

Genetic Algorithm for SU(N) gauge theory on a lattice

A. Yamaguchi *

The Particle Physics Laboratory

Ochanomizu University

2-1-1 Otsuka Bunkyo Tokyo, Japan

Abstract: An algorithm is proposed for the simulation of pure SU(N) lattice gauge theories based on Genetic Algorithms(GAs). Main difference between GAs and Metropolis methods(MPs) is that GAs treat a population of points at once, while MPs treat only one point in the searching space. This provides GAs with information about the assortment as well as the fitness of the evolution function and producing a better solution. We apply GAs to SU(2) pure gauge theory on a 2 dimensional lattice and show the results are consistent with those by MPs and Heatbath methods(HBs). Thermalization speed of GAs is especially faster than the simple MPs

*E-mail address: azusa@socrates.phys.ocha.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

Genetic Algorithm is based upon the theory of evolution. The study of GAs originates with John Holland [1] in the mid-1970s. Since the mid-1980s GAs have been explored how to use in a various fields of applied sciences and industrial technology for optimizations (ex. Traveling Salesman problem) stochastic search (ex. Pattern matching) and learning system (ex. Neural Network).

GA is defined as a computer simulation in which by a change of generations with selections and multiplications depending on the fitness value of the evaluation of a population of virtual organisms on computer, better genetics of a previous generations tends to be passed on its offspring. Here selection means the survival of the fittest, while multiplications are the processes in that organisms multiply.

GAs work best in the following situations [4]:

1. Potential solutions can be represented in a way which exposes components of solutions, and
2. operators to mutate and hybridize these representations are available.

GAs have two advantage points that updating process need neither any local data nor global data and that the fitness is only evaluated after updating process is guided to a good solution in a searching space.

In lattice gauge field theory, an individual in GAs corresponds to a whole lattice and each field variables corresponds to chromosome. The evaluation function is the normal lattice action.

Main procedures of GAs are selection, multiplication, mutation and crossover. Among them, mutation is the same idea as updating process of Metropolis method, but MPs use mutation alone. HBs and MPs treat only one lattice configuration, whereas GAs can treat a various number of lattice configurations.

We applied GAs to pure $SU(2)$ gauge theory in 2-dimensions, explored various schemes and examined its effectiveness in the simplest way. Our results show the distinctive features of GAs which lead to the fast thermalization. The short calculation time are accomplished by the encoding configurations on a lattice.

Even if individuals are systems including fermion fields which bring the difficulty of the non-local logarithmic determinants, GAs might be able to simulate without particular difficulty.

II. GENETIC ALGORITHMS FOR $SU(N)$

The success of GAs strongly depends on how to map the concrete representations toward the abstract searching space in which operators move through.

Since integer is faster than real operation, the information of field configurations are encoded to integer values of which bit patterns are treated as chromosome.

After encoding procedures, the current genomes are recombined and produce new genomes which might be able to produce next offsprings. Among the schemes at the recombination stage, we have two kinds of mutation schemes with ensure ergodicity. If all the 1 bits in the particular position of genome are eliminated, a 1 bit will eventually reappear there by the mutation for genome. Therefore the coverage of the whole searching space are ensured by the mutation for the source of information of configurations.

GAs' procedures, crossover and mutation, tend to make candidate solutions to climb hills and escape from the local minima, i.e. GAs are global search compared with MPs. After global search by GAs, the local search by Metropolis methods become effective for identifying the true minima of solutions. At this stage the solution are already converged around the best solutions and a local search do not break down them. This method is called Hybrid GAs.

Our combination scheme of two kind of mutations means not only the satisfaction of ergodicity but also our algorithm is Hybrid Genetic Algorithm. It has been known that Hybrid GAs are good at Traveling Salesman Problem [3].

A flowchart of a Hybrid GA for SU(N) is given as

Hybrid GAs
INITIALIZATION
 creating link variables
 coding phenotype to genotype (binary strings)
REPRODUCTION
 Selection and Multiplication
 Crossover and Mutation
 Evaluation
METROPOLIS METHOD
the ultima generation

At the reproduction stage, if there are no clear difference between fitness values of individuals, the difference is emphasized by Scaling, or if there are too clear difference between fitness values, Scaling make them obscure. Basically, there are three kinds of Scaling functions, Linear scaling, Exponential scaling and Sigma scaling (Windowing).

Linear Scaling	$f'_i = af_i + b$
Exponential Scaling	$f'_i = (f_i)^k$
Sigma Scaling (Windowing)	$f'_i = f_i - (\bar{f} - c \times \sigma)$

where f_i is the raw fitness value of i'th genome, \bar{f} is the mean, and σ is the standard deviation with some integer k and some constants a, b and c.

In Sigma Scaling, genomes with fitness value lower than $c \times \sigma$ are treated as fatal ones.

