



# Global optimization using Sobol indices

Alexandre Janon

► **To cite this version:**

| Alexandre Janon. Global optimization using Sobol indices. 2019. hal-02154121

**HAL Id: hal-02154121**

**<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02154121>**

Submitted on 12 Jun 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Global optimization using Sobol indices

Alexandre Janon<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France.
2. Inria Saclay - Ile-de-France, Bât. Turing, Campus de l'Ecole Polytechnique, 91120 Palaiseau, France.

Homepage: <https://www.math.u-psud.fr/~janon/>

June 12, 2019

## Abstract

We propose and assess a new global (derivative-free) optimization algorithm, inspired by the LIPO algorithm, which uses variance-based sensitivity analysis (Sobol indices) to reduce the number of calls to the objective function. This method should be efficient to optimize costly functions satisfying the sparsity-of-effects principle.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Setup and assumptions</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Goal	2
1.2	Base strategy	3
1.3	Sobol indices	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Proposed algorithm</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Numerical illustrations</b>	<b>5</b>

## Introduction

Finding the minimum (or maximum) of a given numerical function (called the objective function) defined over a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (the input space) is a fundamental problem with numerous applications such as in model fitting, machine learning or system design. In general, it requires many evaluations of the objective function over the input space. Each evaluation of

the objective can be computationally expensive (for instance, in system design applications, numerical evaluation of the objective can require solving a partial differential equation discretized on a fine mesh), hence the need for optimization strategies that require as few evaluations as possible. To be efficient, these strategies rely on assumptions on the objective function and/or input space: convexity or Lipschitz continuity for instance.

In this paper, we will consider an exploration strategy of the input space based on the so-called Sobol global (or variance-based) sensitivity indices. These indices are defined in the following context: the  $d$  input parameters are supposed to be independent random variables of known probability distributions, so that the objective function (called the *output function* in this context) is a square-integrable random variable. For each set  $u$  of input parameters, we define the (closed) Sobol' index of  $u$ , which quantifies the fraction of the variance of the output function due to the variability of parameters in  $u$ . These indices are normalized to be in  $[0; 1]$ , and parameter subsets whose index is close to one have larger "influence" on the output than subsets with indices close to zero.

Some output functions may depend on a large number of input parameters, however, computation of the Sobol indices can show that a function verifies a "sparsity-of-effects" principles: only a small number of them have a significant effect, or that some interactions of input parameters have small influences on the outputs (for instance, if the output function is a sum of  $d$  one-variable functions).

This paper proposes a way to take advantage of this principle to perform optimization. In the first section, we review the definition of Sobol indices and the base sequential optimization strategy; in the second section, we describe the proposed optimization algorithm; and, in the third section, we illustrate the behavior of this algorithm on a numerical test case.

## 1 Setup and assumptions

### 1.1 Goal

We denote by  $f : \mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the objective function to be minimized. That is, we want to compute:

$$\min_{\mathcal{D}} f$$

by using as few as possible evaluations of  $f$ .

We assume that  $\mathcal{D} = [-1; 1]^d$ , and we suppose that:

- $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  is a uniform random variable on  $\mathcal{D}$ ,
- $Y = f(X)$  is a square-integrable real random variable :  $Y \in L^2(\mathcal{D})$ ,
- $Y$  has unit variance:  $\text{Var}Y = 1$ .

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , our goal is to define a random sequence  $S_n = (X^1, X^2, \dots, X^n) \in \mathcal{D}^n$ , such that:

- $S_n$  can be computed by evaluating  $f$  exactly  $n$  times,
- for each  $i = 2, \dots, n$ ,  $X^{i+1}$  depends on  $X^1, \dots, X^i$  and  $f(X^1), \dots, f(X^i)$ ,
- we have that:

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} f(X^i) \approx \min_{\mathcal{D}} f.$$

## 1.2 Base strategy

To compute a “minimizing” sequence  $S_n = (X^1, \dots, X^n)$ , we take some subset  $\mathcal{F}$  of functions  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and we use the following algorithm:

- Inputs:  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ .
- Initialization : choose  $X^1$  uniformly on  $\mathcal{D}$ ;
- Iteration: for  $i = 2, \dots, n$ , repeat:
  - choose  $X^i$  uniformly on:

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{x \in \mathcal{D} \text{ s.t. } \exists g \in \mathcal{F}_i, g(x) < \min_{1 \leq j < i} f(X^j)\}$$

where:

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \{g \in \mathcal{F}, \forall 1 \leq j < i, g(X^j) = f(X^j)\}$$

The  $\mathcal{F}$  accounts for “regularity” assumptions made on the objective function  $f$ . At each iteration of the algorithm, the  $\mathcal{F}_i$  set contains functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  that are consistent with the evaluations of  $f$  made so far in the algorithm. We look for an input  $X^i$  where evaluating  $f$  may improve our current minimum, that is, when there exist a function in  $\mathcal{F}_i$  returning a smaller value.

