09	0.00	0.24†	0.19*	0.12†	0.71†	-0.00
LRZIP	0.08	0.26†	-0.02	0.01	0.07	-0.02	0.24†	0.09	0.09	-0.09	-0.02	0.49†	-0.01	0.23†	0.42†	0.14*
XGBOOST	0.21†	0.06	0.10	0.20†	0.07	0.28†	0.58†	0.19†	0.22†	0.06	0.24†	0.09	0.16*	0.16*	0.52†	0.08
NOC-CM-LOG	-0.03	0.35†	-0.03	0.10	-0.23†	-0.52†	0.34†	-0.21†	-0.07	0.52†	-0.02	0.06	-0.14*	-0.34†	0.42†	-0.12*
DEEPARCH	0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.11	0.19*	-0.11	0.43†	0.22†	0.03	0.18*	0.04	0.10	-0.03	0.11	0.49†	0.19*
BDB_C	-0.21†	-0.18*	0.11	0.20†	-0.22†	0.28†	0.48†	-0.11*	-0.22†	-0.07	0.20†	0.41†	-0.16*	0.32†	0.66†	0.07
HSQLDB	-0.26†	-0.23†	0.22†	0.41†	-0.08	0.42†	0.62†	-0.08	-0.13*	0.17*	0.28†	0.46†	0.19†	0.30†	0.66†	0.20†
DCONVERT	-0.09	0.06	0.23†	0.34†	0.08	0.50†	0.51†	0.05	-0.02	0.03	0.08	0.28†	0.16*	0.37†	0.53†	0.12*
7z	0.22†	0.08	0.23†	0.54†	0.18*	0.33†	0.63†	0.17*	0.38†	0.11	0.41†	0.62†	0.23†	0.32†	0.69†	0.22†
APACHE	-0.41†	0.16*	-0.41†	-0.27†	0.10	0.17*	-0.07	0.10	-0.10	-0.03	-0.45†	-0.20†	0.04	-0.07	-0.21†	0.04
HSMGP	-0.09	-0.50†	0.22†	0.49†	-0.01	0.08	0.19†	0.01	0.07	-0.23†	0.44†	0.49†	0.33†	0.25†	0.41†	0.34†
MONGODB	0.06	0.37†	0.52†	0.53†	0.32†	0.29†	0.60†	0.20†	0.31†	0.20†	0.54†	0.52†	0.34†	0.23†	0.58†	0.23†
POSTGRESQL	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.42†	-0.06	0.09	0.09	0.00	-0.10	0.39†	0.06	0.08	0.26†	0.06
EXASTENCILS	0.35†	0.09	0.58†	0.59†	-0.27†	-0.29†	0.59†	-0.16*	0.38†	0.24†	0.69†	0.65†	-0.19†	-0.35†	0.66†	-0.04
KANZI	-0.12*	0.05	0.22†	0.36†	-0.08	0.02	-0.11	-0.21†	-0.06	0.12*	0.50†	0.39†	0.06	0.26†	0.19*	0.09
JUMP3R	-0.13*	0.02	0.20†	-0.06	-0.06	0.20†	-0.45†	-0.10	0.21†	0.34†	0.27†	0.32†	0.16*	0.24†	0.48†	0.13*
MARIADB	-0.37†	-0.42†	0.27†	0.51†	0.01	0.33†	0.47†	0.22†	-0.36†	-0.34†	0.32†	0.51†	-0.04	0.23†	0.47†	0.19*
POLLY	0.28†	0.15*	0.36†	0.09	0.05	-0.18*	0.40†	0.07	0.31†	0.08	0.43†	0.17*	0.02	0.22†	0.41†	0.06
SQL	0.16*	-0.18*	0.15*	0.05	0.09	-0.06	0.00	0.02	0.19†	-0.05	0.31†	0.17*	-0.02	0.05	0.13*	0.06
VP9	0.46†	0.31†	0.39†	0.39†	0.16*	0.49†	0.38†	0.17*	0.40†	-0.04	0.41†	0.43†	0.22†	0.48†	0.45†	0.06
SPARK	0.23†	0.09	-0.23†	-0.09	-0.13*	-0.09	0.00	0.05	0.16*	0.14*	-0.28†	-0.13*	-0.18*	-0.16*	-0.08	-0.05
HIPACC	-0.23†	-0.05	0.11	0.35†	0.20†	0.30†	0.23†	0.04	-0.12*	0.01	0.29†	0.18*	0.12*	0.12*	0.27†	0.12*
REDIS	-0.01	-0.11	0.11	-0.11	0.01	-0.10	-0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.22†	0.01	-0.09	0.26†	-0.01
STORM	-0.04	-0.11	0.00	-0.07	0.21†	-0.14*	-0.06	-0.08	-0.05	-0.35†	0.00	-0.02	0.17*	0.19†	-0.05	0.42†
SAC	-0.10	0.13*	0.01	0.06	0.11	0.28†	0.42†	0.08	-0.04	0.01	0.03	0.18*	0.19*	-0.11	0.48†	0.02
HADOOP	0.06	-0.17*	0.03	-0.09	-0.05	-0.03	-0.23†	-0.01	-0.02	0.18*	-0.07	-0.11	0.26†	0.13*	0.00	0.00
TOMCAT	-0.13*	0.00	-0.11	0.07	-0.09	-0.07	0.05	-0.11	-0.10	-0.12*	-0.13*	0.06	0.00	-0.06	0.13*	0.14*
JAVAGC	0.07	-0.05	0.49†	0.54†	0.00	0.09	0.20†	0.12*	0.16*	-0.02	0.64†	0.64†	0.00	0.22†	0.32†	0.01

TABLE 13: Spearman correlations between model accuracy and its resulting tuning efficiency for sequential model-based tuners. The formats are the same as Table 12.

System	MAPE and Efficiency								μ RD and Efficiency							
	BOCA	ATConf	FLASH	OtterTune	ResTune	ROBOTune	SMAC	Tuneful	BOCA	ATConf	FLASH	OtterTune	ResTune	ROBOTune	SMAC	Tuneful
BROTLI	-0.38†	0.17*	-0.07	-0.26†	0.02	0.27†	-0.15*	0.00	-0.20†	-0.01	-0.08	-0.05	0.09	0.36†	0.10	0.07
LLVM	0.01	-0.08	0.20†	0.20†	0.09	-0.12*	-0.15*	-0.07	0.06	-0.03	0.33†	0.23†	0.17*	-0.09	-0.08	-0.06
LRZIP	-0.01	-0.02	-0.18*	-0.08	0.01	-0.12*	-0.09	-0.02	-0.07	-0.06	-0.08	-0.03	-0.01	-0.04	-0.15*	0.04
XGBOOST	0.29†	-0.05	0.19†	0.05	-0.11	-0.18*	0.04	-0.11	0.17*	-0.06	0.14*	-0.01	-0.07	-0.13*	0.02	-0.03
NOC-CM-LOG	-0.32†	-0.31†	0.09	-0.05	-0.13*	-0.69†	-0.49†	-0.30†	-0.28†	-0.17*	-0.05	-0.16*	-0.06	-0.58†	-0.50†	-0.21†
DEEPARCH	0.15*	-0.10	0.19†	0.16*	0.02	0.02	0.09	-0.04	0.18*	0.02	0.03	0.11	0.08	0.00	0.07	0.00
BDB_C	-0.03	-0.12*	0.19†	0.09	-0.35†	-0.10	-0.32†	-0.38†	-0.03	0.07	0.18*	0.12*	-0.22†	-0.02	-0.39†	-0.42†
HSQLDB	-0.07	-0.18*	0.47†	0.17*	-0.12*	-0.21†	-0.41†	-0.14*	-0.03	0.11	0.46†	0.21†	0.05	-0.19*	-0.36†	0.06
DCONVERT	0.16*	-0.04	0.33†	0.21†	0.01	-0.17*	-0.03	-0.07	0.13*	-0.04	0.22†	0.23†	0.05	-0.06	-0.01	-0.07
7z	-0.10	0.05	0.36†	0.12*	0.32†	0.11	0.12*	0.32†	-0.01	-0.02	0.47†	0.16*	0.35†	0.15*	0.16*	0.35†
APACHE	0.13*	-0.04	-0.20†	-0.01	-0.06	-0.10	-0.11	-0.06	0.24†	0.06	0.01	0.16*	0.02	-0.08	-0.05	0.02
HSMGP	-0.02	-0.24†	0.21†	0.24†	-0.04	-0.33†	-0.12*	-0.04	0.14*	-0.02	0.31†	0.23†	0.35†	0.08	0.18*	0.35†
MONGODB	0.22†	0.05	0.30†	0.36†	0.01	-0.18*	0.39†	-0.02	0.30†	0.17*	0.39†	0.38†	0.10	-0.11	0.58†	0.03
POSTGRESQL	0.16*	-0.08	-0.39†	0.03	0.18*	0.19†	0.21†	0.17*	-0.23†	0.00	-0.40†	-0.08	0.09	0.24†	-0.06	0.10
EXASTENCILS	0.38†	0.02	0.37†	0.37†	-0.18*	-0.19†	0.49†	-0.18*	0.43†	0.15*	0.43†	0.41†	-0.11	-0.03	0.52†	-0.11*
KANZI	-0.01	0.15*	0.22†	-0.01	-0.17*	-0.12*	-0.14*	-0.10	0.10	0.05	0.33†	-0.03	0.11	0.03	-0.17*	0.15*
JUMP3R	0.06	-0.04	0.21†	-0.16*	-0.20†	-0.18*	-0.09	-0.14*	0.14*	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.10	-0.16*	-0.18*	0.08
MARIADB	-0.25†	-0.23†	0.40†	0.08	-0.30†	-0.19*	0.02	-0.15*	-0.24†	0.08	0.41†	0.13*	-0.24†	-0.12*	0.03	-0.08
POLLY	0.14*	0.12*	0.25†	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.26†	0.07	0.12*	0.01	0.21†	0.03	0.07	-0.10	0.26†	0.02
SQL	0.01	0.05	0.13*	0.03	-0.05	-0.13*	0.07	-0.06	0.14*	0.08	0.14*	0.01	-0.06	0.07	0.01	0.00
VP9	0.30†	-0.12*	0.34†	0.33†	-0.13*	-0.21†	0.36†	-0.12*	0.27†	-0.08	0.35†	0.32†	-0.15*	-0.21†	0.39†	-0.14*
SPARK	-0.06	-0.06	0.12*	-0.23†	-0.03	-0.17*	-0.05	-0.13*	-0.05	-0.05	0.08	-0.26†	-0.04	-0.17*	-0.06	-0.11
HIPACC	-0.12*	0.00	0.18*	0.08	-0.06	-0.09	0.00	-0.01	-0.10	0.16*	0.19*	0.09	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.07
REDIS	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.02	-0.01	0.08	0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.15*	-0.03	-0.06	0.03	-0.05	-0.01	0.09
STORM	0.10	0.01	-0.05	0.31†	0.13*	0.09	0.02	-0.03	-0.02	-0.14*	-0.30†	-0.31†	0.05	0.11	-0.22†	0.02
SAC	-0.01	-0.05	0.04	0.03	-0.06	-0.19*	0.03	0.21†	-0.08	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.06
HADOOP	-0.02	0.10	0.20†	0.10	-0.02	-0.08	0.21†	0.13*	0.04	-0.01	0.27†	0.09	-0.04	0.02	0.25†	-0.07
TOMCAT	0.07	-0.10	0.07	0.10	-0.01	-0.04	0.07	-0.09	-0.04	0.09	0.01	0.08	-0.06	0.03	0.16*	-0.17*
JAVAGC	0.10	0.04	0.22†	0.30†	0.11	-0.10	0.17*	0.03	0.13*	0.06	0.27†	0.33†	0.14*	-0.13*	0.24†	0.04

that certain tuners show generally stronger correlations than others, e.g., OtterTune, Flash, SMAC, and GA, due to the same reasons mentioned in RQ3. Interestingly, Random also exhibits considerable strength of correlations due to its nature, since it has no sophisticated heuristics and hence the tuning quality is more relevant to the accuracy of the mode that guides it. Some tuners also easier to have negative correlations because they tend to leverage the model more loosely, e.g., in ROBOTune, the model predictions are guided by an ensemble of three acquisition functions, hence weakening the positive effect of the model.