The selection is based on the survival of the fittest. Genomes of the previous generation are selected as candidates for parents, according to their own scaled/raw fitness values. It is important, however that even genomes with lower values have some possibility to pass their genetics on the next generation, because it might

help the system to escape from local minima. Generally there are three kinds of schemes of selection expected to select genomes perfect as possible, Roulette Selection, Tournament Selection, and Stochastic Universal Sampling. Among them, Stochastic Universal Sampling which chooses N genomes from the population at once ensures a sampling including low fitness value genomes. Since a genome on the top of the stack by this sampling takes to be a candidate of parents, this scheme is the most efficient way to maintain diversity of children.

Reproduction schemes are Crossover and Mutation. In $SU(2)$ pure gauge theory, Crossover means to exchange the elements of gauge field variables on each lattice point. This scheme brings its action to increase, caused by the increase of surface energy. The amount of increase is larger than the expected decrease coming from the lowering of interior energy.

We use two schemes of Crossover. One is Uniform Crossover in which a child genome is created with its own genetics that consists of genetics passed from one of parents with some probability p and those from another one with the probability $1 - p$. Each genotype is occupied by the genes from parents independently. Another scheme is 2-point Crossover that parents genomes whose forms are not strings but rings are split into 2 parts at two crosspoints chosen at random, and then combined to make a new genome.

The different point between them is that 2-point Crossover might suppress some increase of its action rather than Uniform Crossover. Diversity is to have high probability of a production of an interesting child genome is, however, assured by Uniform Crossover rather than 2-point Crossover.

The problem which remains and to be expected is how to update the population. Generally, N children produced from N parents replace all the parents, Then, the next generation becomes totally new. This scheme is called spawning. The diversity of the population depends, however, strongly on the selection of the parents. As Updating

schemes Breeding and spawning are presented following nature species. Spawning is also called as Discrete generation scheme. Swap all of the previous generation with the new generation. Breeding is called as Continuous generation scheme in which parents and children are mixed by the following three replacements; the replacement of parent that the child was produced from, the replacement of the worst genome in the population, or the replacement of the oldest genome in the population. De Jong introduced a parameter called Generation gap which is the ratio of the number of children to the number of parents in a generation [2]. The scheme called Elitism might be thought as that it could improve Updating procedure, because replacement of the best individual in a population is forbidden. It must be remarked, however, that it has greater risk to fall into premature convergence than simple spawning and breeding schemes. In the same way, though schemes that replace the oldest/worst one or never replace the best one also might be looked clever way, it yields no improvement to avoid false convergence at all.

The real problem we have is what our goal is. GAs search the space we create, looking for the best solution. In our case, the final goal is a configuration which stay in the thermal equilibrium, so that it is impossible to establish thermal equilibrium state without the detailed balance. It means that our updating scheme have to ensure this constraint. At the updating procedure, we set the accept/reject function between a better parent and a better child. The transition probability $P(\{\phi\}_{child} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{parent})$ is generated as $P = P_A P_C$ where $P_C(\{\phi\}_{child} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{parent})$ is an arbitrary probability distribution for the proposed change from configurations of a parent to that of a child, and P_A is the acceptance probability $P_A(\{\phi\}_{child} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{parent})$ are given by

$$P_A(\{\phi\}_{child} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{parent}) \propto \min \left\{ 1, \frac{P_C(\{\phi\}_{parent} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{child}) \cdot e^{S_{child}}}{P_C(\{\phi\}_{child} \leftarrow \{\phi\}_{parent}) \cdot e^{S_{parent}}} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here S is the usual action of SU(N) lattice gauge theories, that is

$$S[U] = \beta \Sigma_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \text{ReTr} U_p \right), \quad (2)$$

where U_p is the element of $SU(N)$ defined on a plaquette p and β is a coupling constant.

As the usual Metropolis algorithm, P_C is corresponding to be uniform, so that there is no bias to create particular configuration.

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we present the simulation results and compare the thermalization of GAs with that of MPs. In our GAs, Linear scaling and Stochastic universal sampling selection scheme are used, 2point crossover scheme is adopted with crossrate 0.65, and Mutation ratio is 0.008. The population sizes are 16 for $\beta = 0.5$, 32 for $\beta = 2.0$ and 128 for $\beta = 8.0$. Since small β has the large tolerance to increase the action, it does not need a large population size. Runs for β values 0.2, 0.5 end at 128th generation, and a run for β value 8.0 ends at 18th generation. Their thermalization times are compared with those given by MPs. Figures 1, 2 and 3 show the results of thermalization with β values 0.5, 2.0 and 8.0, respectively. In each figure, the horizontal dotted line shows the average value of action per plaquette of the last 1000 sweeps after 30,000 sweeps, given by Heatbath method. Square dots show values of the action per plaquette every generation, obtained by GAs. Time interval between generations depends on the population size. Line show action per plaquette, given by MPs. Runs with three kinds of β values converge at the target value, the average values by Heatbath, faster than Simple Metropolis method. A run with a large β converges quite fast, instead of the low acceptance ratio. The fluctuation of the run with $\beta = 0.5$ is, however, quite hard. A bad crossover procedure among a low diversity population brings an unexpected increase of the action that is accepted by the tolerance of a small β , otherwise a good crossover procedure brings a large decrease of the action. Eventually an average value of action minima with a small

β is close to that of Heatbath. Note however that while MPs treat just one lattice, GAs treats a population size number of lattices at once.

