Meta-Learning Acquisition Functions for Bayesian Optimization

Abstract

Many practical applications of machine learning, such as tuning hyperparameters or process settings, rely on data-efficient black-box function optimization. Readily available algorithms are typically designed to be universal optimizers and, thus, often suboptimal for specific tasks. We propose a method to meta-learn customized optimizers within the well-established framework of Bayesian optimization (BO), allowing our algorithm to utilize the proven generalization capabilities of Gaussian processes. Indeed, only the acquisition function (AF) is replaced by a learned neural network, while retaining the standard BO optimization loop. The approach is evaluated on several simulated tasks, two hyperparameter search problems, as well as a sim-to-real transfer experiment. The results show that the learned optimizers (1) perform better than or on-par with classical AFs on general function classes, (2) automatically identify structural properties of a function class on available source tasks or cheap simulations and (3) are able to transfer this knowledge to new problems, thereby significantly outperforming existing hand-engineered AFs.

1 Introduction

Global optimization of black-box functions is highly relevant for a wide range of real-world tasks. Oftentimes, there is a need to optimize relatively low-dimensional ($\lesssim 10D$) functions where each function evaluation is expensive in either time or cost. Numerous examples can be found within the field of machine learning (e.g., the tuning of hyperparameters) as well as in practical settings outside of it (e.g., the identification of control parameters or the optimization of system designs).

In this context of data-efficient global black-box optimization, Bayesian optimization (BO) has emerged as a powerful solution [5, 40, 38]. BO’s data efficiency originates from probabilistic surrogate models which are used to generalize over information from individual data points. This model is typically given by a Gaussian process (GP), whose well-calibrated uncertainty prediction allows for an informed exploration-exploitation trade-off during optimization. The exact manner of performing this trade-off, however, is left to be encoded in an acquisition function (AF). While a large range of hand-designed AFs is available in the literature, it is typically not clear which one of them will work best on a given new problem. Additionally, more involved AFs such as Entropy Search methods [18, 19], are computationally expensive. Most importantly for our research, however, is the difficulty of effectively incorporating structural knowledge about the objective function to increase data-efficiency.

Indeed, general mathematical results [21, 50] state that one cannot hope to find optimization algorithms which are optimal for all types of problems, but, by exploiting specific structural properties.
of a given class of objective functions, it is possible to devise optimizers which perform well on instances of this function class. Unfortunately, manually designing a new optimization strategy for each new class of functions would be prohibitively expensive as it would require continuous expert attention. Therefore, it is desirable to find methods which automatically discover structure in the class of objective functions at hand and exploit this knowledge for data-efficient global black-box optimization.

The meta-learning approach to this problem assumes access to a large set of functions which are similar to the objective functions under consideration. In an offline training phase on these functions the algorithm can learn to exploit the structure of the particular function class at hand, with the goal of exhibiting superior performance compared with general-purpose optimization strategies in the subsequent application. For meta-learning global black-box optimization, such training sets can be obtained in various ways. For example, in the context of hyperparameter optimization, similar objective functions arise when training the same machine learning model on various different datasets. Likewise, in the context of control tasks, a set of similar and cheap objective functions emerges by using different sets of physical parameters in a fast simulation of the system of interest.

While previous methods meta-learn the entire optimization loop from scratch \cite{6, 25, 26}, we argue that it might be beneficial to retain proven parts of an existing optimization algorithm instead of re-learning it completely from data. As BO is known to work well by exploiting the generalization capabilities of its underlying GP, we propose to meta-learn data-efficient global black-box optimization by retaining the structure of BO and by only replacing the optimization strategy, i.e., the AF, within the BO loop by a learned neural network.

Our contributions are (1) a novel method allowing the incorporation of structural knowledge about a class of objective functions into the framework of BO through learned neural AFs to increase data-efficiency, (2) an automatic and practical procedure for training such neural AFs which is fully compatible with the black-box optimization setting, i.e., not requiring gradients, and (3) the demonstration of the efficiency and practical applicability of our approach on synthetic functions, hyperparameter optimization problems, as well as a challenging hardware control task.

2 Related Work

The general idea of improving the performance or convergence speed of a learning system on a given set of tasks through experience on similar tasks is known as learning to learn, meta-learning or transfer learning and has attracted a large amount of interest in the past while remaining an active field of research \cite{35, 20, 46, 24}.

In the context of meta-learning optimization, a large body of literature revolves around learning local optimization strategies. One line of work focuses on learning improved optimizers for the training of neural networks, e.g., by directly learning update rules \cite{4, 33} or by learning controllers for selecting appropriate step sizes for gradient descent \cite{7}. Another direction of research considers the more general setting of replacing the gradient descent update step by neural networks which are trained using either reinforcement learning \cite{25, 26} or in a supervised fashion \cite{1, 27}. Finn et al. \cite{13}, Flennerhag et al. \cite{14}, Nichol et al. \cite{29} propose approaches for initializing machine learning models through meta-learning to be able to solve new learning tasks with few gradient steps.

