

Harnessing Low-Fidelity Data to Accelerate Bayesian Optimization via Posterior Regularization

Bin Liu

School of Computer Science, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, China
bins@ieee.org

Abstract

Bayesian optimization (BO) is a powerful paradigm for derivative-free global optimization of a black-box objective function (BOF) that is expensive to evaluate. However, the overhead of BO can still be prohibitive if the maximum number of allowed function evaluations is less than required. In this paper, we investigate how to reduce the required number of function evaluations for BO without compromise in solution quality. We explore the idea of posterior regularization for harnessing low fidelity (LF) data within the Gaussian process upper confidence bound (GP-UCB) framework. The LF data are assumed to arise from previous evaluations of an LF approximation of the BOF. An extra GP expert called LF-GP is trained to fit the LF data. We develop a dynamic weighted product of experts (DW-POE) fusion operator. The regularization is induced from this operator on the posterior of the BOF. The impact of the LF-GP expert on the resulting regularized posterior is adaptively adjusted via Bayesian formalism. Extensive experimental results on benchmark BOF optimization tasks demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed algorithm over state-of-the-art.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a maximization problem

$$\max_{x \in \chi} f(x), \quad (1)$$

where $f: \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous real-valued function, χ a Euclidean solution domain defined in $\mathbb{R}^d$, d the dimension of x . Suppose that there exists an $x^* \in \chi$ such that $f(x) \leq f(x^*)$, $\forall x \in \chi$. The task is to find x^* based on a limited number of evaluations of f . An evaluation consists of sampling an x in χ , inputting it to f , and then obtaining the corresponding output $y = f(x) + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, at the expense of a certain amount of computational resources. We focus on cases wherein f is an expensive-to-evaluate black-box function with no access to its gradient. We also assume that f is smooth and can be modeled by a GP expert. Such derivative-free expensive function optimization problems arise in many

fields such as industrial design in complex engineered systems, model selection in statistics, the hyper-parameter configuration for complex machine learning systems. BO is well recognized as a powerful framework for addressing such type of problems.

Of particular interest here is how to find or obtain a satisfactory estimate of x^* with BO using as less as possible evaluations of f . In particular, we explore the idea of posterior regularization for accelerating the GP-UCB method of [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010] by harnessing LF data. The accelerated BO algorithm (ABO) can be used for cases wherein the maximum number of allowed function evaluations is less than required by its non-accelerated counterpart. We assume that some LF data are pre-available, while, once the BO procedure is activated, no new LF data will be accessible. The regularization is induced from an expert fusion operator on the posterior of the BOF at each iteration of the BO procedure. An extra GP expert, termed LF-GP, is trained to fit the LF data and then gets involved in the fusion operation. The impact of LF-GP on the resulting regularized posterior is dynamically adapted via Bayesian formalism.

The basic idea underlying the proposed ABO algorithm is illustrated in Fig.2. It depicts the result obtained at an iteration of ABO when applied for a 1D pedagogical case presented in subsection 4.1. We see that ABO suggests a better next point to query than GP-UCB (see Fig.1). This is due to the posterior regularization operation embedded into the ABO algorithm that helps to reveal more structural information of the BOF f through exploiting LF data points. In Fig.2, we see that the presence of the LF point at $x = 3$ makes the uncertainty band of the posterior significantly shrank at the local area of $x = 3$. The UCB of the predicted f therein is reduced accordingly. In contrast, the GP-UCB algorithm, trained with only three high fidelity (HF) points, suggests evaluating f at one query point near $x = 3$. That is because the high degree of uncertainty in the posterior estimate near the point $x = 3$ and the missing of structural information near the point $x = 4$ make the resulting UCB curve somewhat misleading.