Despite some systems being more likely to result in negative correlation due to their complex tuning landscapes (e.g., APACHE), we see no consistent pattern in the strength of correlation with respect to the scale of systems. This is because the scale might not be the only factor that

influences the correlation between model accuracy and its tuning quality, but more importantly the characteristic of the corresponding configuration landscape (as we will discuss in Section 5).

Finding 5

The accuracy of the model generally has a negligible or weak correlation to the tuning quality it guides for sequential model-based tuners (from 82% to 97% of the cases). The batch counterparts exhibit mostly similar results but with more obvious correlations between model accuracy and the resulting performance. The strength is often not strong though.

TABLE 14: Spearman correlations between model accuracy and its resulting tuning performance for batch model-based tuners. The formats are the same as Table 12.

System	MAPE and Performance									μ RD and Performance								
	BestConfig	Irace	GGA	ParamILS	Random	GA	SWAY	ConEx	Brute-force	BestConfig	Irace	GGA	ParamILS	Random	GA	SWAY	ConEx	Brute-force
BROTLI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.19*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.25†
LLVM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.14*
LRZIP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.20†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.17*
XGBOOST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.24†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.27†
NOC-CM-LOG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.51†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.45†
DEEPARCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.34†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.28†
BDB_C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.47†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.52†
HSQLDB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.38†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.50†
DCONVERT	0.36†	0.16*	0.31†	0.21†	0.48†	0.28†	0.29†	0.24†	-	0.35†	0.18*	0.31†	0.21†	0.49†	0.28†	0.30†	0.24†	-
Zz	0.68†	0.73†	0.77†	0.78†	0.75†	0.77†	0.78†	0.78†	-	0.70†	0.75†	0.79†	0.78†	0.78†	0.79†	0.79†	0.79†	-
APACHE	0.36†	0.49†	0.44†	0.43†	0.39†	0.45†	0.52†	0.47†	-	0.37†	0.38†	0.35†	0.34†	0.33†	0.35†	0.47†	0.38†	-
HSMGPG	0.23†	0.18*	0.08	0.07	0.26†	0.29†	0.31†	0.24†	-	0.16*	0.27†	0.14*	0.12*	0.46†	0.32†	0.36†	0.28†	-
MONGODB	0.18*	0.22†	0.34†	0.33†	0.63†	0.33†	0.25†	0.27†	-	0.18*	0.21†	0.30†	0.30†	0.61†	0.33†	0.28†	0.24†	-
POSTGRESQL	0.13*	0.03	0.11*	0.12*	0.01	0.14*	0.10	0.17†	-	0.15*	0.00	0.09	0.11	-0.02	0.12†	0.04	0.09	-
EXASTENCILS	0.42†	0.65†	0.69†	0.66†	0.72†	0.70†	0.46†	0.69†	-	0.38†	0.63†	0.66†	0.65†	0.74†	0.70†	0.43†	0.66†	-
KANZI	0.00	0.31†	0.31†	0.32†	0.23†	0.36†	0.31†	0.30†	-	0.03	0.35†	0.43†	0.44†	0.27†	0.46†	0.39†	0.39†	-
JUMP3R	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.01	-	0.37†	0.62†	0.62†	0.70†	0.72†	0.64†	0.73†	0.69†	-
MARIADB	0.37†	0.35†	0.53†	0.45†	0.56†	0.55†	0.44†	0.47†	-	0.39†	0.40†	0.53†	0.43†	0.55†	0.53†	0.47†	0.46†	-
POLLY	0.29†	0.16*	0.38†	0.34†	0.36†	0.37†	0.33†	0.25†	-	0.25†	0.14*	0.33†	0.26†	0.32†	0.33†	0.34†	0.20†	-
SQL	0.03	0.30†	0.31†	0.37†	0.08	0.21†	0.22†	0.23†	-	0.04	0.33†	0.24†	0.39†	0.06	0.35†	0.17*	0.19†	-
VP9	0.39†	0.35†	0.39†	0.46†	0.32†	0.41†	0.32†	0.35†	-	0.37†	0.38†	0.40†	0.45†	0.30†	0.44†	0.34†	0.35†	-
SPARK	-0.05	0.31†	0.53†	0.50†	0.45†	0.57†	0.49†	0.42†	-	-0.06	0.30†	0.48†	0.46†	0.41†	0.50†	0.43†	0.35†	-
HIPACC	0.06	0.58†	0.59†	0.61†	0.73†	0.67†	0.73†	0.65†	-	0.01	0.58†	0.59†	0.61†	0.73†	0.66†	0.73†	0.65†	-
REDIS	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.08	0.07	-0.15*	0.13*	-0.01	-	0.06	0.12*	0.16*	0.07	0.12*	0.24†	0.04	0.11	-
STORM	0.32†	0.39†	0.43†	0.45†	0.31†	0.39†	0.36†	0.43†	-	0.43†	0.51†	0.52†	0.48†	0.54†	0.57†	0.45†	0.52†	-
SAC	-0.01	0.37†	0.42†	-0.05	0.05	0.52†	0.57†	0.55†	-	0.02	0.36†	0.45†	-0.02	0.68†	0.57†	0.71†	0.58†	-
HADOOP	0.05	0.13*	0.00	0.08	0.11	-0.17*	0.17†	0.04	-	0.05	0.24†	0.22†	0.26†	0.13*	0.34†	0.29†	0.18*	-
TOMCAT	0.13*	0.21†	0.24†	0.37†	0.36†	0.19†	0.09†	0.30†	-	0.03	0.14*	0.33†	0.33†	0.34†	0.40†	0.24†	0.30†	-
JAVACC	-0.01	0.65†	0.67†	0.62†	0.69†	0.68†	0.68†	0.67†	-	0.00	0.67†	0.70†	0.64†	0.78†	0.71†	0.72†	0.70†	-

TABLE 15: Spearman correlations between model accuracy and its resulting tuning efficiency for batch model-based tuners. The formats are the same as Table 12.

System	MAPE and Efficiency									μ RD and Efficiency								
	BestConfig	Irace	GGA	ParamILS	Random	GA	SWAY	ConEx	Brute-force	BestConfig	Irace	GGA	ParamILS	Random	GA	SWAY	ConEx	Brute-force
BROTLI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.25†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.16*
LLVM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03
LRZIP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.20†
XGBOOST	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.12*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.07
NOC-CM-LOG	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.36†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.32†
DEEPARCH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.42†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.14*
BDB_C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.26†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.30†
HSQLDB	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.45†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.53†
DCONVERT	-0.05	0.02	0.14*	-0.01	0.57†	0.03	0.20†	0.19*	-	-0.07	0.02	0.13*	-0.02	0.59†	0.04	0.21†	0.22†	-
Zz	0.17*	0.09	0.33†	0.08	0.75†	0.23†	0.17*	0.31†	-	0.17*	0.08	0.35†	0.08	0.81†	0.24†	0.20†	0.34†	-
APACHE	0.08	0.04	0.27†	0.12*	0.46†	0.19†	0.08	0.27†	-	0.01	0.12*	0.25†	0.14*	0.41†	0.16†	0.10	0.13*	-
HSMGPG	0.31†	0.02	0.22†	-0.07	0.39†	0.23†	0.10	0.14*	-	-0.25†	-0.01	0.20†	0.00	0.61†	0.29†	0.18*	0.17*	-
MONGODB	0.01	-0.07	0.13*	-0.03	0.61†	0.12*	-0.07	0.21†	-	0.03	-0.04	0.13*	-0.11	0.60†	0.14*	-0.04	0.20†	-
POSTGRESQL	-0.03	-0.08	-0.04	-0.01	0.44†	-0.02	0.20†	0.19†	-	0.02	-0.09	0.02	-0.09	0.43†	0.04	0.22†	0.23†	-
EXASTENCILS	0.36†	-0.04	0.57†	0.31†	0.75†	0.26†	0.01	0.59†	-	0.37†	-0.08	0.60†	0.30†	0.75†	0.28†	0.04	0.57†	-
KANZI	0.16*	-0.08	0.02	0.03	0.32†	0.08	-0.07	0.04	-	0.15*	-0.05	0.04	0.06	0.32†	0.02	-0.02	0.00	-
JUMP3R	-0.02	-0.09	0.03	0.11	0.02	-0.03	-0.03	0.09	-	-0.09	-0.01	0.20†	0.06	0.58†	0.18*	0.17*	0.23†	-
MARIADB	0.12*	0.02	0.16*	-0.09	0.50†	0.14*	0.15*	0.18*	-	0.13*	0.07	0.22†	-0.04	0.55†	0.13*	0.20†	0.13*	-
POLLY	0.01	0.01	0.12*	0.00	0.35†	0.02	-0.10	0.02	-	0.04	0.04	0.13*	0.03	0.29†	0.01	-0.15*	0.03	-
SQL	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	-0.08	-	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.18*	0.09	0.05	0.04	-0.17*	-
VP9	-0.15*	0.08	0.28†	0.11	0.38†	0.13*	0.04	0.23†	-	-0.17*	0.08	0.26†	0.05	0.38†	0.11†	0.08	0.22†	-
SPARK	0.01	-0.09	0.10	0.06	0.48†	0.32†	0.04	0.04	-	0.02	-0.10	0.08	0.07	0.46†	0.34†	0.00	0.02	-
HIPACC	0.02	0.06	0.12*	0.16*	0.80†	0.24†	0.07	0.30†	-	0.00	0.06	0.07	0.15*	0.80†	0.24†	0.09	0.32†	-
REDIS	-0.06	0.08	-0.04	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.03	-0.21†	-	0.01	0.00	-0.11	0.10	-0.06	0.00	-0.13*	-0.18*	-
STORM	-0.12*	-0.05	0.03	0.03	0.26†	0.04	0.23†	-0.02	-	-0.15*	-0.05	0.02	0.06	0.46†	0.06	0.19†	0.00	-
SAC	0.05	-0.01	0.24†	0.10	0.52†	0.19†	0.37†	0.45†	-	0.02	-0.04	0.21†	0.12*	0.55†	0.20†	0.38†	0.47†	-
HADOOP	-0.01	0.07	-0.13*	-0.03	0.01	-0.09	0.06	-0.02	-	0.12*	0.01	0.10	0.05	-0.02	0.09	0.08	0.02	-
TOMCAT	-0.11*	0.09	0.10	0.03	0.17*	0.07	-0.01	-0.12*	-	0.05	-0.14*	0.28†	0.08	0.18*	0.18*	0.01	-0.04	-
JAVACC	-0.01	0.09	0.14*	0.18*	0.67†	0.16*	0.06	0.41†	-	-0.04	0.10	0.19†	0.18*	0.76†	0.18*	0.06	0.40†	-