We are currently aware of only one work tackling the problem of meta-learning global black-box optimization from scratch \cite{6}. In contrast to our proposed method, the authors choose an end-to-end approach and represent the optimizer as a recurrent neural network working on the raw input vectors. Based on statistics of the optimization history accumulated in its memory state, this network directly outputs the next query point. This approach inherently requires a new optimizer to be learned for each new dimensionality, whereas the core of our method is dimensionality-agnostic. Their network is also trained in a supervised fashion which requires gradients of the objective functions during training to backpropagate them through the unrolled RNN. Conversely, we consider applications where gradients are not available.

A number of articles address the problem of increasing BO’s data-efficiency via warm-starting, i.e., by incorporating data from past optimizations on source tasks into the current target task. A range of methods accumulate all available source and target data in a single GP and make the data comparable via a ranking algorithm \cite{3}, standardization or multi-kernel GPs \cite{51}, multi-task GPs \cite{44}, the GP
noise model \[45\], or by regressing on prediction biases \[39\]. These approaches naturally suffer from the cubic scaling behaviour of GPs, which can be tackled for instance by replacing the GP model, e.g., with Bayesian neural networks \[41\] with task-specific embedding vectors or adaptive Bayesian linear regression \[40\] with basis expansions shared across tasks via a neural network. Other approaches retain the GP surrogate model and combine individual GPs for source and target tasks in an ensemble model with the weights adjusted according to the GP uncertainties \[34\], dataset similarities \[48\], or estimates of the GP generalization performance on the target task \[12\]. Similarly, \[16\] form a stack of GPs by iteratively regressing onto the residuals w.r.t. the most recent source task. In contrast to our proposed method, many of these approaches rely on hand-engineered dataset features to measure the relevance of source data for the target task. Such features have also been used to pick promising initial configurations for BO \[9,11\].

The method being closest in spirit and capability to our approach is proposed by Wistuba et al. \[49\]. It is similar to the aforementioned ensemble techniques with the important difference that the source and target GPs are not combined via a surrogate model but via a new AF, the so-called transfer acquisition function (TAF). This AF is defined to be a weighted superposition of the predicted improvements according to the source GPs and the expected improvement according to the target GP. The weights are adjusted either according to the GP’s uncertainty prediction or by using dataset features. Viewed in this context, our method also combines knowledge from source and target tasks in a new AF but our weighting is determined automatically in a meta-learning phase and can additionally be regulated during the optimization on the target task to adapt on-line to the specific objective function at hand. Furthermore, our method does not store and evaluate many source GPs during optimization as the knowledge from the source datasets is encoded directly in the network weights of the learned neural AF, allowing for faster evaluation speed after training.

3 Preliminaries

We state the general problem of global black-box optimization, review Bayesian optimization, and give a short overview of reinforcement learning.

Global Black-Box Optimization In global black-box optimization, the goal is to find a global optimum \(x^* \in \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}} f(x)\) of some unknown bounded real-valued objective function \(f: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) on the compact domain \(\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D\). The only means of acquiring information about \(f\) is via (possibly noisy) evaluations at points in \(\mathcal{D}\). Typically, a Gaussian process (GP) \[32\] is employed as surrogate model in which case the resulting posterior belief about \(f\) is given in terms of a mean function \(\mu_t(x) \equiv \mathbb{E}\{f(x) \mid \mathcal{H}_t\}\) and a variance function \(\sigma^2_t(x) \equiv \mathbb{V}\{f(x) \mid \mathcal{H}_t\}\), for which closed-form expressions are available. To determine the next iterate \(x_t\) based on the optimization history \(\mathcal{H}_t \equiv \{(x_i, f(x_i))\}_{i=1}^{t-1}\). In particular, the optimizer has to decide for the iterate \(x_t \in \mathcal{D}\) based on the optimization history \(\mathcal{H}_t \equiv \{(x_i, f(x_i))\}_{i=1}^{t-1}\). In particular, the optimizer does not have access to gradient information. To assess the performance of global optimization algorithms, it is natural to use the simple regret \(R_t \equiv |f(x^*) - f(x_t^*)|\) where \(x_t^*\) is the best input vector found by an algorithm up to and including step \(t\).

Bayesian Optimization In Bayesian optimization (BO) \[38\], one specifies a prior belief about the objective function \(f\) and at each step \(t\) builds a probabilistic surrogate model conditioned on the current optimization history \(\mathcal{H}_t\). Typically, a Gaussian process (GP) \[32\] is employed as surrogate model in which case the resulting posterior belief about \(f\) is given in terms of a mean function \(\mu_t(x) \equiv \mathbb{E}\{f(x) \mid \mathcal{H}_t\}\) and a variance function \(\sigma^2_t(x) \equiv \mathbb{V}\{f(x) \mid \mathcal{H}_t\}\), for which closed-form expressions are available. To determine the next iterate \(x_t\) based on the belief about \(f\) given \(\mathcal{H}_t\), a sampling strategy is defined in terms of an acquisition function (AF) \(\alpha(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}_t): \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\). The AF outputs a score value at each point in \(\mathcal{D}\) that the next iterate is defined to be given by \(x_t \in \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \alpha(x \mid \mathcal{H}_t)\). The strength of the resulting optimizer is largely based upon carefully designing the AF to trade-off exploration of unknown versus exploitation of promising areas in \(\mathcal{D}\).