Related work

Multi-fidelity optimization has recently attracted considerable research interests. Techniques such as hierarchical partitioning [Sen *et al.*, 2018], hierarchical




Figure 1: An illustrative show of a traditional BO algorithm on a 1D pedagogical example. f_l is an LF approximation of f . The upper panel shows the GP posterior mean and the two standard deviations band. The bottom panel shows the UCB curve obtained based on the GP posterior.

modeling [Qian and Wu, 2008] and ensemble methods [Peherstorfer *et al.*, 2018], are used to incorporate multiple fidelities/cheap approximations of the BOF. Most relevant to this paper is the line of work on Bayesian optimization with multi-fidelity data such as the MF-GP-UCB method in [Kandasamy *et al.*, 2016] and the multi-fidelity BO (MFBO) algorithm in [Perdikaris and Karniadakis, 2016]. Research topics that are close to MFBO in concept include multi-information source optimization [Ghoreishi and Allaire, 2018; Poloczec *et al.*, 2017], multi-task BO [Swersky *et al.*, 2013], multi-output GP [Álvarez and Lawrence, 2011; Boyle and Frea, 2005], meta-learning based BO [Feurer *et al.*, 2018; Feuerer *et al.*, 2014].

The success of the aforementioned methods requires specific assumptions to be satisfied. For instance, MFBO methods in [Perdikaris and Karniadakis, 2016; Kennedy and O’Hagan, 2000; Perdikaris *et al.*, 2016] work under a basic assumption that the relationship between $f(x)$ and $f_l(x)$ satisfies $f(x) = \rho f_l(x) + n$, where $f_l(x)$ denotes an LF approximation of $f(x)$ and n a noise item. Extra operations or assumptions are usually needed to determine the value of the correlation parameter ρ . The hierarchical modeling approach of [Qian and Wu, 2008] requires that the data points selected for HF evaluations come from a subset of those used for LF evaluations. The MF-GP-UCB algorithm in [Kandasamy *et al.*, 2016] assumes that $\|f(x) - f_l(x)\|_\infty$ is bounded and *a priori* known.

In contrast, using our proposed ABO algorithm does not require any of the aforementioned assumptions to be satisfied. In ABO, a flexible expert fusion operator module is embedded that takes charge of grasping and exploiting the intrinsic correlation between the BOF and its LF counterpart automati-




Figure 2: An illustrative show of the proposed ABO algorithm on the same example as depicted in Fig.1 with 3 HF points and 3 LF points. f_l is an LF approximation of f . The upper panel shows the regularized posterior mean and the two standard deviations band. The bottom panel compares the two UCB curves obtained before and after the posterior regularization (PR).

cally. In addition, we consider a fixed LF training data set $\mathcal{D}_{lf}$ for use. That said, only the HF BOF is allowed to be evaluated after starting the BO process. In contrast, in settings of most existent MFBO methods, e.g. in [Kandasamy *et al.*, 2016], new LF evaluations are allowed to perform and thus the set $\mathcal{D}_{lf}$ will be expanded accordingly. See details on the problem setup in subsection 2.1.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Problem setup

The task is to maximize the BOF f over the domain χ , as formulated in Eqn.(1). We search the maximizer x^* or the maximum value $f^* = f(x^*)$ using an algorithm that evaluates a sequence of points $x_{1:t} \triangleq \{x_1, \dots, x_t\}, t > 0$. An evaluation of f at $x \in \chi$ yields an observation $y = f(x) + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We assume that J LF query points $\mathcal{D}_l = \{x_{l,j}, y_{l,j}\}_{j=1}^J$ are pre-available, where $x_l \in \chi$, $y_l = f_l(x_l) + \epsilon$, ϵ denotes a zero-mean noise item. At time t , the algorithm chooses to query at x_{t+1} based on $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^t$ and $\{x_{l,j}, y_{l,j}\}_{j=1}^J$. The goal of the algorithm is to achieve as small as possible simple regret, as defined below

$$S_t = \min_{i=1, \dots, t} f^* - f(x_i). \quad (2)$$

Note that we do not put any constraint on the relationship between f and f_l here, while our algorithm will discover and then make use of their relationship automatically and implicitly in a data-driven manner.

2.2 Gaussian process (GP)

A GP is a stochastic process. It is often used as a Bayesian nonparametric prior for a function f defined over a space χ .

