

ARTICLE TYPE

Black-box optimization on hyper-rectangle using Recursive Modified Pattern Search and application to ROC-based Classification Problem

Priyam Das*

¹Department of Biomedical Informatics,
Harvard Medical School, Massachusetts, USA

Correspondence

*Priyam Das, 70 S Huntington Ave, Apt 1,
Boston, MA 02130. Email: pdas@ncsu.edu

Summary

In Statistics, multi-modal and non-smooth likelihood (or, objective function) maximization problems often arise with known upper and lower bound of the parameters. A novel derivative-free global optimization technique is developed to optimize any black-box function on a hyper-rectangular euclidean space. In literature, pattern search technique has been shown to be a powerful tool for blackbox optimization. The proposed algorithm follows the principle of pattern search technique where new updated solution is obtained from the current solution making movements (within the constrained sample space) along the coordinates. Before making a jump from the current solution point to a new solution point, objective function is evaluated in several neighborhood points around the current solution and the best solution point is chosen based on the objective function values at those points. Parallel threading can be used to make the algorithm more scalable. Performance of the proposed method is evaluated based on optimization of upto 5000 dimensional multi-modal benchmark functions. The proposed algorithm is shown to perform upto 40 and 368 times faster compared to Genetic Algorithm (GA) and Simulated Annealing (SA) respectively. The proposed method is used to estimate the optimal biomarker combination from Alzheimer data by maximizing the empirical estimates of area under ROC curve.

KEYWORDS:

Non-convex optimization, constrained problem, ROC, AUC, multi-modal objective function

1 | INTRODUCTION

In the field of science and engineering, a black-box is considered as a device, system or object which can only be observed in terms of inputs and outputs but the internal process of the system is unknown. In the field of operation research and machine learning, functions with (possibly) multiple extremums, analytically intractable derivatives and discontinuity are generally categorized as black-box functions. While optimizing any objective function with complicated mathematical structure consisting of large number of variables, it is a common practice to optimize it treating as a blackbox. Because, in case there is uncertainty about continuity and smoothness of the objective function, the scope of using convex optimization techniques can be limited. Also multi-modal nature of the objective function can make it unsuitable for convex optimization techniques.

'Gradient descent (GD)' (Marquardt 1963) is one of the most well-known methods used for convex optimization. A few other convex optimization techniques are 'Trust Region Reflective (TRF)' algorithm (Byrd, Gilbert, & Nocedal 2000), 'Interior-point (IP)' algorithm (Potra & Wright 2000) and 'Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP)' algorithm (Boggs & Tolle 1996). In most of these algorithms (e.g., GD, TRF, SQP) derivatives are used to find the best direction of the movement in the sample space while optimizing any objective function. While minimizing any objective function

⁰Abbreviations: AUC, area under curve; ROC curve, receiver operating characteristic curve

using convex optimization techniques, emphasis is put mainly on finding the local solution. Despite being efficient for minimizing convex problems, while minimizing non-convex functions, these algorithms tend to get stuck at local solutions although global solution is desired. For low dimensional non-convex minimization problems, it is a common practice to optimize using convex optimization techniques starting from several starting points and extract the best solution from the set of obtained solutions. However, with increasing dimension of the parameter space, this strategy might prove to be computationally expensive. In a few other existing optimization algorithms, the main motivation is to minimize the number of function evaluations required to find a reasonable local minimum (e.g., Goodner, Tsianos, Li, and Loeb (2012)) which might not be desirable if finding the global minimum is the main objective.