4.5 RQ5: How Much Accuracy Change Do We Need?

4.5.1 Methods

Finally, we are particularly interested in understanding to what extent the model accuracy needs to differ in order to create nontrivial improvement in the tuning quality. To that end, in RQ5, we perform the following steps:

- 1) Pick a model accuracy metric and a tuning quality metric.
- 2) For MAPE, we divide the values into 11 ranges, i.e., $\{0 - 10, 10 - 20, \dots, > 100\}$. Similarly, for μ RD, we use four ranges, i.e., $\{0 - 0.1, 0.1 - 0.2, 0.2 - 0.3, > 0.3\}$. Those ranges are determined based on the distribution of their accuracy values we observed.
- 3) Pick a tuner and a system studied.
- 4) Within each range, we find the set of tuner-model pairs (under the chosen tuner and system), denoted as \mathcal{A} , whose average accuracy values across the runs fit within the range. For each pair $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (an anchor), we calculate its difference on the accuracy metric against any other pairs for the same tuner and system, says b , such that $b \in \mathcal{B}_a$ achieves

significantly better results than that of a on the tuning quality metric according to Mann-Whitney U-test (b could fall in any range).

- 5) We find the $b_s \in \mathcal{B}_a$ such that the accuracy difference Δ between a and b_s is the smallest across any other $b \in \mathcal{B}_a$ (we distinguish the cases where b has better accuracy from those where b has worse accuracy than a , since the correlation between accuracy and tuning quality can be negative). This Δ serves as a sample.
- 6) Repeat from 3) until all combinations of tuners and systems are covered.
- 7) Repeat from 1) until all combinations of accuracy-quality metrics have been considered.

For example, suppose that we aim to study how much MAPE changes can significantly influence the tuning performance while the ranges of interest have been defined and there are four models (DaL, DeepPerf, GP, and DECART) with an average MAPE of 5%, 15%, 40%, and 45%, respectively (Steps 1-3), we at first pick a tuner and system, e.g., Flash and MARIADB. At Step 4, assuming that the best performance of the tuner-model pair is Flash-DaL followed




Fig. 9: The Δ of model accuracy for creating significant improvements on tuning quality under sequential model-based tuners. $+\Delta$ and $-\Delta$ denote the improvements in tuning quality are the results of enhanced and worsened accuracy, respectively. The abbreviations are the same as Figure 7. Detailed figures can be found at here: https://github.com/ideas-labo/model-impact/blob/main/RQ_supplementary/RQ5/supplement.pdf.




Fig. 10: The Δ of model accuracy for creating significant improvements on tuning quality under batch model-based tuners. 0.0 ± 0.0 implies no samples can significantly improve the tuning for a range. The formats are the same as Figure 9. Detailed figures can be found at here: https://github.com/ideas-labo/model-impact/blob/main/RQ_supplementary/RQ5/supplement.pdf.

by Flash-DeepPerf, Flash-GP and then Flash-DECART, such that all of them except that between Flash-GP and Flash-DECART are statistically different according to the U-test, if we treat Flash-DECART as a (an anchor), then we know its MAPE is within 40% and 50% while it corresponds to two b : Flash-DaL and Flash-DeepPerf, which can significantly improve the tuning results of Flash-DECART (Step 4). Now, in Step 5, we know that DaL and DeepPerf improves the MAPE from DECART by 40% and 30%, respectively. Therefore, to answer **RQ5**, a sample (for the $+\Delta$ case) we found for MAPE between 40% and 50% is that it needs at least 30% improvement to significantly boost the tuning performance. We can then treat the other pair as a to collect more samples. The same can be performed on other tuners, systems, and metrics (Steps 6-7).

For each accuracy-quality combination, we plot the mean and standard deviation of the accuracy changes from the samples for both sequential and batch model-based tuners.

4.5.2 Results

From the results plotted in Figures 9 and 10, we can suggest that for a model that has an accuracy range of $[x, y]$, it needs to improve (or worsen due to the findings of **RQ4**) its accuracy by at least an average Δ in general to significantly enhance the tuning quality. Clearly, we see that for both sequential and batch model-based tuners, certain ranges of the model accuracy only require a small accuracy change to im-

prove the tuning quality, e.g., when the model has between 0% - 10% MAPE under sequential model-based tuners, an increase of as small as 0.7% in average would have already led to a considerable performance improvement on tuning. Other ranges, in contrast, exhibit the need for a relatively larger accuracy change to realize nontrivial tuning improvement. For example, when the MAPE is worse than 100%, it needs around 85.9% MAPE improvement to achieve significantly better efficiency of batch model-based tuners.

Notably, there is a clear trend where models with better accuracy tend to require smaller Δ for significantly improving the tuning quality over all cases. This is a consistent pattern regardless of whether the model accuracy enhances (blue) or degrades (red).

Finding 6

Depending on the ranges of model accuracy, it requires distinct changes in the accuracy (improve or worsen) to significantly ameliorate any tuning quality metric for both sequential and batch model-based tuners ($[0.6, 85.9]$ for MAPE and $[0.006, 0.148]$ for μ RD). In particular, the better the accuracy, the smaller the accuracy change is needed to considerably enhance the tuning.

5 DISCUSSION: A NEW PERSPECTIVE OF CONFIGURATION LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

To understand the reasons behind some of the most surprising results obtained from the study, we analyze examples from the perspective of fitness landscape analysis [15], [75] over the configuration space that provides insights into the spatial information and “difficulty” of the tuning problems.

Since the model guides the tuner, essentially we transit from tuning in the real configuration landscape of the system to a landscape emulated by the model, hence comparing how well the model-built landscape resembles the real one can provide much richer information beyond the accuracy metrics. To that end, we use both intuitive landscape visualization and metrics in the analysis.

In addition to the above, we have also provide a theoretical hypothesis as to what is the key barrier that make the model less effective for configuration tuning.

5.1 Landscape Visualization

In this work, we leverage Heatmap, which is one of the most straightforward methods, to visualize the configuration landscape [51]. Since the landscape is naturally multi-dimensional, we use multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) to convert all the dimensions of configuration options by creating two new dimensions. The benefit of MDS is that it preserves the global distance between each pair of data samples, which is important for analyzing the overall structure of the landscape. As such, in a configuration landscape Heatmap, the two axes represent the reduced dimensions while the color denotes the performance values. We also normalize the performance value in the Heatmap for each of the real and model-built landscapes to make the similarity/difference more intuitive. This is because a model would still emulate an excellent landscape compared with the real one as long as their relative structure and distribution are similar, even though the absolute configurations’ performance is rather different.

5.2 Landscape Metrics

5.2.1 Fitness Distance Correlation (FDC)

In general, FDC assesses how close the relation between performance value and distance to the nearest optimum in the configuration space [49], which quantifies the overall guidance that the configuration landscape can offer for a tuner [87]. Formally, FDC (denoted as ϱ) is computed as:

$$\varrho(f, d) = \frac{1}{\sigma_f \sigma_d p} \sum_{i=1}^p (f_i - \bar{f})(d_i - \bar{d}) \quad (6)$$

where p is the number of configurations measured. $f_i = f(x_i)$ is the performance value for the i th configuration and $d_i = d_{opt}(x_i)$ is the shortest Hamming distance of such a configuration to its nearest global optimum. \bar{f} (\bar{d}) and σ_f (σ_d) are the mean and standard deviation, respectively.

Intuitively, FDC is the Pearson correlation between f and d , ranging within $[-1, 1]$ where 1 and -1 imply the strongest monotonically positive and negative correlation, respectively; 0 indicates no correlation can be detected. For a performance that needs minimization, when $0 < \varrho \leq 1$, the configuration turns better (smaller performance value)

as the shortest distance to a global optimum reduces. This means that, when FDC becomes closer to 1, the guidance provided to a tuner is stronger and it is more likely to exist a path towards a global optimum via configurations with decreasing performance values, making the tuning potentially easier. In contrast, $-1 \leq \varrho < 0$ indicates the opposite.

5.2.2 Deviation between Predicted and True Global Optimum

Since a modeled landscape might result in a different global optimum(a) compared with the real one, we need to understand to what extent the guidance (by FDC) in the landscape of a model makes sense with respect to the real landscape. To this end, we assess the deviation between the global optimum estimated by the model and the true global optimum in the real landscape by means of their Hamming distance and performance gap, denoted as Δd and Δp respectively. If the real performance of the predicted global optimum configuration, as identified in the modeled landscape, is closer to that of the true global optimum in the real landscape on both configuration and performance, then we know that guiding the tuner toward the predicted global optimum in the modeled landscape is likely to be more effective.

5.2.3 Correlation Length

Comparing FDC and the real performance of the global optimum still cannot account for the local paths between local optima, i.e., the ruggedness of the landscape. As a result, we additionally measure the Correlation Length (ℓ) [84], calculated as below (the notations are the same as that for Equation 6):

$$\ell(p, s) = -(\ln |\frac{1}{\sigma_f^2(p-s)} \sum_{i=1}^{p-s} (f_i - \bar{f})(f_{i+s} - \bar{f})|)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

$\ell(p, s)$ is essentially a normalized autocorrelation function of neighboring configurations’ performance values explored, in which s denotes the Hamming distance of a neighbor and p is the total number of measured configurations. We set s according to the nearest possible neighboring configurations measured in our experiments. The higher the value of ℓ , the smoother the landscape, as the performance of adjacently sampled configurations is more correlated. Otherwise, it indicates a more rugged surface [84], which means it the easier to trap a tuner.