Algorithm 1 The GP-UCB Algorithm

```

1: for  $t=1,2,\dots$  do
2:   Train a GP to fit  $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^t$ ;
3:   Find  $x_{t+1} \in \chi$  by optimizing the acquisition function
      defined in Eqn.(5).
4:   Sample  $y_{t+1} = f(x_{t+1}) + \epsilon_{t+1}$ .
5:   Augment the data  $\mathcal{D}_{t+1} = \{\mathcal{D}_t, (x_{t+1}, y_{t+1})\}$ .
6: end for

```

A GP is determined by its mean function $\mu : \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and covariance function $\kappa : \chi^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that our prior belief on f is modeled by a GP, denoted by $f \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu, \kappa)$. This is equivalent to say that in our prior knowledge, $f(x)$ is distributed normally $\mathcal{N}(\mu(x), \kappa(x, x))$, $\forall x \in \chi$. Given n observations $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ drawn from this GP, the posterior belief on f is also a GP with an updated mean and covariance as follows

$$\mu_n(x) = k^T(K + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}Y, \quad (3)$$

$$\kappa_n(x, x') = \kappa(x, x') - k^T(K + \sigma^2 I)^{-1}k', \quad (4)$$

where $Y = y_{1:n}$, $k, k' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $k_i = \kappa(x, x_i)$, $k'_i = \kappa(x', x_i)$. A common choice of the covariance function κ is the squared exponential (SE) kernel, written as $\kappa(x, x') = \kappa_0 \exp(-(\|x - x'\|^2)/(2h^2))$. Here κ_0 is the scale parameter that determines the extent to which f could deviate from μ . The bandwidth parameter $h \in \mathbb{R}_+$ determines the smoothness of the GP. The larger h is, the smoother the samples drawn from the GP tend to be. For more details on GPs, readers are referred to [Williams and Rasmussen, 2006].

2.3 GP-UCB algorithm

The GP-UCB algorithm of [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010] is a typical BO method, which uses the GP prior to model f and a UCB acquisition function to recommend new query points for evaluating f . At time t , the next point to query x_{t+1} is chosen via two steps. First, calculate a UCB of the GP as follows

$$\phi_t(x) = \mu_t(x) + \beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_t(x), \quad (5)$$

where μ_t and σ_t are respectively the posterior mean and standard deviation of the GP conditional on $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^t$. Next, choose the next query point by maximizing ϕ_t , i.e., $x_{t+1} = \max_{x \in \chi} \phi_t(x)$. This optimization can be dealt with by off-the-shelf optimization techniques, e.g., the CMA-ES method [Hansen, 2006]. The composites of the acquisition function, namely μ_t and σ_t in ϕ_t , promote exploitation and exploration, respectively, in recommending the next point to query. The GP-UCB procedure is shown in Algorithm 1. For more details on GP-UCB and other alternatives of BO methods, see [Shahriari *et al.*, 2016].

3 The proposed ABO algorithm

The ABO algorithm is built on the basis of GP-UCB [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010]. Compared with GP-UCB, ABO is expected to be capable of employing less expensive BOF evaluations to find a satisfactory solution. The basic strategy to achieve search acceleration is to harness an LF dataset

Algorithm 2 The Proposed ABO Algorithm

```

1: Train an LF GP to fit  $\mathcal{D}_{lf} = \{(x_{lf,j}, y_{lf,j})\}_{j=1}^J$ ;
2: for  $t=1,2,\dots$  do
3:   Train an HF GP to fit  $\mathcal{D}_t = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^t$ ;
4:   Posterior regularization: adjust the posterior of  $f$ ,
      given by the HF GP, using Eqns.(10)-(11).
5:   Find  $x_{t+1} \in \chi$  by optimizing the acquisition function
      defined in Eqn.(12).
6:   Sample  $y_{t+1} = f(x_{t+1}) + \epsilon_{t+1}$ .
7:   Augment the data  $\mathcal{D}_{t+1} = \{\mathcal{D}_t, (x_{t+1}, y_{t+1})\}$ .
8:   Update weights of the GP experts using Eqns.(13)-(14).
9: end for