Reinforcement Learning Reinforcement learning (RL) allows an agent to learn goal-oriented behavior via trial-and-error interactions with its environment \[43\]. This interaction process is formalized as a Markov decision process: at step \(t\) the agent senses the environment’s state \(s_t \in \mathcal{S}\) and uses a policy \(\pi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})\) to determine the next action \(a_t \in \mathcal{A}\). Typically, the agent explores the environment by means of a probabilistic policy, i.e., \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})\) denotes the probability measures over \(\mathcal{A}\). The environment’s response to \(a_t\) is the next state \(s_{t+1}\), which is drawn from a probability distribution with density \(p(s_{t+1} \mid s_t, a_t)\). The agent’s goal is formulated in terms of a scalar reward \(r_t = r(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1})\), which the agent receives together with \(s_{t+1}\). The agent aims to maximize the
expected cumulative discounted future reward $\eta(\pi)$ when acting according to $\pi$ and starting from some state $s_0 \in S$, i.e., $\eta(\pi) \equiv \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T} \gamma^{t-1} r_t \bigg| s_0 \right]$. Here, $T$ denotes the episode length and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ is a discount factor.

4 Meta-Learning Acquisition Functions for Bayesian Optimization

We now introduce our proposed approach for learning data-efficient customized sampling strategies in the context of BO. We dub the resulting algorithm MetaBO.

Bayesian Optimization with Neural Acquisition Functions Our goal is to devise a global black-box optimization method that is able to automatically identify and exploit structural properties of some class of objective functions for improved data-efficiency. As motivated above, we stay within the realm of BO, as this method is well-known for its data-efficiency originating from the powerful generalization capabilities of a GP surrogate model. The sampling strategy built upon this GP is classically encoded in a hand-designed AF. We use meta-learning to replace this AF by a neural network but keep the rest of the BO-loop intact (middle panel of Fig. 1). To distinguish it from a classical AF $\alpha$, we call such a network a neural acquisition function and denote it by $\alpha_\theta$, indicating that it is parametrized by a vector $\theta$.

As inputs to the neural AF we use the pointwise GP posterior prediction, i.e., $\alpha_\theta(x) = \alpha_\theta[\mu_t(x), \sigma_t(x)]$. This architecture allows learning a scalable neural AF that can be evaluated at arbitrary points $x \in D$ and which can be used as a plug-in feature in any state-of-the-art BO framework. In particular, if smooth activation functions are chosen, a neural AF constitutes a smooth mapping $D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, allowing to utilize gradient-based optimization strategies to find its maximum when used in the BO loop during evaluation. We further emphasize that after the training phase the resulting neural AF is fully automatic, i.e., there is no need to calibrate any hyperparameters.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the class of objective functions for which we want to learn a neural acquisition function $\alpha_\theta$. For instance, $\mathcal{F}$ could be the set of objective functions resulting from different physical configurations of a laboratory experiment or the set of loss functions used for training a machine learning model evaluated on different data sets. Often, such function classes have structure which can be exploited for data-efficient optimization. In many relevant cases, it is straightforward to obtain approximations to $\mathcal{F}$, i.e., a set of functions $\mathcal{F}'$ which capture the most relevant properties of $\mathcal{F}$ (e.g., through numerical simulations or surrogate models for hyperparameter optimization [8, 49]) but are much cheaper to evaluate. In an offline training phase, our meta-learning algorithm makes use of such cheap approximations to learn about the structure of $\mathcal{F}$ and to adapt $\theta$ to obtain a data-efficient optimization strategy customized to $\mathcal{F}$.
Training Procedure In practical black-box optimization tasks, gradients of the objective functions in \( \mathcal{F} \) are generally not available. This is oftentimes also true for the functions in \( \mathcal{F}' \), for instance, if \( \mathcal{F}' \) comprises numerical simulations. Therefore, we resort to RL as the meta-algorithm, as it does not require gradients of the objective functions. In particular, we propose to use the trust-region policy gradient method Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) \([37]\) as the algorithm to train the neural AF. Tab.\( \text{[1]} \) translates the MetaBO-setting into RL parlance.

During training, the meta-algorithm requires access to the global information contained in the GP posterior prediction. Thus, the state \( s_t \) at optimization step \( t \) formally corresponds to the entire functions \( \mu_t \) and \( \sigma_t \). PPO explores the state space using a parametrized stochastic policy \( \pi_0 \) from which the actions \( a_t = x_t \) are sampled, i.e., \( a_t \sim \pi_0 (\cdot | s_t) \). To arrive at a practical implementation, we evaluate \( \mu_t \) and \( \sigma_t \) on a discrete set of points \( \xi \equiv \{ \xi_n \}_{n=1}^{N} \subset \mathcal{D} \) and feed these evaluations through the neural AF \( \alpha_\theta \) at once, yielding one scalar output value \( \alpha_\theta (\xi_i) \equiv \alpha_\theta (\mu_t (\xi_i), \sigma_t (\xi_i)) \) for each point \( \xi_i \).