5.2.4 What Constitutes a Good Model-emulated Landscape?

Given the above metrics, an excellent emulation of the configuration landscape created by a model should have close FDC and deviation of the predicted global optimum to the true one with respect to the real landscape, hence it provides similar guidance to the tuners. At the same time, the correlation length should be higher, because this leads to a smoother landscape which can be easier for a tuner to explore. It is important to note that a higher correlation length in an emulated landscape is only useful when the guidance it provides is also similar to that of the real landscape, or otherwise the tuning could be directed to the

wrong optimum region, even though the entire landscape might be easier for a tuner to tackle.

5.3 Observational Analysis

5.3.1 Why is the Model Useful (Useless) to the Tuning Quality?

It is worth noting that, while models are generally not effective in tuning the quality of batch model-based tuners under the maximum budget we consider in this work, they can still reduce the overhead significantly, which could be helpful for certain scenarios. For example, when the available resource is rather limited and only very little configuration can be measured, then, since in **RQ4**, we show that the model accuracy does not strongly correlate with the tuning results, a much less accurate model (with less data) might still lead to similar tuning quality to the case when the training data is more sufficient. This, in contrast, would much more significantly degrade the quality of the model-free counterpart if they were to run under the same budget.

To understand why the models are more helpful for the sequential model-based tuners over the batch counterparts from **RQ1**, Figure 11 illustrates a typical example using Heatmaps based on the two MDS reduced dimensions for TOMCAT under DT. Since **RQ3** and **RQ4** reveal that the model accuracy can be misleading, we compare how well the model can emulate the real configuration landscape. We see that visually, the initial model under a sequential model-based tuner (i.e., only be trained by the hot-start samples) is less similar to the real landscape compared with the model trained by a batch (Figure 11a and Figure 11d vs. Figure 11c and Figure 11d). This can also be reflected in the metrics: compared with the batch model, the initial model is more distant from the real landscape on nearly all metrics.

However, when the model under sequential model-based tuners is progressively updated, the landscape it emulated would eventually become much closer to the real one: If we compare Figure 11b and Figure 11d, we observe that now, the Heatmap of the final model is clearly more similar to the real landscape than the batch counterpart, especially on the peaks and troughs, which is also the case over all metrics (despite that they are trained under similar training size, i.e., 282 vs. 288). In particular, the closer FDC and deviation of global optimum imply that the landscape of the final model provides tuning guidance that is closer to the real one compared with its batch counterpart. In the meantime, we see that the final model has a higher correlation length than the real landscape while the batch model emulates lower. This suggests that the progressively updated final model exhibits less severe local optimum issues and hence is easier for the tuners (especially those that leverage local search), at the same time, the guidance it provides is also more similar to the real landscape. Therefore, the progressively updated model under sequential model-based tuners can emulate the tuning landscape better (and easier) than its batch counterpart, explaining why the models tend to be more useful for the sequential model-based tuners but tend to be useless for the batch ones.




Fig. 11: Configuration landscapes derived from the model for the sequential model-based tuner (a and b), the model for the batch model-based tuner (c), and the real configuration space (d) for TOMCAT.

5.3.2 Why Better Model Accuracy Does Not Always Lead to Superior Tuning Quality?

While it is counter-intuitive to observe the results for **RQ3** and **RQ4**, they are indeed possible from the perspective of landscape analysis. Figure 12 shows a case of LLVM, in which we see that the μ RD can be improved from 0.142 to 0.068 by simply changing `HINNPerf` to DT on a batch model-based tuner (from Figure 12a to Figure 12b)—a 2.09 \times improvement. However, the tuning quality when pairing those two models with different tuners is generally indistinguishable. This is because, visually, we see that their landscape appears to be quite similar. This is also reflected by the landscape metrics, e.g., there is nearly no change in the FDC and correlation length. The above is a typical example of the key reason that the changes in model accuracy often do not strongly correlate with the changes in tuning quality.

One very surprising observation is that better model accuracy might negatively correlate with the tuning results. Figure 13 shows one of such common examples. Here, for a sequential model-based tuner that tunes HSMGP, the




Fig. 12: Configuration landscapes derived from the models for a batch model-based tuner for LLVM, showing a large μ RD improvement (from a to b) might not lead to significant deviation on the modeled configuration landscape.




Fig. 13: Configuration landscapes derived from the final models for a sequential model-based tuner for HSMGP, showing a large MAPE improvement (from b to a) might also lead to a significantly more distant configuration landscape modeled compared with the real one (c).

MAPE can be improved from 47.4% with $1.84\times$ to 25.7% by using GP (Figure 13a) instead of HINNPerf (Figure 13b), but the tuning quality in the former is often significantly worsened over different tuners. This is because both the visual interpretation, patterns of local optima regions, and nearly all the metrics of landscape indicate that HINNPerf emulates the real landscape (Figure 13c) better than the GP. In particular, HINNPerf’s FDC and deviation between predicted and true global optimum are closer to those of GP, meaning that the HINNPerf landscape offers more effective guidance in the tuning. The higher correlation length in HINNPerf landscape than the real landscape and that of the GP also suggests that the former can also relieve some tuning difficulties caused by the local optima on the real landscape (as it is smoother) while providing closed guidance towards the true global optimum. GP, in contrast,

makes the landscape harder by, e.g., creating unnecessary local optima.

All the above examples imply one rule: the model accuracy is not a reliable indication of the emulated landscape within which the tuner would explore, hence cannot properly reflect the better or worse when comparing the tuners.

5.3.3 Why A Smaller Accuracy Change is Needed to Significantly Influence the Tuning Under Higher Accuracy?

While RQ5 reveals how much accuracy changes are needed to significantly improve the tuning quality, it additionally demonstrates an interesting pattern: worse accuracy needs a larger change to do so compared with better accuracy. This can also be explained from the perspective of configuration landscape analysis.

Figure 14 is a common example from RQ5 where the MAPE of the two models is excellent, i.e., both are less than 1%. Here, when switching from DT (Figure 14a) to DECART (Figure 14b), the MAPE only decreases 0.1%, but there is a statistically significant improvement in the tuning quality thereof. In fact, although the change exhibited in accuracy is trivial, we see that the deviation in the landscape visualization, as well as the metrics, are clear and substantial, especially on the FDC and performance gap. This explains why a rather small change on a model with some relatively good accuracy might still lead to considerable tuning quality enrichment.

On the other hand, a drastic improvement in a model with badly performed accuracy might still lead to a trivial change in the tuning quality. Figure 15 shows a typical example, in which we see that changing from LR to SPLConqueror on SQLITE can improve the accuracy from 111.8% to 48.2%—a 63.6% deviation (from Figure 15a to Figure 15b). However, with such a large accuracy change, we note that the landscapes are almost identical, i.e., both the metrics and visualization show no obvious deviations.

5.4 Theoretical Hypothesis

Landscape analysis helps us to better explain our observations based on empirical data, here, we additionally provide a theoretical hypothesis as to the fundamental causes of the results in this study. In particular, we conjecture the reason that a model cannot emulate the landscape well while being less useful to the tuning is due to the presence of high sparsity and ruggedness in the configuration landscape (i.e., similar configurations can cause drastically different impacts on the performance), which can be discussed from both the system view and modeling view below.

5.4.1 System View

A key cause of the sparsity and ruggedness in the configuration landscape is the design intention of many configurable systems, for which we identify three categories of options/interactions:

- **Bottlenecks-related options:** These options, when changed to certain value ranges, can lead to drastic performance shifts. For example, in TOMCAT, the option `maxKeepAliveRequests` controls the maximum number of requests that an HTTP connection can handle before it is closed. An overly high value




Fig. 14: Configuration landscapes derived from the models for a batch model-based tuner on HSQLDB, showing a small MAPE reduction in an already excellent accuracy (from a to b) might lead to significant deviation on the modeled configuration landscape, which results in dramatic improvement on the tuning quality.




Fig. 15: Configuration landscapes derived from the models for a batch model-based tuner for SQLITE, showing a large MAPE reduction in a very bad accuracy (from a to b) might lead to trivial deviation on the modeled configuration landscape, resulting non-significant tuning quality change.

of `maxKeepAliveRequests` may lead to excessive resource consumption and response delays. On the other hand, too small values cause a large number of concurrent connections that last for a long time and can exhaust the thread pool, thus making the system struggle.

- **Architecture-level options:** There are options that control the architectural selection of underlying algorithms, which can cause large and sudden changes in the performance. For example, e.g., in EXASTENCILS, the option `explorationId` is used to store a series

of categorical symbols that are associated with certain “exploration” algorithms to be exploited, leading to largely deviated performance among the optional values.

- **Dependent options:** There might be dependencies between two options, which can constrain their setting and leave “holes” in the configuration landscape. For instance, in HADOOP, the options `mapreduceJobReduces` and `mapreduceFrameworkName` have strong dependencies. Specifically, when `mapreduceFrameworkName` is set to `local`, `mapreduceJobReduces` will be ignored because the job runs locally and cannot be parallelized or scheduled in a distributed manner, thereby causing sparsity and ruggedness.

Since building the model is often a purely data-driven practice, domain information related to configurable systems is rarely considered. This prevents the model from properly emulating the configuration landscape, despite performing well on the accuracy metrics.

5.4.2 Modeling View

From the modeling perspective, another reason that causes the model to be less helpful to the tuning is due to their local overfitting issue. Specifically, since we now know that the accuracy metrics can be misleading, highly “accurate” models can be detrimental to configuration tuning due to their tendency to overfit too narrowly on specific regions of the configuration landscape, prioritizing those regions of the configuration space with local optima or placing excessive emphasis on a small number of influential options. As a result, the model might be measured as “excellent” using misleading accuracy metrics, but it does not effectively generalize to the broader space. This failure to generalize can lead to a misrepresentation of the true configuration landscape, causing the tuner to miss potentially superior configurations. The model might also unnecessarily trap the tuner in local optima and prevent it from exploring potentially promising regions.

6 LESSONS LEARNED AND OPPORTUNITIES

Our study provides evidence that challenges the general belief presented in Section 2, demonstrating its inaccuracy and misleading nature. Specifically, the results also allow us to learn several lessons on different aspects that help to provide insights for future research opportunities, which we discuss below.

6.1 On How to Use Model in Tuning

From *Finding 1* and *Finding 2*, we learn that

Lesson 1: Depending on how the model is applied, in general, it might or might not be useful for tuning quality. The community should, therefore, emphasize how the models can be progressively updated throughout the tuning (in sequential model-based tuners) rather than batch-train them in prior (batch model-based tuners).