IV. SIMULATION SCHEMES

There is a various way/process of evolution. How to combine them is very important, since some wrong/strong combination leads to the premature convergence at the local minima. This section presents simulation results by comparing 2point crossover scheme and uniform crossover scheme, and by comparing the difference of a population size. Simulations are performed with two β , 0.2 and 0.8. In their runs the uniform crossover with crossrate 0.65 and 2point crossover with the same crossrate are used. Population size are 32 and 16 for $\beta = 0.2$, and 64 and 128 for $\beta = 8.0$.

Figures 4 and 5 show the comparison of schemes and population sizes with β values 2.0 and 8.0, respectively. In both crossover schemes, there is no difference of convergence speed between population sizes on the point of elapsed time. On the point of the number of generation steps, however, the cases of large population size obviously brings quick decrease of the action rather than them of small population size. This is reasonable on GA simulation, since the richer diversity avoids the capture into a local minima, leading a global minima immediately. The slow speed of a large population size comes from the large number of procedures, because we have not yet optimized GAs procedures enough. Simulation with uniform crossover scheme does not converge fast. It is because this scheme brings the increase of the action caused by the increase of the surface energy that tends to overcome the decrease of the interior energy. The fact suggest that the more effective crossover scheme is needed for the simulation on the higher dimensions.

V. CONCLUSION

We apply GAs to SU(N) lattice gauge theory. The GAs is an extended version of Metropolis method. We present in this paper an experimental result of SU(2) pure gauge theory on a 2 dimensional lattice. Fig 6 shows the average values obtained by GAs and those given by HB for the sake of comparison. Schemes, crossrate and mutation rate are same as in the previous section, and the 2point crossover scheme is used. Runs for small β s (≤ 2.0) have 32 population size and end at 64th generation. Among them, last 32 generation values are averaged ones. Simulations for β s (≥ 2.5) have 128 population size and end 32th generation. Last 16 generation values are averaged ones.

GAs' simulation converges rapidly at the minimum value of HB, especially for large β s. As shown before, for small β s, fluctuations are, however, very hard at every generation step. If taking into account that one generation step corresponds to 128 sweeps of MPs, their fluctuations become milder and acceptable.

We optimized memory size for the simulation with a large population size on a work station. For example, our simulation with 128 population size of $32 \cdot 32$ lattice needs a memory size not 128 times but only 8 times as in the usual methods with the same lattice size.

GAs are effective methods particularly for parallel processing. Two ways of parallelization are possible, one is a GAs scheme called migration in that individuals growing up on a island migrate to other island, the other is that a root processor on which selection and updating are carried, distributes genome to child processors. Both methods are possible because GAs treat all data as global.

We show the possibility and effectiveness of GAs for SU(N) lattice gauge theory without any optimization of schemes. The more detailed discussion and study about the detailed balance should be needed. Besides them, physical values of Wilson loop

and correlation lengths will be calculated in the near future.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I acknowledge the use of the Reproduction Plan Language, RPL2 produced by Quadrastone Limited, in the production of this work. I acknowledge the use of workstations of Yukawa Institute. I thank Prof.A.Sugamoto for discussions, for reading the manuscript and for his help, Prof.H.Nakajima for useful and helpful discussion, Dr.Kamoshita for his comments, and Dr.M.Feurstein for making me notice the analogy between GAs and Metropolis.

REFERENCES

- [1] Holland,J. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial system* The University of Michigan, (1975), and MIT Press (1992).
- [2] DeJong,K. *An analysis of the behavior of a class of genetic adaptive system* PhD thesis, University Michigan (1975).
- [3] Malek,M., Guruswamy,M. et al. *A Hybrid Algorithm Technique* The technical report of Texas University Austin, TR-89-06,(1990).
- [4] Hondroudakis,A.,Malard,J.,Wilson,G.V.A *An Introduction to Genetic Algorithm Using RPL2* EPCC TRACS Student note(1995)

FIGURES




FIG. 1. Thermalization of the action per plaquette on $32 \cdot 32$ lattice at $\beta = 0.5$.




FIG. 2. Thermalization of the action per plaquette on $32 \cdot 32$ lattice at $\beta = 2.0$.




FIG. 3. Thermalization of the action per plaquette on $32 \cdot 32$ lattice at $\beta = 8.0$.




FIG. 4. Comparison of Recombination schemes and population sizes at $\beta = 2.0$




FIG. 5. Comparison of Recombination schemes and population sizes at $\beta = 8.0$




FIG. 6. Action per plaquette given by Hybrid GAs and HeatBath .