These outputs are interpreted as the logits of a multinomial distribution, i.e., we arrive at the policy architecture \( \pi_\theta (\cdot | s_t) \equiv \text{Mult} [\alpha_\theta (\xi_1), \ldots, \alpha_\theta (\xi_N)] \), cf. Fig.\( \text{[1]} \) right panel. Thus, the proposed policy evaluates the same neural acquisition function \( \alpha_\theta \) at arbitrarily many input points \( \xi_i \) and preferably samples points \( \xi_i \) with high \( \alpha_\theta (\xi_i) \).

Due to the curse of dimensionality, it is infeasible to use a sufficiently fine static set \( \xi \) for arbitrary problems. Instead, MetaBO continuously adapts \( \xi \) to the current state of \( \alpha_\theta \). At each step \( t \), \( \alpha_\theta \) is first evaluated on a static and relatively coarse Sobol grid \( \xi_{global} \) spanning the whole domain \( \mathcal{D} \). Subsequently, local maximizations of \( \alpha_\theta \) from the \( k \) points corresponding to the best evaluations are started. We denote the resulting set of local maxima by \( \xi_{local,t} \). This approach mimics the optimization of the AF in the popular BO implementation Spearmint \([40]\). Finally, we define the state \( s_t \) to consist of the functions \( \mu_t \) and \( \sigma_t \) evaluated on the union \( \xi = \xi_t = \xi_{local,t} \cup \xi_{global} \). The adaptive local part of this set enables the agent to exploit what it has learned so far by picking points which look promising according to the current neural AF while the static global part maintains exploration. Note that this general architecture allows learning dimensionality-agnostic AFs, i.e., in contrast to the learning to learn approach by Chen et al. \([6]\) our neural AFs do not have to be retrained when changing the dimensionality \( D \) of the optimization domain \( \mathcal{D} \).

As reward signal we use the negative simple regret, \( r_t \equiv -R_t \) (or a logarithmically transformed version, \( r_t \equiv -\log_{10} R_t \)). This choice rewards fast convergence to the optimum but does not penalize explorative evaluations which do not yield an immediate improvement. Furthermore, this choice makes episodes on different objective functions \( f \in \mathcal{F}' \) comparable, as it normalizes the outcomes w.r.t. the current true maximum. We emphasize that the knowledge about the true maximum is only needed during training and that cases in which it is not even known at training time do not limit the applicability of our method, as a cheap approximation (e.g., by evaluating the function on a coarse grid) can also be utilized.

The left panel of Fig.\( \text{[1]} \) depicts the resulting training loop graphically. The outer loop corresponds to the PPO iterations, each performing a policy update step \( \pi_\theta \rightarrow \pi_\theta_{t+1} \). To approximate the gradients of the PPO loss function, in the inner loop we record a batch of episodes, i.e., a set of \( (s_1, a_1, r_1) \)-tuples, by rolling out the current policy \( \pi_\theta \). At the beginning of each episode, we draw some function \( f \) from the training set \( \mathcal{F}' \) and fix an optimization budget \( T \). In each iteration of the inner loop we determine the adaptive set \( \xi_t \) and feed the state \( s_t \), i.e., the GP posterior evaluated on this set, through the policy which yields the action \( a_t = x_t \). We then evaluate \( f \) at \( x_t \) and use the result to compute the reward \( r_t \) and to update the optimization history: \( \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{t+1} = \mathcal{H}_t \cup \{ x_t, f (x_t) \} \). Finally, the GP is conditioned on the updated optimization history \( \mathcal{H}_{t+1} \) to obtain the next state \( s_{t+1} \).