```

$\mathcal{D}_{lf} = \{(x_{lf,j}, y_{lf,j})\}_{j=1}^J$ that is assumed to be pre-available. To implement the above strategy, the key idea we adopt here is to adjust the posterior of f by letting it respect predictions made by running another GP regression that uses $\mathcal{D}_{lf}$ as the training data, as shown in Fig.2. That said, we construct two GP experts here. One is embedded in the traditional GP-UCB framework, and the other, which we term LF-GP, is trained to fit the LF data and used for making predictions of f based on the LF data. In spirit, the ABO algorithm can be regarded as an application of the posterior regularization strategy [Zhu *et al.*, 2014; Ganchev *et al.*, 2010] to the GP-UCB method. We develop a dynamic weighted product of experts (DW-POE) fusion operator, which generalizes the POE model of [Hinton, 2002] by using a technique termed dynamic model averaging [Liu, 2017; Dai and Liu, 2016; Liu, 2011]. The regularization is induced from the DW-POE fusion operator on the posterior. The impact of the LF-GP expert on the resulting regularized posterior is adaptively adjusted via Bayesian formalism.

3.1 ABO algorithm procedure

The ABO procedure is shown in Algorithm 2. First, we train an LF GP expert to fit the LF data $\mathcal{D}_{lf}$. This operation is carried out off-the-shelf. Then, given any query $x \in \chi$, we can invoke the LF-GP expert to get an LF posterior mean and standard deviation of $f(x)$, denoted by $\mu_{lf}(x)$ and $\sigma_{lf}(x)$, respectively. In the main loop of ABO, we first train an HF GP expert to fit $\mathcal{D}_t$ at time t . We call it HF GP to discriminate it from the LF-GP. This HF GP expert gives a posterior estimate of $f(x)$, with mean $\mu_t(x)$ and variance $\sigma_t(x)$. We adjust this posterior via the DW-POE operator, which will be described in detail in subsection 3.2. Then, based on the adjusted posterior, we construct a UCB acquisition function as shown in Eqn.(12) and find x_{t+1} by optimizing the acquisition function using the CMA-ES algorithm. As shown in Eqn.(9), a time-evolving weight $0 \leq w_{lf,t} < 1$ is assigned to the LF-GP expert when carrying out the DW-POE operator. The weight w_{lf} will be adjusted along time by Eqns.(13)-(14). We give an analysis of the above algorithm design in subsection 3.3.

3.2 Dynamically weighted POE (DW-POE)

We start by briefly describing the POE model of [Hinton, 2002], which is the basis of the DW-POE operator

proposed for GP posterior regularization.

POE

Given multiple probability densities, $p_i(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, a POE models a target probability distribution $p(x)$ as the product of $p_i(x)$'s as follows,

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_i p_i(x), \quad (6)$$

where Z is a normalizing constant that makes $p(x)$ a probability distribution that integrates to 1. When $p_i(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i(x), \sigma_i^2(x))$, $i = 1, \dots, I$, $p(x)$ is still Gaussian, with mean and variance:

$$\mu(x) = \left(\sum_i \mu_i(x) (\sigma_i^2(x))^{-1} \right) \left(\sum_i (\sigma_i^2(x))^{-1} \right)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma^2(x) = \left(\sum_i (\sigma_i^2(x))^{-1} \right)^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

DW-POE for GP posterior regularization

We generalize the POE model for GP posterior regularization. This generalized POE is termed DW-POE. The regularization is induced from the DW-POE on the posterior of f given by the HF GP expert. Define $p_{1,t}(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t(x), \sigma_t^2(x))$ and $p_2(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{lf}(x), \sigma_{lf}^2(x))$. That said, we use $p_{1,t}(x)$ and $p_2(x)$ here to denote the posterior of f given by the HF GP at time t and the LF-GP, respectively. The regularized posterior is specified to be

$$p_{reg,t}(x) \propto p_{1,t}(x)^{1-w_{lf,t}} p_2(x)^{w_{lf,t}}, \quad (9)$$

where $0 \leq w_{lf,t} < 1$ denotes a time-evolving weight assigned to the LF-GP expert. The time-evolving rule is specified by Eqns.(13)-(14). Since $p_{1,t}(x)$ and $p_2(x)$ are both Gaussian, the mean and the variance of the regularized posterior can be calculated as below [Cao and Fleet, 2014]