This strategy is used in [Malherbe and Vayatis, 2017] in the so-called “LIPO” algorithm, in the particular case where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of the  $k$ -Lipschitz functions. This paper refers to [Hanneke et al., 2011] and [Dasgupta, 2011] to call  $\mathcal{F}_i$  the active subset of consistent functions.

## 1.3 Sobol indices

For any subset  $u \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$  of size  $|u|$ , we denote by  $X_u$  the vector:

$$X_u = (X_k, k \in u) \in [-1; 1]^{|u|}.$$

We recall (see for instance the decomposition lemma of [Efron and Stein, 1981]) that for any square integrable function  $g : [-1; 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  there exists a unique decomposition:

$$g(X) = \sum_{u \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} g_u(X_u)$$

where the  $g_u(X_u)$  are pairwise orthogonal random variables of  $L^2$ :

$$\forall u, v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}, u \neq v \implies \mathbb{E}(g_u(X_u)g_v(X_v)) = 0.$$

The Sobol index of  $g$  relative to the subset of input parameters  $u$  is defined by (see [Sobol, 1993, 2001]):

$$S_u(g) = \frac{\text{Var}(g_u(X_u))}{\text{Var}(g(X))}.$$

Sobol indices can be expressed from the expansion of  $g$  on a tensor  $L^2$  orthonormal basis: let  $(\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $L^2([-1, 1])$  (with  $\psi_0 = \sqrt{2}$ ). Then  $g$  can be expanded onto the tensorized basis:

$$g(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^d, v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} a_{i,v}(g) \psi_{i,v}(X_v)$$

where:

$$\psi_{i,v}(X_v) = \prod_{k=1}^{|v|} \psi_{i_k}(X_{v_k})$$

for  $i = (i_1, \dots, i_{|v|}) \in \mathbb{N}^{|v|}$  and  $v = \{v_1, \dots, v_{|v|}\}$ .

Suppose, to simplify, that  $\text{Var}(g(X)) = 1$ . Then we have:

$$S_u(g) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^{|u|}} a_{i,u}(g)^2$$

Note that, in the case where the 1D basis  $(\psi_i)$  is formed by the Legendre polynomials (normalized to have unit variance) we get the expression of the Sobol indices using polynomial chaos expansion ([Crestaux et al., 2009]).

## 2 Proposed algorithm

Let's assume that some Sobol indices of  $f$  are known to satisfy:

$$S_u(f) \leq s_u, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}$$

where  $\mathcal{U}$  is a set of subsets of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $\{s_u, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}\}$  are known reals in  $[0; 1]$ .

Our minimization algorithm uses the strategy described in 1.2 with

$$\mathcal{F} = \{g \in L^2([-1, 1]^d) \text{ s.t. } \text{Varg}(X) = 1, \text{ and } \forall u \in \mathcal{U}, S_u(g) \leq s_u\}$$

At each iteration,  $X^i$  is drawn from uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{D}_i$  using a rejection sampling algorithm : we take a proposal  $x$  uniformly sampled on  $\mathcal{D}$ , then the existence of  $g$  is checked by computing:

$$m(x) = \min_{h \in \mathcal{F}_i} h(x) \quad (1)$$

If

$$m(x) < \min_{1 \leq j < i} f(X^j)$$

then  $x$  is accepted and used as  $X^i$ . Else,  $x$  is rejected and a new  $x$  is drawn uniformly on  $\mathcal{D}$ .

In practice, we use a truncated  $L^2$  orthonormal basis of normalized Legendre polynomials (up to degree  $D$ ), and we solve the following optimization problem:

$$m(x) \approx \min_{(a_{k,v}) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} a_{k,v} \psi_{k,v}(x) \quad (2)$$

with:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i = \left\{ (a_{k,v})_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} a_{k,v} = 0 \forall v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}, \forall k \text{ s.t. } \exists \ell, k_\ell > D, \\ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, v \subset \{1, \dots, d\}} a_{k,v} \psi_{k,v}(X^j) = f(X^j), \forall 1 \leq j < i, \\ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d, u \subset \{1, \dots, d\}, u \neq \emptyset} a_{k,u}^2 \leq 1, \\ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}^d} a_{k,u}^2 \leq s_u, \forall u \in \mathcal{U} \end{cases} \right\}$$

This optimization problem has to be solved multiple times (for various  $x$  values), and is affected by the curse of dimensionality; however it is convex (as a quadratically-constrained linear program) and hence can be solved very efficiently without any new evaluation of the  $f$  function, e.g. by an interior point method (see [Boyd and Vandenberghe, 2004] for instance). Hence, this algorithm is computationally interesting if  $f$  when sufficiently costly to evaluate.