Incorporating Additional Input Features A key feature of the proposed MetaBO framework is the possibility to easily incorporate additional task-relevant information by extending the state \( s_t \), i.e., by giving the neural AF access to additional input features (beyond the GP posterior prediction \( \mu_t \) and \( \sigma_t \)). In particular, we propose to add to the state \( s_t \) the current optimization step \( t \) and the optimization budget \( T \), as these features can be valuable for adjusting the exploration-exploitation trade-off \([32]\). Furthermore, we may add the point \( x \in \mathcal{D} \) at which the inputs \( \mu_t = \mu_t|_x \) and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RL</th>
<th>MetaBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy ( \pi_\theta )</td>
<td>Neural AF ( \alpha_\theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>Opt. run on ( f \in \mathcal{F}' )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep. length ( T )</td>
<td>Opt. budget ( T )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State ( s_t )</td>
<td>( \mu_t, \sigma_t ) on set ( \xi_t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action ( a_t )</td>
<td>Sampling point ( x_t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward ( r_t )</td>
<td>E.g. neg. regret (-R_t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. prob. ( p )</td>
<td>Noisy eval. of ( f ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GP-update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: RL \( \leftrightarrow \) MetaBO
We trained MetaBO on a wide range of function classes and compared the performance of the resulting neural AFs with popular hand-designed AFs for BO, namely expected improvement (EI) [28], GP-upper confidence bound (GP-UCB) [23, 42], and probability of improvement (PI) [22]. For the transfer learning experiments, we additionally benchmarked against the transfer acquisition function framework (TAF) as proposed in Wistuba et al. [49]. To give quantities such as lengthscales a consistent meaning, we scaled all objective functions to the optimization domain $D = [0, 1]^D$. If not stated differently, we report performance in terms of the median simple regret $R_t$ over 100 optimization runs on unseen functions as a function of the optimization step $t$ together with 30%/70% percentiles (shaded areas). We emphasize that we performed all experiments with the same MetaBO hyperparameters (with minor exceptions for the simulation-to-real task), making our method easily applicable in practice. To foster reproducibility, we provide a detailed exposition of the experimental settings in App. B and make the source code of MetaBO available online.

### 5 Experiments

We trained MetaBO on a wide range of function classes and compared the performance of the resulting neural AFs with popular hand-designed AFs for BO, namely expected improvement (EI) [28], GP-upper confidence bound (GP-UCB) [23, 42], and probability of improvement (PI) [22]. For the transfer learning experiments, we additionally benchmarked against the transfer acquisition function framework (TAF) as proposed in Wistuba et al. [49]. To give quantities such as lengthscales a consistent meaning, we scaled all objective functions to the optimization domain $D = [0, 1]^D$. If not stated differently, we report performance in terms of the median simple regret $R_t$ over 100 optimization runs on unseen functions as a function of the optimization step $t$ together with 30%/70% percentiles (shaded areas). We emphasize that we performed all experiments with the same MetaBO hyperparameters (with minor exceptions for the simulation-to-real task), making our method easily applicable in practice. To foster reproducibility, we provide a detailed exposition of the experimental settings in App. B and make the source code of MetaBO available online.

**Global Optimization Benchmark Functions** As a first experiment we evaluated our method on the classical global optimization benchmark functions Branin ($D = 2$), Goldstein-Price ($D = 2$), and Hartmann-3 ($D = 3$) [31]. To construct the training distribution, we applied translations sampled uniformly from $[-0.1, 0.1]^D$ and scalings from $[0.9, 1.1]$. Here, we included the position feature $x$ to enable MetaBO to identify and exploit structural properties of the objective functions.

We trained neural AFs with MetaBO for maximal translations $a = 0.1$ along each axis. For TAF, we evaluated TAF-20 ($M_{TAF} = 20$) source tasks, $N_{TAF} = 30$ datapoints each) and TAF-50 ($M_{TAF} = 50$, $N_{TAF} = 100$), with the source tasks being spread uniformly over the training distribution of MetaBO. Fig. 2 shows the performance on unseen functions drawn from this training distribution. MetaBO outperforms the classical AFs EI, PI, and GP-UCB by a large margin, in particular at early stages of the optimization by making use of the structural knowledge acquired during the meta-learning phase. Furthermore, after about 5 initial steps used to identify the objective function at hand, MetaBO outperforms TAF on both the Branin and Goldstein-Price functions while being competitive on the Hartmann-3 function. Note that TAF showed both improved and degraded performance when increasing $M_{TAF}$ and $N_{TAF}$, limiting its applicability in practice. In contrast, MetaBO’s neural AFs do not require calibration of any hyperparameters after training. Additionally, MetaBO outperforms

![Figure 2: Performance on three global optimization benchmark functions with random translations sampled uniformly from $[-0.1, 0.1]^D$ and scalings from $[0.9, 1.1]$. MetaBO outperforms EI, GP-UCB, and PI by clear margin, especially in early stages of the optimization. TAF is only competitive on the Hartmann-3 function and its performance depends strongly on the number of source tasks (we depict $M_{TAF} \in \{20, 50\}$). In contrast, MetaBO has no free hyperparameters after training.](https://github.com/boschresearch/MetaBO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>Meta-BO</th>
<th>TAF-20</th>
<th>TAF-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branin ($D = 2$)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Price</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM-3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Mean time per BO step in s.*
MetaBO (ours) EI GP-UCB PI Random

(a) $D = 2$

(b) $D = 4$

(c) $D = 5$

Figure 4: Performance on functions sampled from a GP prior with lengthscales sampled uniformly from $\ell \in [0.1, 1.0]$ for different dimensions $D$. We trained one single dimensionality-agnostic neural AF on the 5-dimensional task and evaluated it for different dimensionalities without retraining. MetaBO performs slightly better than or on par with the benchmark AFs on this function class. The results for $D \in \{1, 3\}$ are very similar and can be found in App. A (Figs. 8).

(a) Simple regret (MetaBO’s performance signal).