In order to optimize blackbox function, in literature, several heuristic algorithms have been proposed over last few decades. One of the very first blackbox optimization approaches was proposed by Fraser (1957) known as 'Genetic algorithm (GA)' which was later popularized by Bethke (1980); Goldberg (1989). Another popular heuristic global optimization technique is 'Simulated annealing (SA)' (Kirkpatrick, Gelatt, & Vecchi 1983) which is widely used in the field of engineering (Granville, Krivanek, & Rasson 1994). Among other methods, one of the most commonly used black-box optimization technique 'Particle swarm optimization (PSO)' was first proposed in Kennedy and Eberhart (1995). Most of these blackbox optimization techniques incorporate the principle of exploration along with finding the direction of local solution. Once it gets stuck to any local minimum, further exploration efforts are typically made to find better solution following many heuristic principles. Also, in general, derivative-based movements are avoided since computation of derivatives can be expensive even in case they are tractable. Thus the sense of exploration and avoiding usage of derivatives are two notable aspects conceived by any typical blackbox techniques unlike convex optimization approaches. But there still remain challenges with solving high dimensional blackbox functions with some of these above-mentioned algorithms, e.g., mentioned GA might not scale well with complexity as in higher dimensional optimization problems, there is often an exponential increase in search space size (Geris 2012).

In order to avoid derivative to find the direction of movement from the current solution to a better one, a very common and effective approach is to move along the coordinates. Over the time, a sequence of coordinate search based global optimization techniques evolved which are discussed as follows. In 1952, Fermi and Metropolis (1952) proposed a very simple but effective coordinate search algorithm for minimizing unconstrained black-box functions. First, a step-size is fixed at the beginning of an iteration. Then that step-size is added and subtracted from each coordinate of the current solution one at a time. Thus for a n -dimensional parameter space, at each step, $2n$ new points in the neighborhood of the current solution point is explored and the objective function value is evaluated at those points. Out of these $2n + 1$ points (including the starting point of the iteration), the point with the minimum objective function value is considered as the updated solution after that iteration. If no improvement (in terms of solution) is observed after an iteration, the same search principle is repeated after decreasing the step-size to the half of its previous value. Thus a finer search is incorporated in this algorithm. Extending and generalizing the Fermi's principle for a several class of blackbox optimization problems, Torczon (1997) proposed Generalized pattern search (GPS) algorithm. The main principle of Pattern Search (PS) based algorithms is to evaluate the objective function value in a few points in the neighbourhood of the current solution, obtained by making coordinate-wise movements, and subsequently selecting the best neighborhood point (among selected ones) in terms of the objective function value. However, the performance depends on the way the sizes of the coordinate-wise movements are considered within the algorithm. Later several articles evolved focusing on optimization using Direct Search (DS) which can be considered as a variant of PS (Audet & Dennis 2006; Custodio & Madeira 2015; Kolda, Lewis, & Torczon 2003; Lewis & Torczon 1999; Martinez & Sobral 2003). A few other derivative-free optimization methods have been proposed in Audet (2014); Audet, Bechard, and Digabel (2008); Audet, Jr., and Digabel (2008); Conn, Scheinberg, and Vicente (2009); Digabel (2011); Jones, Schonlau, and Welch (1998); Martelli and Amaldi (2014).

Despite the fact that a large number of blackbox optimization algorithms have been proposed in the last couple of decades, only a few of them deals with blackbox problem on constrained spaces. Unconstrained blackbox optimization algorithms might not be appropriate for solving constrained blackbox problems since at some points in the unconstrained search space (outside the constrained domain), the objective function might be infeasible. Also, additional computation resources might be spent looking for solution in the search space outside the domain. In statistics, often the parameters to be estimated are bounded by known upper and lower bounds. Even though sometime, the parameters (to be estimated) are not bounded in theoretical sense, but putting a reasonable bound from prior experience might be helpful in reducing the search space, and hence reducing the computation time. Thus, an algorithm specifically designed for optimizing any objective function over any desired bound on the coordinates is helpful in (1) reducing the search space (based on experience and prior idea from real data) and (2) employing more thorough search over the desired region (with coordinate-wise lower and upper bound). In this paper a derivative-free pattern search based method 'Recursive Modified Pattern Search (RMPS)' is proposed for minimizing a black-box function on a hyper-rectangular domain. Similar to the Fermi's principle (Fermi and Metropolis (1952), Figure 1), in the proposed algorithm at each iteration, the value of the objective function is evaluated at $2n$ neighboring points which are obtained by making $2n$ (where n is the dimension of the parameter space) coordinate-wise movements with derived step-sizes. Unlike the Fermi's principle and GPS, RMPS is specifically designed for optimizing blackbox functions over the hyper-rectangular domain. There also remain several other differences of RMPS compared to the existing PS techniques which is noted down in the supplementary material. Since it is typical for any blackbox optimization algorithm to incorporate a strategy for jumping out of local minimum in search of better solution, in RMPS we consider 'restart' strategy as discussed below. Based on the step-sizes for the coordinate-wise movements for each coordinate (similar to $+s$ and $-s$ in