It is interesting to reveal that, compared with the model-free counterpart in terms of tuning quality, models tend to be more useful for sequential model-based tuners under sufficient and fair budget (*Finding 1*) while having negligible or even harmful impacts on the batch model-based tuners (*Finding 2*)—which is still not fully comply with the general belief. This suggests that, while using the models would certainly help to relieve the cost and is desirable for some scenarios (e.g., when the possible budget is small), the way how they are used within the tuning is important for tuning quality. In particular, this also influences the designs of certain tuners: it is inappropriate to assume that a model-free tuner can be seamlessly and arbitrarily paired with a surrogate model (i.e., the batch model-based tuners) while retaining the same tuning effectiveness. Instead, a more sophisticated interplay between model updates and tuner guidance, such as those in the sequential model-based tuner, is required. To that end, a potential future opportunity lies in:

Opportunity 1: *Efficient online model updating/learning for configuration tuning.*

Models can be updated within the existing sequential model-based tuners, but it is mostly achieved by retraining the entire model. This might be possible for simple models with little data, e.g., LR and DT, but soon would become infeasible for large models with increasing data size, e.g., DeepPerf and DaL, since every retraining can pose considerable overhead [13]. Indeed, a complete model training from scratch can take up to an hour [34] for a complex model. As such, we envisage that there will be an increasing need for online model updating/learning strategies, tailored to the characteristics of configuration data and the tuner, that learns the newly measured configurations without discarding the current model and retaining it from scratch.

6.2 On the Optimality of Model Choices

A straightforward conclusion obtained from *Finding 3* is

Lesson 2: *The originally chosen models in the sequential model-based tuners are still far from being optimal for the tuning, hence researchers should follow a more thorough investigation of the model choice.*

It is surprising to observe that those models, albeit claimed to be the best choice in their corresponding sequential model-based tuners, are mostly sub-optimal for tuning quality. There are still considerable chances where they can be seamlessly substituted with another model to form a new tuner-model pair that achieves significant tuning improvement, thereby researchers should follow a more systematic justification when choosing the model. This suggests an interesting future research opportunity:

Opportunity 2: *Automated model and tuner construction throughout configuration tuning.*

Since our results show that the best model (for tuning quality) differs depending on the system and tuner, we envisage that the optimal tuner-model pair for sequential

model-based tuners would only become clear during tuning, and future tuners can benefit from a more loosely designed architecture. This, in turn, suggests a new bi-level optimization formulation of the configuration tuning problem wherein the first level, the goal is to find the best tuner-model pair while the second level simultaneously focuses on tuning the configuration under different tuner-model pairs.

6.3 On the Relation between Model Accuracy and Tuning Quality

A key insight we obtained from *Finding 4* and *Finding 5* is

Lesson 3: *A more accurate model does not generally imply better tuning quality, hence the community should shift away from pure accuracy-driven research of surrogate models for configuration tuning.*

It is remarkable to note that, unlike what is implied in the general belief, the model accuracy rarely exhibits a strong positive correlation to its effectiveness on tuning quality, meaning that seeking a more accurate model does not often lead to better quality for tuning. In fact, in most cases, the model accuracy does not influence the tuning or can even retain a negative correlation. As explained in Section 5, this is due to the nature of the configuration landscape: the failure of the model to learn certain landscape properties that can significantly impact a tuner, e.g., fitness guidance, ruggedness, and the severity of local optima issues in the tuning landscape. Yet, these properties cannot be captured/measured by the accuracy metrics. The key message we obtained is that the current accuracy-driven research on modeling configuration is potentially misleading, and we should not rely on accuracy alone to judge the model’s effectiveness for configuration tuning. This, therefore, raises a promising research thread:

Opportunity 3: *Additional proxies, alongside accuracy, for measuring the usefulness of the model in model-based configuration tuning.*

One such technique, as we have demonstrated in Section 5, is fitness landscape analysis [75], which contains many proxies to assess the behavior of a tuner. For example, as we have shown, the severity of local optima can be measured by correlation length [84], directly quantifying the shape and difficulty of the surrogate landscape (as well as to what extent it differs from the real landscape). This, if used together with the accuracy, can better reflect how the model might help when used for the actual configuration tuning.

From our theoretical discussion in Section 5.4, we urge the community to revisit our strategy in building configuration performance models:

Opportunity 4: *Configuration performance modeling should additionally consider code patterns that cause sparsity and ruggedness.*

Indeed, there have been recent efforts working towards a similar initiative [24], [34], [40], [90], [91]. However, studies [24], [34], [40] that aim to tackle sparsity still originate

from a data distribution point of view; while works [90], [91] that leverage information of code in building the model have not consider those patterns that cause sparsity and ruggedness. As such, a better synergy between those two categories of efforts is still necessary for future research.

6.4 On the Significance of Model Accuracy Change

Finding 6 provides us with an intuitive understanding:

Lesson 4: The range of accuracy value influences how much change in the accuracy of the model can be non-trivially beneficial to the tuning quality. Therefore, for newly proposed models where MAPE or μ RD are used, one should at least consolidate their claims on model effectiveness by comparing their accuracy changes with the average Δ discovered in this work.

Indeed, we often witness from existing work that researchers claim “the model increase by $x\%$ MAPE over the others” as an indication of its usefulness for tasks like configuration tuning. *Finding 4* and *Finding 5* have already suggested this can be misleading, hence we should avoid making such a claim as the indication of the model’s effectiveness for configuration tuning. *Finding 6* further offers evidence that approximates to what extent those claims tend to be inappropriate. For example, suppose that, under sequential model-based tuning, there is a state-of-the-art model B that has 30% MAPE while a newly proposed model A performs 25%—a 5% improvement. For that case, Figure 9 shows that, since B ’s MAPE is within [30, 40], the improvements (from B to A) in accuracy need to be at least 13% on average in order to create significantly better tuning results, and hence the superiority of the proposed model A might not be meaningful from the model’s usefulness standpoint. This leads to an interesting research opportunity:

Opportunity 5: A more thorough procedure for quantifying the meaningfulness of model accuracy’s change, answering the question of “how much accuracy change is practically meaningful?”.

Our finding calls for a more systematic evaluation procedure for model assessment to draw conclusions on how much difference tends to be useful for practical configuration tuning. This goes beyond the introduction of metrics, paving the way for a more complete engineering methodology in configuration performance modeling.

7 THREATS TO VALIDITY

This section elaborates on the potential threats to the validity of our study.

7.1 Internal Threats

Internal threats are the potential biases introduced by the bias of parameter settings that may impact the accuracy or reliability of the findings, including:

- **Tuning Budget:** The tuning budget influences the tuning quality and can be system-specific. In this study, we follow a common strategy used in previous

work [20], [21], [32]: run all the tuners for each system and record the number of measurements that lead to reasonable convergence. We set the biggest budget found across the tuner to ensure fairness. Although this still does not guarantee true convergence, it serves as a sensibly good approximation considering the expensive measurements in configuration tuning.

- **Hot-start size:** To ensure reliability, we use the most common and largest hot-start size to train the model for sequential model-based tuners. This number serves as a trade-off between exploration and exploitation: a too-large one would cause the tuning budget to become too limited while a too-small one might cause the model to severely mislead the tuning. Indeed, we cannot say for certain that this setting is optimal, but it tends to be the most pragmatic setting for our study.
- **Training sample size:** We also follow what has been used in existing work [24], [34], [40] to choose the size for batch-training the model under batch model-based tuners. Again, we set the largest size found in the literature and it has been proven to be one of the most appropriate sample sizes in configuration performance modeling research.
- **Other model/tuner settings:** For all models and tuners studied, we set the same parameter settings as used in their corresponding work, or follow the same hyperparameter tuning strategy, e.g., in DeepPerf.

7.2 Construct Threats

Threats to construct validity may lie in the following aspects:

- **Metrics:** To ensure coverage, our studies consider two types of metrics (accuracy and tuning quality), each involving more than one metric that is of diverse nature. For example, MAPE and μ RD are representative of their residual and ranked accuracy; while the performance and efficiency are the two most important factors in configuration tuning. All of those are commonly used in prior work [19], [24], [30], [34], [40], [69], [70], [108]. Nevertheless, studying additional metrics might lead to additional insights.
- **Stochastic bias:** Most of the models and tuners are stochastic in nature, therefore it is important to assess the statistical significance. To mitigate such, we repeat each experiment 30 runs and use Mann-Whitney U-Test and Scott-Knott ESD Test for pairwise and multiple comparisons, respectively. We also use Spearman correlation to analyze the result with interpretation widely used for software engineering problems [13], [94].

7.3 External Threats

External validity refers to limitations in the generalizability of the findings to other populations, such as the selection of subject systems and training samples:

- **Software systems:** In this study, we consider 29 configurable systems that are of diverse domains, performance attributes, and scales, leading to one of the largest empirical studies to date in this field. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that this collection of systems is not exhaustive and the inclusion of more systems might prove to be fruitful.
- **Tuners:** To ensure comprehensive coverage, we consider a total of 17 tuners, including 8 sequential model-based ones and 9 model-free/batch model-based ones. These include sample methods, e.g., `Random`, and complex ones that involve different dimension/space reduction mechanisms, e.g., `BOCA`. Indeed, there are always newly proposed tuners that can further consolidate our findings.
- **Models:** We consider a list of 10 models that are commonly studied in the community. Again, while this list is not exhaustive, the results have already provided strong evidence that additional models are unlikely to invalidate the conclusions drawn.

8 RELATED WORK

In this section, we discuss the studies that are relevant to this work.

8.1 Surrogate Models for Configuration Performance

Researchers have proposed different configuration surrogate models to guide configuration tuning, ranging from statistical models [39], [70], [80] to more recent deep learning-based ones [16], [24], [34], [36], [40].

Among others, `SPLConqueror` [80] combines linear regression with different sampling methods to capture configuration option interactions. `DECART` [39] improves upon `CART` with hyperparameter tuning and an efficient resampling method. However, these models face challenges when dealing with sparse datasets—a common property for configurable software systems. To overcome these limitations, deep learning-based approaches have developed rapidly for learning configuration performance in the last decade. For example, `DeepPerf` [40], a deep neural network model, effectively addresses feature sparsity in all configurable systems by utilizing L_1 regularization to reduce the prediction error. `DaL` [34] divides the sparse configuration data into distinct and more focused subsets and trains a local deep neural network for each subset, which has been shown to achieve better accuracy.

There has also been some discussion on the suitability of models for different systems. For example, Zhao et al. [107] points out that `GP` can only model continuous options well but `RF` is capable of handling both continuous and categorical options. However, `RF` often does not guarantee high accuracy.