(b) Fraction of unsolved test tasks.

Figure 5: Performance on two 2D hyperparameter optimization tasks (SVM/AdaBoost). We trained MetaBO on 35 randomly chosen datasets and also used these as source tasks for TAF. The remaining 15 datasets were used for this evaluation. MetaBO learns an extremely data-efficient sampling strategy on the SVM experiment, while performing comparably with the baseline methods on AdaBoost.

TAF w.r.t. evaluation speed, since TAF evaluates $M_{TAF}$ source GPs, while MetaBO only performs a forward pass through the neural AF, cf. Tab. 2 (excludes MetaBO’s training time).

We further evaluated the neural AFs on objective functions outside of the training distribution. Fig. 3 shows the number of optimization steps required by MetaBO and EI to achieve a given performance when varying the maximal translation $a \in [0.0, 0.8]$ on the Branin function. The results show that MetaBO behaves robustly and generalizes well to functions outside of the training distribution, demonstrating that it is indeed capable of combining the knowledge about promising areas in $D$ with a sophisticated sampling strategy built upon the GP surrogate model. The corresponding results on Goldstein-Price and Hartmann-3 are similar and moved to App. A (Fig. 7).

General Function Classes In a second experiment we investigated MetaBO’s performance on general function classes without any specific structure except some correlation lengthscale. We sampled such objective functions from a GP prior with squared-exponential kernel with lengthscales drawn uniformly from $\ell \in [0.1, 1.0]$. To study a dimensionality-agnostic version of MetaBO, we excluded the feature $x$ from the state $s_t$. Indeed, we trained a neural AF using MetaBO only once on 5-dimensional objective functions and evaluated it for different dimensionalities without retraining.

The results (Fig. 4) show that MetaBO is capable of learning neural AFs which perform slightly better than or on par with the benchmark AFs on these general function classes. During the meta-learning phase, MetaBO automatically identified a suitable exploration-exploitation trade-off for BO, resulting in a hyperparameter-free and dimensionality-agnostic neural AF at evaluation time.

Hyperparameter Optimization We consider two hyperparameter optimization (HPO) problems, namely RBF-based SVMs (HPO of RBF kernel parameter, penalty parameter $C$, 144 configurations)
Figure 6: Performance on a simulation-to-real task (cf. text). MetaBO and TAF used data from a cheap simulation. (a, b) Extended training distribution (simulation). (c) Transfer to the hardware depicted in (d). MetaBO learns robust neural AFs with very strong early-time performance and on-line adaption to the target objectives, reliably yielding stabilizing controllers after less than ten BO iterations while TAF, EI, and GP-UCB explore too heavily.

Simulation-to-Real Task  Lastly, to demonstrate its practical applicability, we evaluated MetaBO on a 4D control task on a Furuta pendulum [15]. We included the position feature $x$ and applied BO to tune the four feedback gains of a linear state-feedback controller used to stabilize the pendulum in the upward equilibrium position. To assess the performance of a given controller, we employed a logarithmic quadratic cost function [2] with a penalty term if no stabilization could be achieved. We emphasize that the cost function is rather sensitive to the control gains, resulting in a challenging black-box optimization problem.

To meta-learn the neural AF, we employed a simple numerical simulation of the Furuta pendulum which models only the most basic physical effects. The training distribution was then generated by sampling the free physical parameters (two lengths, two masses), uniformly on a range of 75\% – 125\% around the true parameters of the hardware (Quanser QUBE – Servo 2]). We also used this simulation to generate $M_{TAF} = 50$ source tasks ($N_{TAF} = 200$).

Figs. 6(a), 6(b) show the performance on objective functions from simulation with physical parameters sampled uniformly on a wider range than during training (10\% – 200\% around the true parameters). MetaBO learned robust neural AFs, combining knowledge about the class of objective functions with an on-line adaption to the target objective function based on the GP model, yielding extremely strong early-time performance (Fig. 6(a)) and allows further improvements over time (Fig. 6(b)). In contrast, TAF does not adapt the weighting of source and target tasks online to the specific objective function at hand which leads to excessive explorative behaviour on this complex class of objective functions.

We finally applied the AFs obtained from simulation without any changes on the hardware. Fig. 6(c) shows that MetaBO indeed learned AFs generalizing well from the simulated objectives to the hardware task and is thereby able to rapidly adjust to its specific properties which results in very data-efficient optimization on the target system, consistently yielding stabilizing controllers after less than ten BO iterations. In comparison, the benchmark AFs require many samples to identify promising regions of the search space and therefore do not reliably find stabilizing controllers within the budget of 50 optimization steps.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduced MetaBO, a meta-learning approach for learning data-efficient neural AFs for BO which consistently outperform the popular hand-designed AFs EI, GP-UCB, and PI when structure is present.
in the class of objective functions under consideration, and also outperform the state-of-the-art TAF approach for warmstarting BO. The learned AFs also generalize well beyond the training distribution which makes MetaBO applicable for real-world tasks such as sim-to-real settings.