FIGURE 1 Fermi's principle : Possible $2n$ movements starting from initial point (x_1, \dots, x_n) inside an iteration with fixed step-size s , while optimizing any n -dimensional objective function.

Figure 1), it can be determined if a local minimum has been found. Once all the movement step-sizes become smaller than a certain threshold (set by user), the step-size is again set to a higher value in order to look for better solution in distant neighborhood. We term this strategy as 'restart' which is, to the best of our knowledge, never considered in the field of PS algorithms. The algorithm terminates when two consecutive restarts yield the similar solution (if norm of difference is smaller than threshold set by the user). A brief discussion on the main differences among RMPS and other PS based algorithms is provided in Section A of the supplementary material. One of the biggest advantage of the proposed algorithm is that within each iteration, the objective functions can be evaluated parallelly in $2n$ directions since once the step-size for an iteration is fixed, the movements and the objective function value evaluation steps in $2n$ directions are independent of each other. Therefore $2n$ parallel threads can be incorporated.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the detailed description of the proposed algorithm. In Section 3, we discuss the theoretical properties of RMPS. In Section 4 the comparative performance of the proposed algorithm along with a few other existing methods is reported based on optimization of several moderate and high-dimensional challenging non-convex benchmark functions. In Section 5, the proposed algorithm is applied to find the optimal linear combination of the biomarkers for Alzheimer's disease based on the data collected on the values of the biomarkers from subjects belonging to various stages of Alzheimer disease. A short discussion on the proposed algorithm is provided in Section 6.

2 | RECURSIVE MODIFIED PATTERN SEARCH (RMPS)

Consider an objective function $Y = f(\mathbf{x})$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the parameter of dimension n . Suppose our objective is to

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} : f(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\text{subject to} : \mathbf{x} \in S \subset \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned}$$

where $S = \prod_{j=1}^n I_j$, $I_j = [a_j, b_j]$ are closed and bounded intervals on \mathbb{R} for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now consider the bijection map

$$g : S \mapsto [0, 1]^n$$

where $g(\mathbf{z}) = (g_1(\mathbf{z}), \dots, g_n(\mathbf{z})) \in [0, 1]^n$ is such that $g_i(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{z_i - a_i}{b_i - a_i}$. So, without loss of generality, the domain of \mathbf{x} can be taken to be $S = [0, 1]^n$. So the problem of minimizing a function on a hyper-rectangular domain is equivalent to the problem of minimizing a function on a unit cube of same dimension. For ease of notation, in the rest of the paper, the domain of the parameter space is considered to be unit cube of dimension n .

Runs

RMPS consists of several *runs*. Each *run* is given by a sequence of iterations and a *run* is terminated based on some convergence criteria (details as follows). After each iteration step, typically a new solution point is found (although it is possible to obtain no new solution after an iteration). After the sequence of iterations performed within a *run*, when the *run* is terminated, it returns a solution which is obtained at the last iteration of that *run*. The first *run* is initialized from the initial guess (or starting point) provided by the user. The following *runs* start from the solution returned by the *run* its previous *run*. For example, the forth *run* would start from the solution returned by the third *run*. So the user should set the starting point for the first *run* (see Figure 2) only. Starting from the solution returned by the previous one, each *run* tries to improve the solution by making coordinate-wise jumps of step-sizes which typically either remain the same or decrease after each iteration. And the sequence of decreasing step sizes gradually decreases close to zero (details as follows). After each *run*, the obtained solution is either better than the solution returned by the previous *run* or the same. If two consecutive *runs* give the same solution (up to some fixed decimal place set by the user), the algorithm terminates and returns the solution returned by the last executed *run*, which is the final solution.