$$\mu_{reg,t}(x) = \frac{\mu_t(x)w_1P_1 + \mu_{lf}(x)w_2P_2}{w_1P_1 + w_2P_2}, \quad (10)$$

$$\sigma_{reg,t}^2(x) = (w_1P_1 + w_2P_2)^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

where $w_1 = 1 - w_{lf,t}$, $w_2 = w_{lf,t}$, $P_1 = (\sigma_t^2(x))^{-1}$, $P_2 = (\sigma_{lf}^2(x))^{-1}$. Following [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010], we calculate a UCB of the regularized GP as follows

$$\phi_{reg,t}(x) = \mu_{reg,t}(x) + \beta_t^{1/2} \sigma_{reg,t}(x). \quad (12)$$

The weight w_{lf} is used to control the influence of the LF-GP expert on the regularized posterior. The dynamic feature of w_{lf} makes the DW-POE adaptable for use for different cases. Suppose a case in which the LF-GP expert produces a biased mean prediction with an erroneously low predicted variance. If the combination rule specified by the original POE is under use, then it can lead to a detrimental prediction of f , while a down-weighting of the LF-GP expert is beneficial for avoiding that detrimental prediction. On the other hand, when the HF GP is more unreliable than the LF-GP due to lack of enough training data in $\mathcal{D}_t$, an up-weighting of the LF-GP expert can be beneficial for providing a better prediction. The key is how to adapt the value of w_{lf} in a smart

way. We propose a data-driven approach to adapt it based on Bayesian formalism. The adaptation procedure consists of two steps. Given $w_{lf,t}$, the first step gives a prior prediction of $w_{lf,t+1}$ as follows

$$\hat{w}_{lf,t+1} = \frac{w_{lf,t}^\alpha}{w_{lf,t}^\alpha + (1 - w_{lf,t})^\alpha}, \quad (13)$$

where α is called the forgetting factor, which is assigned with a fixed value 0.9 in our experiments. Then, upon the arrival of the new observation y_{t+1} , we update $w_{lf,t+1}$ as below

$$w_{lf,t+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{\hat{w}_{lf,t+1} \cdot l_{lf}}{\hat{w}_{lf,t+1} \cdot l_{lf} + (1 - \hat{w}_{lf,t+1}) \cdot l_{hf}}, & \text{if } y_{t+1} > \max(y_{1:t}) \\ \hat{w}_{lf,t+1}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $l_{lf} = \mathcal{N}(y_{t+1} | \mu_{lf}(x_{t+1}), \sigma_{lf}^2(x_{t+1}))$ and $l_{hf} = \mathcal{N}(y_{t+1} | \mu_t(x_{t+1}), \sigma_t^2(x_{t+1}))$ are likelihoods of the GP experts conditional on the observation y_{t+1} . As is shown above, we assign a prerequisite, $y_{t+1} > \max(y_{1:t})$, for updating $w_{lf,t+1}$. This indicates one idea adopted here, that is we only take advantage observations corresponding to really high quality queries in updating weights of involved GP experts. By this way, we expect to avoid misleading by low-quality queries. We conducted comparative experiments. The result demonstrates that maintaining this prerequisite in the algorithm is necessary.

3.3 Computational complexity analysis

We analyze the computational complexity of ABO from a completely algorithmic perspective. We do not consider the computational complexity of the BOF evaluation in this analysis. Two GP experts get involved in ABO, while, one of them, the LF-GP expert, can be trained off-the-shelf. All required predictions given by the LF-GP expert can also be obtained off-the-shelf before running the main loop of the algorithm. Within the main loop, the ABO algorithm has two additional operations compared with GP-UCB, namely the posterior regularization operation (Eqns.(10)-(11)) and the weights updating operation (Eqns.(13)-(14)). They contribute a tiny amount of computation complexity. Through the above analysis, we see that ABO has the same level of computational complexity as GP-UCB per iteration. As will be shown in Section 4, ABO requires less iterations than GP-UCB to find a good enough solution, which means that, in real applications, ABO will have smaller computational complexity in total than GP-UCB.