In future work, we plan to study why MetaBO does not yet surpass the benchmark AFs on general function classes and how the performance in such settings can be improved. We also aim to tackle the multi-task multi-fidelity setting \[47\], where we expect MetaBO’s sample efficiency to be of high impact.
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A  Additional Experimental Results

We provide the full set of results for the experiment on the global optimization benchmark functions to investigate the generalization capabilities of MetaBO to functions outside of the training distribution (Fig. 7) as well as for the experiment on general functions sampled from a GP prior with a dimensionality-agnostic neural AF (Fig. 8).

![Fig 7](image1.png)

Figure 7: Investigation of the robustness and generalization capabilities of neural AFs with respect to changes in the distribution of objective functions. The neural AFs were trained on global optimization benchmark functions with random translations sampled uniformly from \([-a, a]^D\) and scalings from \([0.9, 1.1]\). The value \(a\) of the maximal translation along each axis used during training is indicated by a vertical blue dashed line. During evaluation, we varied the ranges of translations and report the median number of steps the neural AFs required to achieve a given simple regret and compare this with EI. 100 optimization runs were performed for each value of \(a\). We observe robust behavior of the neural AFs, outperforming EI by large margin for small to medium values of \(a\) and performing at least on-par with EI for larger values of \(a\). Note that EI’s performance does not necessarily have to be constant, as, for instance, local optima may be pushed outside of the optimization domain for larger values of \(a\).

![Fig 8](image2.png)

Figure 8: Performance on functions sampled from a GP prior with lengthscales sampled uniformly from \(\ell \in [0.1, 1.0]\) for different dimensions \(D\). We trained one single dimensionality-agnostic neural AF on the 5-dimensional task and evaluated it for different dimensionalities without retraining. MetaBO performs slightly better than or on par with the benchmark AFs on this function class.
B  Experimental Details

To foster reproducibility, we provide a detailed explanation of the settings used in our experiments and make source code available online.[1]

B.1  General Implementation Details

In what follows, we explain all hyperparameters used in our experiments and summarize them in Tab. 3. We emphasize that we used the same hyperparameters for all our experiments, with minor exceptions for the simulation-to-real task.

**Gaussian Process Surrogate Models** We used the implementation GPy [17] with squared-exponential kernels with automatic relevance determination and a Gaussian noise model and tuned the corresponding hyperparameters (noise variance, kernel lengthscales, kernel signal variance) off-line by fitting a GP with 100 datapoints to the objective functions in the training and test sets using type-2 maximum likelihood. We also used the resulting hyperparameters for the source GPs of TAF. We emphasize that our method is fully compatible with other (on-line) hyperparameter optimization techniques, which we did not use in our experiments to arrive at a consistent and fair comparison with as few confounding factors as possible.

**Baseline AFs** We set a value of 0.05 for the exploration parameter of PI and of 0.1 for GP-UCB as reported in Srinivas et al. [42]. As is standard, we used the parameter-free version of EI. For TAF, we follow Wistuba et al. [49] and use the product-of-experts formula which is readily applicable in our setting, as it does not rely on hand-engineered dataset features. We detail the specific choices for the number of source tasks \( M_{TAF} \) and the number of datapoints \( N_{TAF} \) contained in each source GP in the main part of this paper.

For the classical AFs EI, GP-UCB, and PI we used the midpoint of the optimization domain \( D \) as initial design. For TAF we did not use an initial design as it utilizes the information contained in the source tasks to warmstart BO. Note that MetaBO also works without any initial design.

**Maximization of the AFs** Our method is fully compatible with any state-of-the-art method for maximizing AFs. In particular, if smooth activation functions are used, our neural AFs can be optimized using gradient-based techniques. We chose to switch off any confounding factors related to AF maximization and used a hierarchical gridding approach for all evaluations as well as during training of MetaBO. For the experiments with continuous domains \( D \), i.e., all experiments except the HPO task, we first put a multistart Sobol grid with \( N_{MS} \) points over the whole optimization domain and evaluated the AF on this grid. Afterwards, we implemented local searches from the \( k \) maximal evaluations via centering \( k \) local Sobol grids with \( N_{LS} \) points, each spanning one unit cell of the uniform grid, around the \( k \) maximal evaluations. The AF maximum is taken to be the maximal evaluation of the AF on these \( k \) Sobol grids. For the HPO task, the AF maximum can be determined exactly, as the domain is discrete.

**Reward Function** If the true maximum of the objective functions is not known at training time, we compute \( R_t \) with respect to an approximate maximum and define the reward to be given by \( r_t = -R_t \). This is the case for the experiment on general function classes (GP samples) where we used grid search to approximate the maximum as well as for the simulation-to-real task on the Furuta pendulum where we used the performance of a linear quadratic regulator (LQR) controller as an approximate maximum. For the experiments on the global optimization benchmark functions as well as on the HPO tasks, we do know the exact value of the global optimum. In these cases, we use a logarithmic transformation of the simple regret, i.e., \( r_t = -\log_{10} R_t \) as the reward signal. Note that we also consistently plot the logarithmic simple regret in our evaluations for these cases.