Parameters set at the beginning, before first run

The following parameters are set at the beginning of the algorithm, before the first *run* is executed.

- **max_runs** : *max_runs* denotes the maximum number of *runs* allowed in the algorithm.




FIGURE 2 Flowchart of RMPS algorithm. Here CC1 denotes the condition $(|F - \min(F, FF)| < \text{tol_fun}$ and $s < \phi$), see Algorithm pseudo-code part in Section 2 for details.

- **max_iter**: max_iter denotes the maximum number of iterations allowed inside a *run*.
- **tol_fun**: tol_fun determines the minimum amount of improvement required after an iteration so that the *global step size* (described later) is kept unchanged for next iteration.
- **tol_fun_2**: The second *run* onwards, whenever a *run* terminates, it is checked whether the solution returned by the current *run* is the same or different with the solution returned by the previous *run* upto certain decimal place which is determined by round_factor . If $\hat{x}^{(R)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(R-1)}$ denote the solution obtained by R-th and $(R - 1)$ -th runs, then if $\|\hat{x}^{(R)} / \text{round_factor} - \hat{x}^{(R-1)}\| < \text{tol_fun_2}$ holds true, then no further *run* is executed and $\hat{x}^{(R)}$ is returned as the final solution. Otherwise, next *run* is executed.

Parameters set at the beginning of run, before it's first iteration

In RMPS each *run* is similar except the values of the tuning parameters which can be reset after each *run*. There are three tuning parameters which are initial *global step size* s_{initial} , *step decay rate* ρ , *step size threshold* ϕ respectively. Note that it is not necessary to change their values at each *run*. User may choose to set their values same for all *runs*, by setting their values before starting first *run*. A brief description of these parameters are provided as follows:

- **initial global step size** (s_{initial}): s_{initial} denotes the highest possible size of coordinate-wise jumps.
- **step decay rate** (ρ): ρ determines the rate of change of *global step size* at the end of each iteration. It's value is fixed at the beginning of each *run*. Whenever any step-size (*global step size* and the *local step sizes*; discussed in the next subsection) is required to be decreased, the step-size is divided by it, $\rho > 1$ must hold.
- **step size threshold** (ϕ): This is the lower bound of the all step-sizes (*global step size* and the *local step sizes*; discussed in the next subsection). Once any step size reaches below ϕ , it is considered that the step-size is sufficiently close to zero.

Parameters set within each iteration

Inside each iteration there is a parameter called *global step size* (denoted by $s^{(j)}$ for j -th iteration) and $2n$ local parameters called *local step sizes* (denoted by $\{s_i^+\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{s_i^-\}_{i=1}^n$). Note that their values are not set by the user. Their values are automatically set based on how the objective function value improves over the iterations.

Further, a brief description on how the values of the tuning parameters affect the the performance of RMPS algorithm is provided in Section B of the supplementary material.

Algorithm : Within a run

Inside a *run*, the first iteration is performed setting the *global step size* $s^{(1)} = s_{\text{initial}}$. Inside an iteration, the value of the *global step size* is kept unchanged throughout all the operations. At the beginning of any iteration, the *local step size* $\{s_i^+\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{s_i^-\}_{i=1}^n$ are set to be equal to the *global step size* of the corresponding iteration. For example, at the beginning of j th iteration, we have, $s_i^+ = s_i^- = s^{(j)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Suppose the current value of \mathbf{x} at the j -th iteration is $\mathbf{x}^{(j)} = (x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_n^{(j)})$. If moving $x_i^{(j)}$ by s_i^+ ($s_i^+ = s^{(j)}$ at the beginning) in the positive direction generates a point outside the domain (i.e., $(x_i^{(j)} + s_i^+) > 1$), then s_i^+ is updated to the value $\frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f}$ where f is the smallest possible integer such that $x_i^{(j)} + \frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f} < 1$. Similarly if moving $x_i^{(j)}$ by s_i^- ($s_i^- = s^{(j)}$ at the beginning) in the negative direction generates a point outside the domain (i.e., $(x_i^{(j)} - s_i^-) < 0$), then s_i^- is updated to the value $\frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f}$ where f is the smallest possible integer such that $x_i^{(j)} - \frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f} > 0$. While choosing f for any given coordinate and given direction, it is taken into account that the updated *local step size* is greater than *step size threshold* ϕ . In case such a f is not feasible (for example, if $1 - x_i^{(j)} < \phi$, then no such f exists such that $x_i^{(j)} + \frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f} < 1$ and $\frac{s_i^{(j)}}{\rho^f} > \phi$), that particular coordinate is not updated in the corresponding direction and is kept unchanged.