4 Experiments

We compare ABO with GP-UCB and two MFBO methods, termed MFBO-I and MFBO-II here, under four function optimization cases. Among the objective functions under consideration, three of them are benchmark functions used for multi-fidelity simulation in the literature. For each case, the objective function is treated as a BOF, and the maximum number of allowed evaluations of the BOF is restricted at 20. A number of LF data are assumed available, which are generated via evaluating an LF version of the BOF at query points randomly drawn from χ . The performance metric adopted here is the simple regret, as defined in Eqn.(2).

The GP-UCB method is included here as a baseline for algorithm performance comparison. MFBO-I is adapted from [Feurer *et al.*, 2015], in which the HF GP expert is initialized with the best query point suggested by the LF-GP that is trained to fit the LF data. MFBO-II is obtained by slightly adjusting the MF-GP-UCB method of [Kandasamy *et al.*, 2016]. The only difference between MF-GP-UCB and MFBO-II lies in that the former needs to select a fidelity level for next query at each iteration, while the latter restricts the fidelity level of next query to be the highest one to fit the settings considered in this paper. We treat MFBO-II as a competitive posterior regularization based method, which uses a different way to regularize the posterior given by the HF GP expert. Through empirical tests conducted in the following subsections, we show that our proposed posterior regularization operator outperforms that used in MFBO-II.

We start by introducing the objective functions used here. The experiment results are presented in subsection 4.2.

4.1 Function optimization cases under consideration

Here, with a slight abuse of notation, we use x_i to denote the i th element of the vector x .

Case I

First, we considered a 1D pedagogical case in which the BOF f and its LF counterpart f_l are specified as below

$$f(x) = 2x^{1.2} \sin(2x) + 2,$$

$$f_l(x) = 0.7f(x) + (x^{1.3} - 0.3) \cdot \sin(3x - 0.5) + 4 \cos(2x) - 5,$$

where $x \in [0, 6]$.

Case II

We then considered a 2D benchmark function used in [Currin *et al.*, 1988]. It is defined as below

$$f(x) = \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2x_2}\right)\right] \frac{2300x_1^3 + 1900x_1^2 + 2092x_1 + 60}{100x_1^3 + 500x_1^2 + 4x_1 + 20},$$

where $x_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i = 1, 2$. Following [Xiong *et al.*, 2013], we considered an LF approximation of f as below

$$f_l(x) = \frac{1}{4}[f(x_1 + 0.05, x_2 + 0.05) + f(x_1 + 0.05, \max(0, x_2 + 0.05))] \\ + \frac{1}{4}[f(x_1 - 0.05, x_2 + 0.05) + f(x_1 - 0.05, \max(0, x_2 - 0.05))],$$

where $x_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i = 1, 2$.

Case III

Next we considered a 4D benchmark function, termed Park (1991) Function 1 [Xiong *et al.*, 2013]:

$$f(x) = \frac{x_1}{2} \left[\sqrt{1 + (x_2 + x_3^2) \frac{x_4}{x_1^2}} - 1 \right] + (x_1 + 3x_4) \exp[1 + \sin(x_3)].$$

where $x_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Following [Xiong *et al.*, 2013], we set its LF approximation to be:

$$f_l(x) = \left[1 + \frac{\sin(x_1)}{10}\right] f(x) - 2x_1 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + 0.5.$$

where $x_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

Case IV

The final function considered here is Park (1991) Function 2 [Xiong *et al.*, 2013]:

$$f(x) = \frac{2}{3} \exp(x_1 + x_2) - x_4 \sin(x_3) + x_3.$$

where $x_i \in [0, 1]$, for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Its LF approximation considered here is [Xiong *et al.*, 2013]:

$$f_l(x) = 1.2f(x) - 1.$$

4.2 Experimental results

In the experiments, we adopted the SE kernel function and the constant mean function for GP regression, and the “minimize.m” function in the GPML toolbox [Williams and Rasmussen, 2006] for hyper-parameter optimization of GP experts. For all algorithms considered, we adopted CMA-ES of [Hansen, 2006] for optimizing the acquisition function. We ran each algorithm 10 times independently to get a Monte Carlo estimate of the algorithm’s performance for each case considered. The weight of the LF-GP expert w_{lf} is initialized at 0.5 for ABO. Using Case I, we validated the mechanism of ABO for harnessing LF data to accelerate searching by visualizing an intermediate result, as shown in Figs.1-2. Fig.3 contrasts simple regrets. It is shown that ABO outperforms the other methods significantly in terms of the searching speed in the first three cases. For the last case, ABO is much faster than GP-UCB and MFBO-II, and it achieves a much smaller simple regret than MFBO-I. Fig.4 shows that the influence of the HF GP expert increases along time as more HF evaluations of f are performed, which conforms to our expectation.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrated that LF data can be a valuable resource for use in accelerating Bayesian optimization. In particular, we presented a novel algorithm design, namely ABO, for harnessing LF data to accelerate the GP-UCB algorithm of [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010] via posterior regularization. The regularization is induced from a data-driven fusion operator on the GP posterior. This fusion operator is developed by generalizing the POE model of [Hinton, 2002] using the Bayesian dynamic model averaging technique. Experimental results show that ABO outperforms GP-UCB and two MFBO methods significantly and consistently over all cases under consideration.

The posterior regularization strategy is shown to be flexible and powerful in the context of BO. It makes the working of ABO require no specific assumptions on the correlation structure between the BOF and its LF approximation. Actually, ABO grasps and exploits the intrinsic correlation between the BOF and its LF counterpart automatically, in a completely data-driven manner. The computation complexity in a per iteration of ABO is roughly the same as that of GP-UCB. In this work, we assume that all LF data are samples of one single LF-GP expert. The future work lies in extending the ABO algorithm to harness LF data sampled from multiple LF-GP experts, each corresponding to a specific LF level.




Figure 3: The mean and two standard derivation band of the simple regrets over iterations. Every algorithm runs 10 times repeatedly for each case. The four panels from top to down corresponds to Case I to Case IV, respectively.

References

[Álvarez and Lawrence, 2011] Mauricio A. Álvarez and Neil D. Lawrence. Computationally efficient convolved multiple output gaussian processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(May):1459–1500, 2011.




Figure 4: The mean and two standard derivation band of the HF GP expert's weight over 10 independent runs of the ABO algorithm. The four panels from top to down corresponds to Case I to Case IV, respectively. Note that the sum of weights of the LF-GP expert and the HF GP expert is always 1. So the traces of the LF-GP expert's weight w_{lf} are not plotted here.

[Boyle and Frean, 2005] Phillip Boyle and Marcus Frean. Dependent gaussian processes. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 217–224, 2005.