All the above discussion and work attempts to improve model accuracy based on the belief that the higher the accuracy, the better it will help with configuration tuning.

8.2 Configuration Tuners

Over the past decade, researchers have proposed and used various search algorithms to find better-performing configurations with a limited budget [11], [26], [50], [56], [70], [88], [100], [104], [108].

8.2.1 Model-Free Tuners

Among the model-free tuners where no surrogate model is used, `BestConfig` [108] utilizes the divide-and-conquer sampling method and the recursive bound-and-search algorithm to explore the sample space. The key is to leverage the sparse nature of the configuration space. `ConEx` [56] is yet another example that leverages the Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling strategy, paired with a simulated annealing-like meta-heuristics, to tune the configuration. The designs are derived from the fact that the configuration space exhibits many local optima that need to be escaped.

Some other tuners see configuration tuning as a black box, hence leveraging a search algorithm that works on any optimization problem. For example, `GGA` [3] tunes configuration by using a gender separation-based meta-heuristic genetic algorithm, which specifically emphasizes different selection pressures to males and females to expedite the search. `SWAY` [10] is an effort from the software engineering community that seeks to focus on the “exploration” of the space first: it selects a large set of configurations and then samples within that set to narrow down to the optimal one. The key motivation for those tuners that ignore models is primarily due to the assumption that “a model cannot be trained accurately enough to help with the tuning”.

8.2.2 Model-Based Tuners

As mentioned, the model-free tuners can be seamlessly paired with any surrogate models that are pre-trained in advance to form batch model-based tuners, as what has been commonly followed in the field [12], [18], [19], [79]. For example, Chen et al. [12] state that their tuner can be paired with any models to facilitate cheaper tuning. Shi et al. [79] also leverage linear regression as a surrogate to boost the ability to explore in the tuner.

Sequential model-based tuners, in contrast, require more sophisticated search methods as the model would also need to be updated throughout the tuning. A vast majority of the examples exist but most of them primarily differ on the chosen model and how it is updated [11], [70], [88], [104]. For example, `OtterTune` [88] and `ResTune` [104] have selected `GP` as their surrogate models while `FLASH` [70] uses `DT` as a surrogate model to accelerate the search. Some other tuners consolidate the operators during the tuning, e.g., `BOCA` [11] leverages `Random Forest` to identify the most important configuration options to serve as the key in the tuning and equip its sampling with a decay function, which gradually reduces the exploration of those non-important options.

Yet, despite the popularity of model-based tuners, they mostly assume that a more accurate model is the dominant factor in designing a better tuner.

8.3 White-box Model/Tuning

Apart from the above black-box models/tuners, indeed, existing white-box models or tuning that relies on those models [90], [91] are useful in explaining certain internal knowledge about the system to humans or can guide the tuning to some extent (e.g., answering questions such as which options or the relevant code is more influential?). However, they still cannot provide additional means to

measure the usefulness of the model during the tuning. For example, white box models still cannot quantify aspects such as fitness guidance, ruggedness, and the severity of local optima issues in the tuning landscape, all of which are important factors in the effectiveness of a configuration tuner. Therefore, as long as the model still acts as an active guide in those approaches and one solely measures the usefulness of the model via accuracy, then the misleading knowledge would still exist. Other white box tuning approaches that do not leverage the model often only work for specific systems (e.g., `MySQLTuner` [1]), and hence not generalizable to the general configuration tuning problem we focus on.

The above is the key motivation behind the introduction of fitness landscape analysis [75] in this work—a whole paradigm that provides insights about why/how the model is useful to the tuner or not. As such, the landscape analysis works for both black and white-box models/tuners. It is true that, at the current stage, the landscape metrics have not linked to the internal structure of the systems, e.g., the nature of their options; this is certainly one of our future works for proposing a more thorough analysis framework for configuration tuning deriving from fitness landscape analysis.

8.4 Empirical Studies on Configuration

Various empirical studies exist on software configuration from several different perspectives.

8.4.1 General Configuration Studies

In general, most empirical studies on configuration focus on understanding its characteristics. Among others, Xu et al. [99] demonstrate that the number of configuration options has increased significantly over the years, and as such, most developers have not yet exploited the full benefits offered by those configurations. Zhang et al. [106] investigate how configurations evolve among system versions, from which some patterns were discovered. Other studies focus on understanding the consequence of inappropriate configuration, e.g., those that lead to performance bugs [42].

While those works do not target model and tuning, they provide insights about the characteristics of configurable software systems and hence are orthogonal to this study.

8.4.2 Studies for Configuration Learning

Since leveraging the surrogate models is often considered a promising way to relieve the expansiveness of configuration tuning, many studies have been conducted on different aspects of building such a model [8], [13], [33], [46], [64]. For example, Gong and Chen [33] study the impact of encoding on the model accuracy, respectively. Jamshidi et al. [46] investigate how a model learned in one environment, e.g., hardware or version, can be transferred into the other while maintaining a good level of accuracy. Chen [13] seeks to understand what is the best way to update a model when a new configuration is measured, considering either complete retraining or incremental learning. Indeed, those works emphasize the model accuracy as the key metric, but they are not concerned about how the model can be used for configuration tuning.

8.4.3 Studies for Tuning without Models

Empirical studies exist for examining the model-free tuners and have not investigated the usefulness of models for tuning. For example, Liao et al. [61] present a study comparing the tuners for deep learning systems. Their findings confirm the necessity of configuration/hyperparameter tuning. Chen and Li [20] also perform an empirical study on configuration tuning without a surrogate model. In particular, the goal is to understand whether some requirements should be considered as part of the tuning objectives, and under what circumstances they might be beneficial or harmful.

8.4.4 Prior Understandings of Models for Tuning

Some studies have focused on comparing model-based tuners explicitly, covering general configurable systems [78] or on specific domains such as database systems [89], [103] and defect predictors [58]. For example, Zhang et al. [103] study and compare different tuners in the database system domain. However, their emphasis is on examining the best tuner along with their models without systematically exploring the influence of the model on the tuning process. Aken et al. [89] replace the model chosen by `OtterTune` with alternative models and compare their tuning performance, aiming to find the most effective model to be used with `OtterTune`. Nevertheless, again, their study neither summarizes how the accuracy of models can impact the tuning nor the importance of using a model.

Overall, existing research has acknowledged that the differently chosen model can influence the tuning results, but there is still a lack of clear understanding regarding the true benefit of using models; the correlation between models (and their accuracy) to the tuning; and how accurate the model needs to be in order to create significant improvements to tuning—all of which are what we seek to study in this work.

9 CONCLUSION

This paper challenges a long-believing yet unconfirmed stereotype for model-based configuration tuning: the higher the model accuracy, the better the tuning results, and vice versa. We do that via conducting one of the largest scale empirical studies to date, consisting of 10 models, 17 tuners, and 29 systems, leading to 13,612 cases. The findings suggest that the models might not be useful depending on how they are used with the tuners and their accuracy can lie: it is not uncommon that more accurate models cannot lead to better tuning quality. We also reveal that the chosen model for most previously proposed tuners is far from optimal and document to what extent the model accuracy needs to change in order to significantly improve the tuning, according to different accuracy ranges. Among others, our key message is:

Key takeaway

We should take one step back from the natural “accuracy is all” belief for model-based configuration tuning.

We provide discussions on the rationale behind the observations from a new perspective of configuration land-

scape analysis. Those, together with the lessons learned, allow us to outline several promising research opportunities:

- Efficient online model updating/learning for configuration tuning.
- Automated model and tuner construction throughout configuration tuning.
- Metrics beyond accuracy to measure model effectiveness to the tuning.
- Sparsity/ruggedness relevant code patterns-driven configuration performance learning and modeling.
- Procedure for quantifying the meaningfulness of model accuracy's change.

This paper is merely a starting point of a series of fruitful future directions in this field. We hope that our findings will spark a dialogue on the reasoning behind the models' usefulness for the tuning process and hence further promote more fruitful research on software configuration tuning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by an NSFC Grant (62372084) and a UKRI Grant (10054084).

REFERENCES

- [1] "Mysq tuner," <https://github.com/major/MySQLTuner-perl>, retrieved on Sep 1, 2024.
- [2] C. Ansótegui, Y. Malitsky, H. Samulowitz, M. Sellmann, and K. Tierney, "Model-based genetic algorithms for algorithm configuration," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2015, Buenos Aires, Argentina, July 25-31, 2015*, Q. Yang and M. J. Wooldridge, Eds. AAAI Press, 2015, pp. 733–739. [Online]. Available: <http://ijcai.org/Abstract/15/109>
- [3] C. Ansótegui, M. Sellmann, and K. Tierney, "A gender-based genetic algorithm for the automatic configuration of algorithms," in *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*. Springer, 2009, pp. 142–157.
- [4] L. Bao, X. Liu, F. Wang, and B. Fang, "ACTGAN: automatic configuration tuning for software systems with generative adversarial networks," in *34th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2019, San Diego, CA, USA, November 11-15, 2019*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 465–476. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00051>
- [5] L. Bao, X. Liu, Z. Xu, and B. Fang, "Autoconfig: automatic configuration tuning for distributed message systems," in *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2018, Montpellier, France, September 3-7, 2018*, M. Huchard, C. Kästner, and G. Fraser, Eds. ACM, 2018, pp. 29–40. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3238147.3238175>
- [6] R. Cao, L. Bao, C. Wu, P. Zhangsun, Y. Li, and Z. Zhang, "Cm-casl: Comparison-based performance modeling of software systems via collaborative active and semisupervised learning," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 201, p. 111686, 2023.
- [7] R. Cao, L. Bao, C. Q. Wu, P. Zhangsun, Y. Li, and Z. Zhang, "CM-CASL: comparison-based performance modeling of software systems via collaborative active and semisupervised learning," *J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 201, p. 111686, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2023.111686>
- [8] R. Cao, L. Bao, P. Zhangsun, C. Q. Wu, S. Wei, R. Sun, R. Li, and Z. Zhang, "Ptssbench: a performance evaluation platform in support of automated parameter tuning of software systems," *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 31, no. 1, p. 4, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-023-00402-z>
- [9] S. Cereda, S. Valladares, P. Cremonesi, and S. Doni, "Cgptuner: a contextual gaussian process bandit approach for the automatic tuning of IT configurations under varying workload conditions," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp. 1401–1413, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol14/p1401-cereda.pdf>
- [10] J. Chen, V. Nair, R. Krishna, and T. Menzies, ""sampling" as a baseline optimizer for search-based software engineering," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 597–614, 2018.
- [11] J. Chen, N. Xu, P. Chen, and H. Zhang, "Efficient compiler autotuning via bayesian optimization," in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1198–1209.
- [12] P. Chen, T. Chen, and M. Li, "MMO: meta multi-objectivization for software configuration tuning," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1478–1504, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3388910>
- [13] T. Chen, "All versus one: an empirical comparison on retrained and incremental machine learning for modeling performance of adaptable software," in *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems, SEAMS@ICSE, 2019*, pp. 157–168.
- [14] —, "Lifelong dynamic optimization for self-adaptive systems: Fact or fiction?" in *IEEE International Conference on Software Analysis, Evolution and Reengineering, SANER 2022, Honolulu, HI, USA, March 15-18, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 78–89. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SANER53432.2022.00022>
- [15] —, "Planning landscape analysis for self-adaptive systems," in *International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems, SEAMS 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 22-24, 2022*, B. R. Schmerl, M. Maggio, and J. Cámara, Eds. ACM/IEEE, 2022, pp. 84–90. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3524844.3528060>
- [16] T. Chen and R. Bahsoon, "Self-adaptive and online qos modeling for cloud-based software services," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 453–475, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2016.2608826>
- [17] —, "Self-adaptive trade-off decision making for autoscaling cloud-based services," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 618–632, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSC.2015.2499770>
- [18] T. Chen, K. Li, R. Bahsoon, and X. Yao, "FEMOSAA: feature-guided and knee-driven multi-objective optimization for self-adaptive software," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 5:1–5:50, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3204459>
- [19] T. Chen and M. Li, "Multi-objectivizing software configuration tuning," in *ESEC/FSE '21: 29th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Athens, Greece, August 23-28, 2021*, D. Spinellis, G. Gousios, M. Chechik, and M. D. Penta, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 453–465. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468555>
- [20] —, "Do performance aspirations matter for guiding software configuration tuning? an empirical investigation under dual performance objectives," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 68:1–68:41, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571853>
- [21] —, "The weights can be harmful: Pareto search versus weighted search in multi-objective search-based software engineering," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 5:1–5:40, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514233>
- [22] —, "Adapting multi-objectivized software configuration tuning," *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.*, vol. 1, no. FSE, pp. 539–561, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643751>
- [23] G. Cheng, S. Ying, and B. Wang, "Tuning configuration of apache spark on public clouds by combining multi-objective optimization and performance prediction model," *J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 180, p. 111028, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2021.111028>
- [24] J. Cheng, C. Gao, and Z. Zheng, "Hinnperf: Hierarchical interaction neural network for performance prediction of configurable systems," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 1–30, 2023.
- [25] N. Cliff, "Dominance statistics: Ordinal analyses to answer ordinal questions." *Psychological bulletin*, vol. 114, no. 3, p. 494, 1993.
- [26] H. Dou, K. Wang, Y. Zhang, and P. Chen, "Atconf: auto-tuning high dimensional configuration parameters for big data processing frameworks," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 2737–2755, 2023.