After the above-mentioned assignment of the values of the *local step sizes*, $2n$ new points are obtained in the neighborhood of the current solution $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$. Objective functions are evaluated at those points. Out of $(2n + 1)$ points (including $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$), the point corresponding to lowest objective function value is considered as the updated solution $\mathbf{x}^{(j+1)}$. In case $|f(\mathbf{x}^{(j+1)}) - f(\mathbf{x}^{(j)})| < \text{tol_fun}$ holds, then *global step size* is decreased divided by ρ , i.e., $s^{(j+1)}$ is set equal to $s^{(j)} / \rho$. Otherwise, *global step size* is kept unchanged. This step signifies the fact that if the objective function is not improving well for the current value of *global step size*, it is decreased to employ a more finer search. Once the value of *global step size* becomes less than *step size threshold* ϕ , the *run* is terminated. It implies, *global step size* is sufficiently close to zero, hence a local solution is reached (under certain sets of regularity conditions, as described in Section 3)

In short, in an iteration, there is only one *global step size* and $2n$ *local step sizes* which are initialized within the iteration being equal to *global step size* and at the end of the iteration, each of them ends up being less than or equal to the *global step size* of that iteration. It should be noted that in a *run*, the *global step size* might decrease or remain same after each iteration. On the other hand, the *local step sizes* have memory-less property since their values do not depend on their old values in the previous iteration. A *run* terminates when *global step size* becomes smaller than ϕ .

Algorithm : Restart strategy

Setting *step size threshold* to a sufficiently small value, it can be shown that if the function is differentiable and convex then the the value of the objective function at the solution is the global minimum (see Section 3). Also the *run* terminates when *global step size* becomes smaller than *step size threshold*. However for non-convex functions, there is no way to ensure whether that is a global minimum or not. To increase the likelihood of reaching the global minimum, at the end of a *run*, another *run* is initiated setting the *global step size* to initial *global step size* s_{initial} . Thus in RMPS, the subsequent set of candidate points are chosen from distant neighborhood and this heuristic approach increases the likelihood of jumping out of the current local solution. Note that, in case it is known that the objective function is convex, there is no need to jump-start since each *run* is designed in such a way so that it returns a local solution (see Section 3) which is the global solution in case of convex objective function. Hence for minimizing a convex function, only one *run* is sufficient.

Regarding this heuristic strategy of jump-start, a concern might be raised whether restarting the next *run* from the solution returned by the previous *run* is more justified compared the possible alternative of restarting from different point(s) randomly generated from the parameter space. Firstly, under certain regularity conditions, the solution obtained at the end of a *run* is a local solution and has the potential of being the true global solution as well, which is not necessarily true for any other randomly generated point. Now, another option is to restart from multiple randomly generated points and execute RMPS for each one of them. For low dimensional cases, the strategy of restarts from different initial points might be scalable. But intuitively, with increase in dimension, the set of possible restart points should ideally increase exponentially. So, considering multiple starting point strategy might prove to be computationally infeasible. In RMPS, upto $2n$ parallel threads are used to perform operations within a iterations, hence, along with that, further parallel threading for multi-start strategy would not be feasible as well. Also, in Section 4 it is shown by experimental studies that the proposed algorithm yields almost equally good solution starting from different randomly generated points for high-dimensional benchmark functions.