- [Cao and Fleet, 2014] Yanshuai Cao and David J Fleet. Generalized product of experts for automatic and principled fusion of gaussian process predictions. In *Automating the Learning Pipeline workshop at NIPS*, 2014.
- [Currin *et al.*, 1988] Carin Currin, Toby Mitchell, Max Morris, and Don Ylvisaker. A bayesian approach to the design and analysis of computer experiments. Technical report, Oak Ridge National Lab., TN (USA), 1988.
- [Dai and Liu, 2016] Yi Dai and Bin Liu. Robust video object tracking via bayesian model averaging-based feature fusion. *Optical Engineering*, 55(8):083102, 2016.
- [Feurer *et al.*, 2014] Matthias Feurer, Jost Tobias Springenberg, and Frank Hutter. Using meta-learning to initialize Bayesian optimization of hyperparameters. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Meta-learning and Algorithm Selection-Volume 1201*, pages 3–10. Citeseer, 2014.
- [Feurer *et al.*, 2015] Matthias Feurer, Jost Tobias Springenberg, and Frank Hutter. Initializing bayesian hyperparameter optimization via meta-learning. In *AAAI*, pages 1128–1135, 2015.
- [Feurer *et al.*, 2018] Matthias Feurer, Benjamin Letham, and Eytan Bakshy. Scalable meta-learning for bayesian optimization using ranking-weighted gaussian process ensembles. In *AutoML Workshop at ICML*, 2018.
- [Ganchev *et al.*, 2010] Kuzman Ganchev, Jennifer Gillenwater, Ben Taskar, et al. Posterior regularization for structured latent variable models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(1):2001–2049, 2010.
- [Ghoreishi and Allaire, 2018] Seyede Fatemeh Ghoreishi and Douglas Allaire. Multi-information source constrained bayesian optimization. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, pages 1–15, 2018.
- [Hansen, 2006] Nikolaus Hansen. The cma evolution strategy: a comparing review. In *Towards a new evolutionary computation*, pages 75–102. Springer, 2006.
- [Hinton, 2002] Geoffrey E Hinton. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural computation*, 14(8):1771–1800, 2002.
- [Kandasamy *et al.*, 2016] Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Gautam Dasarathy, Junier B Oliva, Jeff Schneider, and Barnabás Póczos. Gaussian process bandit optimisation with multifidelity evaluations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 992–1000, 2016.
- [Kennedy and O’Hagan, 2000] Marc C Kennedy and Anthony O’Hagan. Predicting the output from a complex computer code when fast approximations are available. *Biometrika*, 87(1):1–13, 2000.
- [Liu, 2011] Bin Liu. Instantaneous frequency tracking under model uncertainty via dynamic model averaging and particle filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 10(6):1810–1819, 2011.
- [Liu, 2017] Bin Liu. Robust particle filter by dynamic averaging of multiple noise models. In *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2017 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 4034–4038. IEEE, 2017.
- [Peherstorfer *et al.*, 2018] Benjamin Peherstorfer, Karen Willcox, and Max Gunzburger. Survey of multifidelity methods in uncertainty propagation, inference, and optimization. *SIAM Review*, 60(3):550–591, 2018.
- [Perdikaris and Karniadakis, 2016] Paris Perdikaris and George Em Karniadakis. Model inversion via multifidelity bayesian optimization: a new paradigm for parameter estimation in haemodynamics, and beyond. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 13(118):20151107, 2016.
- [Perdikaris *et al.*, 2016] Paris Perdikaris, Daniele Venturi, and George Em Karniadakis. Multifidelity information fusion algorithms for high-dimensional systems and massive data sets. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 38(4):B521–B538, 2016.
- [Poloczek *et al.*, 2017] Matthias Poloczek, Jialei Wang, and Peter Frazier. Multi-information source optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4288–4298, 2017.
- [Qian and Wu, 2008] Peter ZG Qian and CF Jeff Wu. Bayesian hierarchical modeling for integrating low-accuracy and high-accuracy experiments. *Technometrics*, 50(2):192–204, 2008.
- [Sen *et al.*, 2018] Rajat Sen, Kirthevasan Kandasamy, and Sanjay Shakkottai. Multi-fidelity black-box optimization with hierarchical partitions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4545–4554, 2018.
- [Shahriari *et al.*, 2016] Bobak Shahriari, Kevin Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P Adams, and Nando De Freitas. Taking the human out of the loop: A review of bayesian optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, 2016.
- [Srinivas *et al.*, 2010] Niranjan Srinivas, Andreas Krause, Sham M Kakade, and Matthias Seeger. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1015–1022, 2010.
- [Swersky *et al.*, 2013] Kevin Swersky, Jasper Snoek, and Ryan P Adams. Multi-task Bayesian optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2004–2012, 2013.
- [Williams and Rasmussen, 2006] Christopher K Williams and Carl Edward Rasmussen. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [Xiong *et al.*, 2013] Shifeng Xiong, Peter ZG Qian, and CF Jeff Wu. Sequential design and analysis of high-accuracy and low-accuracy computer codes. *Technometrics*, 55(1):37–46, 2013.
- [Zhu *et al.*, 2014] Jun Zhu, Ning Chen, and Eric P Xing. Bayesian inference with posterior regularization and applications to infinite latent svms. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1799–1847, 2014.