**Neural AF Architecture** We used multi-layer perceptrons with tanh-activation functions and four hidden layers with 200 units each to represent the neural AFs. For the simulation-to-real task we used two hidden layers with 100 units each.

[1] https://github.com/boschresearch/MetaBO
Table 3: Parameters of the MetaBO framework used in our experiments. We used the same parameters for all experiments with minor modifications for the simulation-to-real (S2R) task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value in experiments</th>
<th>Value for S2R (if deviating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BO/AF parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality $N_{MS}$ of multistart grid</td>
<td>500 ($D = 1$)</td>
<td>1000 ($D = 2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 ($D = 3$)</td>
<td>2000 ($D = 4$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10000 ($D = 5$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality $N_{LS}$ of local search grid</td>
<td>$N_{MS}$</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number $k$ of multistarts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration parameter PI</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration parameter GP-UCB [42]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MetaBO parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality of $\xi$ global</td>
<td>$N_{MS}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinality of $\xi$ local</td>
<td>$k$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural AF architecture</td>
<td>200 - 200 - 200 - 200</td>
<td>100 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPO parameters</strong> [37]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch size</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of epochs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minibatches</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam learning rate</td>
<td>$1 \cdot 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$5 \cdot 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI-loss clipping parameter</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value network architecture</td>
<td>same as for neural AF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value coefficient in loss function</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy coefficient in loss function</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount factor $\gamma$</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAE-$\lambda$ [36]</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value Function Network**  To reduce the variance of the gradient estimates for PPO, a value function $V_\pi(s_t)$, i.e., an estimator for the expected cumulative reward from state $s_t$, can be employed [36]. In this context, the optimization step $t$ and the budget $T$ are particularly informative features, as for a given sampling strategy on a given function class they allow quite reliable predictions of future regrets. Thus, we propose to use a separate neural network to learn a value function of the form $V_\pi(s_t) = V_\pi(t, T)$. We used the same network architecture to learn the value functions as we used for the neural AFs.

**Computation Time**  For training MetaBO, we employed ten parallel CPU-workers to record the data batches and one GPU to perform the policy updates. Depending on the dimensionality $D$ of the optimization domain $D$ and the complexity of the objective function evaluations, training a neural AF for a given function class took between approximately 30 min and 10 h on this moderately complex architecture.

**B.2 Experiment-specific Details**

We shortly list some additional details specific to the experiments presented in this article.

**Global Optimization Benchmark Functions**  To give TAF fair access to the training distribution used by MetaBO, the $M_{TAF}$ source tasks for TAF were created by putting a Sobol grid with $M_{TAF}$ points over the set of translations and scalings, i.e., over $[-0.1, 0.1]^D \times [0.9, 1.1]$ and then using the corresponding objective functions as the source objectives.

Note further that we clipped the sampled translations such that at least one global optimum stayed within $D$. 
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**General Function Classes**  We determined approximate maxima on the objective functions sampled from a GP prior via grid search.

**Hyperparameter Optimization Tasks**  For this experiment we considered the hyperparameter optimization problems reported in Wistuba et al. [49] and also used in Feurer et al. [12]. We used the data from 2D hyperparameter grid searches for two different machine learning models, namely for a SVM with RBF kernel (RBF kernel parameter, penalty parameter $C$, 144 configurations) and AdaBoost (number of product terms, number of iterations, 108 configurations).

For each model and each hyperparameter configuration, results for training these models on 50 different datasets are available. We randomly chose 35 datasets and used them for training MetaBO and also as source tasks for TAF (we fed the source GPs with all available hyperparameter configurations) and evaluated the methods on the remaining 15 datasets.

To avoid overfitting, we performed leave-one-out cross validation on the training datasets to determine at which iteration to stop the meta-training. Note that this is not an issue for the other experiments presented in this article, as there a continuously parametrized distribution of source tasks is available and the best iteration on the training tasks also works best on unseen tasks drawn from this distribution.

**Simulation-to-real Task**  The task was to stabilize a Furuta pendulum [15] for 5 s around the upper equilibrium position using a linear state-feedback controller. If the controller was not able to stabilize the system or if the voltage applied to the motor exceeded some safety limit, we added a penalty term to the cost function proportional to the remaining time the pendulum would have had to be stabilized for successfully completing the task.

For this task, we did not use the method described in App. B.1 to tune the hyperparameters of the GP surrogate model. In particular, we did not use ARD and tuned the kernel lengthscale for optimal performance of EI as we found that this procedure yields better results for the baseline methods than type-2 maximum likelihood.

The numerical simulation we used to train MetaBO was based on the nonlinear dynamics equations of the Furuta pendulum and did only contain the most basic physical effects. In particular, effects like friction and stiction were not modeled.

As the true maximum of the objective functions is not known, we used the cost accumulated by a linear quadratic regulator (LQR) controller as an approximate maximum to compute the simple regret.