Algorithm pseudocode

Pseudocode for RMPS is given in **Algorithm 1**. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(R)}$ denote the solution obtained at the end of R -th *run*, and $\mathbf{x}^{(j)}$ denote the solution obtained after the j -th iteration within a particular *run*. Initial guess of the solution $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ is provided by the user.

3 | THEORETICAL PROPERTIES

It is not guaranteed for any algorithm to reach to a global minimum of any black-box function every time. But under restrictive conditions like convexity, it is desirable for any optimization algorithm to return the global minimum. In this section we show that under certain regularity conditions, RMPS algorithm reaches a global minimum of the objective function. Consider the following theorem

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode for RMPS

```

R ← 1
top:
j ← 1
s(0), s(1) ← sinitial
if (R = 1) then
  x(0) ← Initial guess
else
  x(0) ←  $\hat{x}^{(R-1)}$ 
end if
while (j ≤ max_iter and s(j) > φ) do
  F ← f(x(j-1))
  s ← s(j-1)
  for h = 1 : 2d do
    i ←  $\lfloor \frac{(h+1)}{2} \rfloor$  ([·] denotes largest smaller integer function)
    sh ← (-1)h s(j)
    xh ← x(j-1)
    xh(i) ← xh(i) + sh
    if (xh(i) > 1) then
      f =  $\lceil \log_{\rho} \frac{s_h}{(1-x^{(j)}(i))} \rceil + 1$ 
      sh ← sh / ρf
    end if
    if (xh(i) < 0) then
      f =  $\lceil \log_{\rho} \frac{-s_h}{x^{(j)}(i)} \rceil + 1$ 
      sh ← sh / ρf
    end if
    if (sh > φ) then
      fh ← f(xh)
    else
      fh ← F
    end if
  end for
  B ← arg minxh fh
  FF ← min({fh}h=12d)
  if (FF < F) then
    x(j) ← B
  else
    x(j) ← x(j-1)
  end if
  if (j > 1) then
    if (|F - min(F, FF)| < tol_fun and s > φ) then
      s ←  $\frac{s}{\rho}$ 
    end if
  end if
  s(j) ← s
  j ← j + 1
end while
 $\hat{x}^{(R)}$  ← x(j),
if || $\hat{x}^{(R)}$  -  $\hat{x}^{(R-1)}$ || < tol_fun_2 then
  return  $\hat{x}$  =  $\hat{x}^{(R)}$  as final solution
  exit
else
  R ← R + 1
  goto top.
end if

```

Theorem 1. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is locally convex and differentiable on a compact set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider a point $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in C$. Consider a sequence $\delta_k = \frac{s}{\rho^k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s > 0, \rho > 1$. Define $\mathbf{u}_k^{(i+)} = (u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_i + \delta_k, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n)$ and $\mathbf{u}_k^{(i-)} = (u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, u_i - \delta_k, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. **If** for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f(\mathbf{u}) \leq f(\mathbf{u}_k^{(i+)})$ and $f(\mathbf{u}) \leq f(\mathbf{u}_k^{(i-)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, the global minimum of f on C occurs at \mathbf{u} .

Proof of Theorem 1. Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset C$ w.r.t. ℓ_∞ -norm containing \mathbf{u} at the center. So, there exists $r > 0$ such that $\mathbf{U} = \prod_{i=1}^n U_i$ where $U_i = (u_i - r, u_i + r)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define $g_i : U_i \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $g_i(\mathbf{z}) = f(u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}, \mathbf{z}, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n)$. Since f is convex on \mathcal{U} , it can be easily shown that g_i is also convex on U_i . We claim that $g_i(u_i) \leq g_i(\mathbf{z})$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in U_i$.