### 3 Numerical illustrations

The minimization algorithm above has been implemented in R, using the CVXR [Fu et al., 2019] package with the ECOS solver. We have tested using the 3D Rosenbrock function over  $[-5; 5]^3$ :

$$f(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \frac{1}{26000} \sum_{m=1}^2 100(X_{m+1} - X_m^2)^2 + (1 - X_m)^2$$

(the  $\frac{1}{26000}$  being here to ensure that  $\text{Var} f \leq 1$ ).

We can notice that no interaction between  $X_1$  and  $X_3$  occurs.

Instead of using a fixed number  $n$  of evaluations of  $f$ , we set a budget of  $N = 100$  resolutions of the convex problem (2) and we report the number of evaluations of  $f$ . We use a maximal polynomial degree of  $D = 4$ .

We perform four experiments:

- experiment A : no constraint on the Sobol indices is taken
- experiment B : we take into account the first-order Sobol indices:

$$S_{\{1\}} \leq 0.42, \quad S_{\{2\}} \leq 0.46, \quad S_{\{3\}} \leq 0.004$$

as well as the *total* first-order Sobol indices:

$$S_{\{1\}} + S_{\{1,2\}} + S_{\{1,3\}} \leq 0.47, \quad S_{\{2\}} + S_{\{1,2\}} + S_{\{2,3\}} \leq 0.56, \quad S_{\{3\}} + S_{\{1,3\}} + S_{\{2,3\}} \leq 0.06,$$

Those six indices have been estimated using the *Saltelli estimator* `sobolSalt` of the R package sensitivity [Iooss et al., 2019].

- experiment C : constraints of experiment B, plus zero interaction between variables 1 and 3:

$$S_{\{1,3\}} = S_{\{1,2,3\}} = 0$$

- experiment D : only zero interaction between variables 1 and 3 (ie., the constraints of experiment C without those of experiment B).

For each experiment, we report:

- $N_{eval}$  the number of evaluations of  $f$  made ;
- $m$  the computed approximation of  $\min f$ .

The smaller is the better for these two numbers.

Results are given in the following table:

Experiment	$N_{eval}$	$m$
A	93	0.0089
B	78	0.0052
C	44	0.0006
D	45	0.0049

We can see that experiments taking Sobol indices into account (B, C and D) improves the results of the algorithm on both criteria ( $N_{eval}$  and  $m$ ), and that taking the absence of interaction between  $X_1$  and  $X_3$  improves further, by halving the necessary number of evaluations to  $f$ , while yielding a comparable estimate of  $\min f$ .

## References

- Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- T. Crestaux et al. Polynomial chaos expansion for sensitivity analysis. *Reliability engineering & System Safety*, 94(7):1161–1172, 2009. ISSN 0951-8320.
- Sanjoy Dasgupta. Two faces of active learning. *Theoretical computer science*, 412(19):1767–1781, 2011.
- Bradley Efron and Charles Stein. The jackknife estimate of variance. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 586–596, 1981.
- Anqi Fu, Balasubramanian Narasimhan, Steven Diamond, and John Miller. *CVXR: Disciplined Convex Optimization*, 2019. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=CVXR>. R package version 0.99-6.
- Steve Hanneke et al. Rates of convergence in active learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(1):333–361, 2011.
- Bertrand Iooss, Alexandre Janon, Gilles Pujol, with contributions from Baptiste Broto, Khalid Boumhaout, Sebastien Da Veiga, Thibault Delage, Jana Fruth, Laurent Gilquin, Joseph Guillaume, Loic Le Gratiet, Paul Lemaitre, Barry L. Nelson, Filippo Monari, Roelof Oomen, Oldrich Rakovec, Bernardo Ramos, Olivier Roustant, Eunhye Song, Jeremy Staum, Roman Sueur, Taieb Touati, and Frank Weber. *sensitivity: Global Sensitivity Analysis of Model Outputs*, 2019. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sensitivity>. R package version 1.16.0.
- Cédric Malherbe and Nicolas Vayatis. Global optimization of lipschitz functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning- Volume 70*, pages 2314–2323. JMLR. org, 2017.
- I. M. Sobol. Sensitivity estimates for nonlinear mathematical models. *Math. Modeling Comput. Experiment*, 1(4):407–414 (1995), 1993. ISSN 1061-7590.
- I.M. Sobol. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo estimates. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 55(1-3):271–280, 2001.