- [27] K. Dreczkowski, A. Grosnit, and H. Bou-Ammar, "Framework and benchmarks for combinatorial and mixed-variable bayesian optimization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, Eds., 2023. [Online]. Available: http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/dbc4b67c6430c22460623186c3d3fdc2-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html
- [28] S. Falkner, A. Klein, and F. Hutter, "BOHB: robust and efficient hyperparameter optimization at scale," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. G. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1436–1445. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/falkner18a.html>
- [29] A. Fekry, L. Carata, T. Pasquier, A. Rice, and A. Hopper, "To tune or not to tune? in search of optimal configurations for data analytics," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020, pp. 2494–2504.
- [30] Y. Gao, Y. Zhu, H. Zhang, H. Lin, and M. Yang, "Resource-guided configuration space reduction for deep learning models," in *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 175–187. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00028>
- [31] R. Garnett, *Bayesian optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [32] S. Gerasimou, R. Calinescu, and G. Tamburrelli, "Synthesis of probabilistic models for quality-of-service software engineering," *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 785–831, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-018-0235-8>
- [33] J. Gong and T. Chen, "Does configuration encoding matter in learning software performance? an empirical study on encoding schemes," in *19th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, MSR 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 23-24, 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 482–494. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3524842.3528431>
- [34] —, "Predicting software performance with divide-and-learn," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, S. Chandra, K. Blincoe, and P. Tonella, Eds. ACM, 2023, pp. 858–870. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616334>
- [35] —, "Deep configuration performance learning: A systematic survey and taxonomy," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2024.
- [36] —, "Predicting configuration performance in multiple environments with sequential meta-learning," *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.*, vol. 1, no. FSE, pp. 359–382, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643743>
- [37] J. Gong, T. Chen, and R. Bahsoon, "Dividable configuration performance learning," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2024.
- [38] A. Grosnit, A. I. Cowen-Rivers, R. Tutunov, R. Griffiths, J. Wang, and H. Bou-Ammar, "Are we forgetting about compositional optimisers in bayesian optimisation?" *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 22, pp. 160:1–160:78, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v22/20-1422.html>
- [39] J. Guo, D. Yang, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, A. Sarkar, P. Valov, K. Czarnecki, A. Wasowski, and H. Yu, "Data-efficient performance learning for configurable systems," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 23, pp. 1826–1867, 2018.
- [40] H. Ha and H. Zhang, "Deepperf: Performance prediction for configurable software with deep sparse neural network," in *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1095–1106.
- [41] —, "Deepperf: performance prediction for configurable software with deep sparse neural network," in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 25-31, 2019*, J. M. Atlee, T. Bultan, and J. Whittle, Eds. IEEE / ACM, 2019, pp. 1095–1106. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00113>
- [42] X. Han and T. Yu, "An empirical study on performance bugs for highly configurable software systems," in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM 2016, Ciudad Real, Spain, September 8-9, 2016*. ACM, 2016, pp. 23:1–23:10. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2961111.2962602>
- [43] F. Hutter, H. H. Hoos, and K. Leyton-Brown, "Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration," in *Learning and Intelligent Optimization: 5th International Conference, LION 5, Rome, Italy, January 17-21, 2011. Selected Papers 5*. Springer, 2011, pp. 507–523.
- [44] F. Hutter, H. H. Hoos, K. Leyton-Brown, and T. Stützle, "Paramils: an automatic algorithm configuration framework," *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, vol. 36, pp. 267–306, 2009.
- [45] P. Jamshidi and G. Casale, "An uncertainty-aware approach to optimal configuration of stream processing systems," in *24th IEEE International Symposium on Modeling, Analysis and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems, MASCOTS 2016, London, United Kingdom, September 19-21, 2016*. IEEE Computer Society, 2016, pp. 39–48. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MASCOTS.2016.17>
- [46] P. Jamshidi, N. Siegmund, M. Velez, C. Kästner, A. Patel, and Y. Agarwal, "Transfer learning for performance modeling of configurable systems: an exploratory analysis," in *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2017, Urbana, IL, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017*, G. Rosu, M. D. Penta, and T. N. Nguyen, Eds. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 497–508. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2017.8115661>
- [47] P. Jamshidi, M. Velez, C. Kästner, and N. Siegmund, "Learning to sample: exploiting similarities across environments to learn performance models for configurable systems," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2018, Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA, November 04-09, 2018*, G. T. Leavens, A. Garcia, and C. S. Pasareanu, Eds. ACM, 2018, pp. 71–82. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236024.3236074>
- [48] P. Jamshidi, M. Velez, C. Kästner, and N. Siegmund, "Learning to sample: Exploiting similarities across environments to learn performance models for configurable systems," in *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2018, pp. 71–82.
- [49] T. Jones and S. Forrest, "Fitness distance correlation as a measure of problem difficulty for genetic algorithms," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Genetic Algorithms, July 15-19, 1995*, 1995, pp. 184–192.
- [50] K. Kanellis, C. Ding, B. Kroth, A. Müller, C. Curino, and S. Venkataraman, "Llamatune: sample-efficient dbms configuration tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05128*, 2022.
- [51] P. Kerschke, H. Wang, M. Preuss, C. Grimme, A. H. Deutz, H. Trautmann, and M. T. M. Emmerich, "Search dynamics on multimodal multiobjective problems," *Evol. Comput.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 577–609, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1162/evco_a_00234
- [52] M. M. Khan and W. Yu, "Robotune: high-dimensional configuration tuning for cluster-based data analytics," in *Proceedings of the 50th international conference on parallel processing*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [53] H. Kim, A. Pervaiz, H. Hoffmann, M. Carbin, and Y. Ding, "Scope: Safe exploration for dynamic computer systems optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.10451*, 2022.
- [54] R. Krishna, V. Nair, P. Jamshidi, and T. Menzies, "Whence to learn? transferring knowledge in configurable systems using beetle," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2020.
- [55] —, "Whence to learn? transferring knowledge in configurable systems using BEETLE," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 2956–2972, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2020.2983927>
- [56] R. Krishna, C. Tang, K. Sullivan, and B. Ray, "Conex: Efficient exploration of big-data system configurations for better performance," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 893–909, 2020.
- [57] J. Lee, S. Seo, J. Choi, and S. Park, "K2vtune: A workload-aware configuration tuning for rocksdb," *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol. 61, no. 1, p. 103567, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2023.103567>

- [58] K. Li, Z. Xiang, T. Chen, S. Wang, and K. C. Tan, "Understanding the automated parameter optimization on transfer learning for cross-project defect prediction: an empirical study," in *ICSE '20: 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering, Seoul, South Korea, 27 June - 19 July, 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 566–577. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377811.3380360>
- [59] L. Li, K. G. Jamieson, G. DeSalvo, A. Rostamizadeh, and A. Talwalkar, "Hyperband: A novel bandit-based approach to hyperparameter optimization," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 18, pp. 185:1–185:52, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/li16-558.html>
- [60] Y. Li and B. C. Lee, "Phronesis: Efficient performance modeling for high-dimensional configuration tuning," *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 56:1–56:26, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3546868>
- [61] L. Liao, H. Li, W. Shang, and L. Ma, "An empirical study of the impact of hyperparameter tuning and model optimization on the performance properties of deep neural networks," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 53:1–53:40, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3506695>
- [62] A. Liaw, M. Wiener *et al.*, "Classification and regression by randomforest," *R news*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 18–22, 2002.
- [63] M. López-Ibáñez, J. Dubois-Lacoste, L. P. Cáceres, M. Birattari, and T. Stützle, "The irace package: Iterated racing for automatic algorithm configuration," *Operations Research Perspectives*, vol. 3, pp. 43–58, 2016.
- [64] H. Martin, M. Acher, J. A. Pereira, and J. Jézéquel, "A comparison of performance specialization learning for configurable systems," in *SPLC '21: 25th ACM International Systems and Software Product Line Conference, Leicester, United Kingdom, September 6-11, 2021, Volume A*, M. R. Mousavi and P. Schobbens, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 46–57. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461001.3471155>
- [65] P. E. McKight and J. Najab, "Kruskal-wallis test," *The corsini encyclopedia of psychology*, pp. 1–1, 2010.
- [66] D. Montgomery, E. Peck, and G. Vining, *Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis*, ser. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=tCIgEAAAQBAJ>
- [67] C. S. Mühlbauer, F. Sattler, and N. Siegmund, "Analyzing the impact of workloads on modeling the performance of configurable software systems," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), IEEE, 2023*.
- [68] L. Myers and M. J. Sirois, "Spearman correlation coefficients, differences between," *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences*, vol. 12, 2004.
- [69] V. Nair, T. Menzies, N. Siegmund, and S. Apel, "Using bad learners to find good configurations," in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2017, Paderborn, Germany, September 4-8, 2017*, E. Bodden, W. Schäfer, A. van Deursen, and A. Zisman, Eds. ACM, 2017, pp. 257–267. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3106237.3106238>
- [70] V. Nair, Z. Yu, T. Menzies, N. Siegmund, and S. Apel, "Finding faster configurations using flash," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 794–811, 2018.
- [71] —, "Finding faster configurations using FLASH," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 794–811, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2870895>
- [72] K. Peng, C. Kaltenecker, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and T. Menzies, "Veer: Disagreement-free multi-objective configuration," *CoRR*, 2021.
- [73] —, "VEER: disagreement-free multi-objective configuration," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2106.02716, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.02716>
- [74] J. A. Pereira, M. Acher, H. Martin, J. Jézéquel, G. Botterweck, and A. Ventresque, "Learning software configuration spaces: A systematic literature review," *J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 182, p. 111044, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2021.111044>
- [75] E. Pitzer and M. Affenzeller, "A comprehensive survey on fitness landscape analysis," in *Recent Advances in Intelligent Engineering Systems*, ser. Studies in Computational Intelligence, J. C. Fodor, R. Klempous, and C. P. S. Araujo, Eds. Springer, 2012, vol. 378, pp. 161–191. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23229-9_8
- [76] C. E. Rasmussen, C. K. Williams *et al.*, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. Springer, 2006, vol. 1.
- [77] M. Sayagh, N. Kerzazi, B. Adams, and F. Petrillo, "Software configuration engineering in practice interviews, survey, and systematic literature review," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 646–673, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2867847>
- [78] A. S. Sayyad, K. Goseva-Popstojanova, T. Menzies, and H. Ammar, "On parameter tuning in search based software engineering: A replicated empirical study," in *2013 3rd International Workshop on Replication in Empirical Software Engineering Research*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 84–90.
- [79] J. Shi, Z. Yang, H. J. Kang, B. Xu, J. He, and D. Lo, "Greening large language models of code," *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2024.
- [80] N. Siegmund, M. Rosenmüller, M. Kuhlemann, C. Kästner, S. Apel, and G. Saake, "Spl conqueror: Toward optimization of non-functional properties in software product lines," *Software Quality Journal*, vol. 20, pp. 487–517, 2012.
- [81] G. Singh, J. Gómez-Luna, G. Mariani, G. F. Oliveira, S. Corda, S. Stuijk, O. Mutlu, and H. Corporaal, "NAPEL: near-memory computing application performance prediction via ensemble learning," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019, DAC 2019, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 02-06, 2019*. ACM, 2019, p. 27. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3316781.3317867>
- [82] A. J. Smola and B. Schölkopf, "A tutorial on support vector regression," *Statistics and computing*, vol. 14, pp. 199–222, 2004.
- [83] Y.-Y. Song and Y. Lu, "Decision tree methods: applications for classification and prediction," *Shanghai archives of psychiatry*, vol. 27, no. 2, p. 130–135, April 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC4466856>
- [84] P. F. Stadler, "Landscapes and their correlation functions," *Journal of Mathematical chemistry*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–45, 1996.
- [85] C. Tantithamthavorn, S. McIntosh, A. E. Hassan, and K. Matsumoto, "An empirical comparison of model validation techniques for defect prediction models," no. 1, 2017.
- [86] —, "The impact of automated parameter optimization on defect prediction models," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 683–711, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2794977>
- [87] J. Tavares, F. B. Pereira, and E. Costa, "Multidimensional knapsack problem: A fitness landscape analysis," *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. Part B*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 604–616, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCB.2008.915539>
- [88] D. Van Aken, A. Pavlo, G. J. Gordon, and B. Zhang, "Automatic database management system tuning through large-scale machine learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM international conference on management of data*, 2017, pp. 1009–1024.
- [89] D. Van Aken, D. Yang, S. Brillard, A. Fiorino, B. Zhang, C. Bilien, and A. Pavlo, "An inquiry into machine learning-based automatic configuration tuning services on real-world database management systems," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 1241–1253, 2021.
- [90] M. Velez, P. Jamshidi, F. Sattler, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and C. Kästner, "Configcrusher: towards white-box performance analysis for configurable systems," *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 265–300, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-020-00273-8>
- [91] M. Velez, P. Jamshidi, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and C. Kästner, "White-box analysis over machine learning: Modeling performance of configurable systems," in *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1072–1084. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00100>
- [92] L. Wang, L. Yang, Y. Yu, W. Wang, B. Li, X. Sun, J. He, and L. Zhang, "Morphling: Fast, near-optimal auto-configuration for cloud-native model serving," in *SoCC '21: ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing, Seattle, WA, USA, November 1 - 4, 2021*, C. Curino, G. Koutrika, and R. Netravali, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 639–653. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3472883.3486987>
- [93] S. Wang, S. Ali, T. Yue, Y. Li, and M. Liaaen, "A practical guide to select quality indicators for assessing pareto-based search algorithms in search-based software engineering," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE*

- 2016, Austin, TX, USA, May 14-22, 2016, L. K. Dillon, W. Visser, and L. A. Williams, Eds. ACM, 2016, pp. 631–642. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2884781.2884880>
- [94] S. Wattanakriengkrai, D. Wang, R. G. Kula, C. Treude, P. Thongtanunam, T. Ishio, and K. Matsumoto, “Giving back: Contributions congruent to library dependency changes in a software ecosystem,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 2566–2579, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2022.3225197>
- [95] M. Weber, C. Kaltenecker, F. Sattler, S. Apel, and N. Siegmund, “Twins or false friends? a study on energy consumption and performance of configurable software,” in *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE, vol. 23, 2023*, p. 12.
- [96] —, “Twins or false friends? A study on energy consumption and performance of configurable software,” in *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2098–2110. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00177>
- [97] T. Xia, R. Krishna, J. Chen, G. Mathew, X. Shen, and T. Menzies, “Hyperparameter optimization for effort estimation,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1805.00336, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.00336>
- [98] J. Xin, K. Hwang, and Z. Yu, “Locat: Low-overhead online configuration auto-tuning of spark sql applications,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, 2022*, pp. 674–684.
- [99] T. Xu, L. Jin, X. Fan, Y. Zhou, S. Pasupathy, and R. Talwadker, “Hey, you have given me too many knobs!: understanding and dealing with over-designed configuration in system software,” in *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2015, Bergamo, Italy, August 30 - September 4, 2015*, E. D. Nitto, M. Harman, and P. Heymans, Eds. ACM, 2015, pp. 307–319. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786852>
- [100] Y. Ye, T. Chen, and M. Li, “Distilled lifelong self-adaptation for configurable systems,” *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2025.
- [101] Z. Yu, Z. Bei, and X. Qian, “Datasize-aware high dimensional configurations auto-tuning of in-memory cluster computing,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS 2018, Williamsburg, VA, USA, March 24-28, 2018*, X. Shen, J. Tuck, R. Bianchini, and V. Sarkar, Eds. ACM, 2018, pp. 564–577. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173162.3173187>
- [102] X. Zhang, Z. Chang, Y. Li, H. Wu, J. Tan, F. Li, and B. Cui, “Facilitating database tuning with hyper-parameter optimization: A comprehensive experimental evaluation,” *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 1808–1821, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol15/p1808-cui.pdf>
- [103] —, “Facilitating database tuning with hyper-parameter optimization: A comprehensive experimental evaluation,” 2022.
- [104] X. Zhang, H. Wu, Z. Chang, S. Jin, J. Tan, F. Li, T. Zhang, and B. Cui, “Restune: Resource oriented tuning boosted by meta-learning for cloud databases,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 international conference on management of data, 2021*, pp. 2102–2114.
- [105] X. Zhang, H. Wu, Y. Li, J. Tan, F. Li, and B. Cui, “Towards dynamic and safe configuration tuning for cloud databases,” in *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, 2022*, pp. 631–645.
- [106] Y. Zhang, H. He, O. Legunsen, S. Li, W. Dong, and T. Xu, “An evolutionary study of configuration design and implementation in cloud systems,” in *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 188–200. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00029>
- [107] X. Zhao, X. Zhou, and G. Li, “Automatic database knob tuning: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- [108] Y. Zhu, J. Liu, M. Guo, Y. Bao, W. Ma, Z. Liu, K. Song, and Y. Yang, “Bestconfig: tapping the performance potential of systems via automatic configuration tuning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing, 2017*, pp. 338–350.
- [109] M. Zuluaga, G. Sergent, A. Krause, and M. Püschel, “Active learning for multi-objective optimization,” in *Proceedings of*


the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2013, Atlanta, GA, USA, 16-21 June 2013, ser. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, vol. 28. JMLR.org, 2013, pp. 462–470. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/zuluaga13.html>



Pengzhou Chen received the B.Eng. degree in Computer Science from the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China in 2024. As a member of IDEAS Lab, he is currently working towards the M.Sc. degree, with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China. His research interests include search-based software engineering, performance modeling, and machine learning.



Jingzhi Gong received the Ph.D. degree from the Loughborough University, U.K., in 2024. As a member of the IDEAS Lab, his doctoral research has been published in major Software Engineering conferences/journals including FSE, TSE, TOSEM, and MSR. His research interests mainly include configuration performance modeling, machine/deep learning, and software engineering. He is currently a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Leeds, U.K., and TurinTech AI, U.K., developing cutting-edge code optimization approaches using large language models and compiler-based techniques.



Tao Chen directs the Intelligent Dependability Engineering for Adaptive Software Laboratory (IDEAS Lab), conducting cutting-edge research on the intersection between AI and Software Engineering. Currently, his research interests include performance engineering, self-adaptive systems, search-based software engineering, data-driven software engineering, and their interplay with machine learning and computational intelligence. His work has been regularly published in all major Software Engineering conferences/journals (ICSE, FSE, ASE, TOSEM, and TSE) and has been supported by projects worth over £1 million from external funding bodies. He currently serves as an Associate Editor for ACM Transactions on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems and a Program Committee member for many prestigious conferences.