Suppose there exist a point $u_i^* \in U_i$ such that $g_i(u_i^*) < g_i(u_i)$. Take $d = |u_i^* - u_i|$ (see Figure S1 and S2 of the supplementary material for better visualization). Clearly $0 < d < r$. Without loss of generality, assume $u_i^* > u_i$. Hence $u_i^* = u_i + d$. Since δ_k is a strictly decreasing sequence going to 0, there exists a N such that for all $k \geq N$, $\delta_k < d$. Now we have $u_i < u_i + \delta_N < u_i + d$. Now there exists a $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$u_i + \delta_N = \lambda u_i + (1 - \lambda)(u_i + d)$. From convexity of g_i , we have

$$f(u_i + \delta_N) = f(\lambda u_i + (1 - \lambda)(u_i + d)) \leq \lambda f(u_i) + (1 - \lambda)f(u_i + d) = \lambda f(u_i) + (1 - \lambda)f(u_i^*) = f(u_i) - (1 - \lambda)(f(u_i) - f(u_i^*)),$$

Since, $f(u_i^*) < f(u_i)$, it implies $f(u_i + \delta_N) < f(u_i)$. But, we know $f(u_i) \leq f(u_i + \delta_N)$. Hence it is a contradiction.

Since partial derivatives of f exist at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$, g_i is differentiable at $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u}_i$. Since \mathbf{u}_i is a local minima of g_i in U_i , we have $g_i'(\mathbf{u}_i) = 0$. So we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{u}} = 0$. By similar argument it can be shown that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} f(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{u}} = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Since f is convex and $\nabla f(\mathbf{u}) = 0$, \mathbf{u} is a local minima in \mathbf{U} . Now, since $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{C}$, \mathbf{u} is also a local minima of \mathbf{C} . But f is convex on \mathbf{C} . Since any local minimum of a convex function is necessarily global minimum, the global minimum of f occurs at \mathbf{u} . \square

Suppose the objective function is convex and all the partial derivatives exist at the obtained solution $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{C}$ which is an interior point. The proposed algorithm terminates when two consecutive *runs* yield the same solution. It implies in the last *run*, the objective function values at all the sites obtained by making jumps of sizes $\delta_k = \frac{\text{initial}}{\rho^k}$ (until δ_k gets smaller than *step size threshold*) around \mathbf{u} , i.e. $f(\mathbf{u}_k^{(i+)})$ and $f(\mathbf{u}_k^{(i-)})$, are greater than or equal to $f(\mathbf{u})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. So, taking *step size threshold* sufficiently small, from the above theorem, RMPS ensures that the returned solution is the global minimum under the assumed regularity conditions of the objective function. From Theorem 1 it is concluded that if the objective function is convex and differentiable then taking *step size threshold* sufficiently small yields the global minimum. It should be also noted that if the function is convex and differentiable and it takes minimum value at some interior point, evaluation of only the first *run* is sufficient to obtain the solution.

4 | COMPARATIVE STUDY ON BENCHMARK FUNCTIONS

In this section, the comparative performance study of RMPS, Simulated Annealing (SA) and Genetic Algorithm (GA) is considered. Both SA and GA are available in Matlab R2014a (The Mathworks) via the Optimization Toolbox functions *simulannealbnd* (for SA), and *ga* (for GA) respectively. In the comparative study, the maximum number of allowed iterations and evaluations of objective function is set to be infinity for *simulannealbnd* function. In case of *ga*, the default parameter values are used. RMPS is implemented in Matlab 2014a and the values of the tuning parameters are taken to be as follows: $\text{max_runs} = 1000$, $\text{max_iter} = 5000$, $\text{tol_fun} = 10^{-15}$, $\text{tol_fun}_2 = 10^{-6}$, $\rho_1 = 2$ (*step decay rate* for the first *run*), $\rho_2 = 1.05$ (*step decay rate* for second *run* onwards), $\phi = 10^{-6}$. We consider 45 benchmark functions (Jamil & Yang 2013) and each test function is minimized starting from 10 randomly generated points (under 10 random number generating seeds in MATLAB) within the considered domain of solution space using these three above-mentioned methods. The domains of the search regions can be found in the supplementary material Table S1. All simulation studies in this paper are performed in a machine with 64-Bit Windows 8.1, Intel i7 3.60GHz processors and 32GB RAM. In Table 1, the obtained minimum values for each occasion is noted down for all considered algorithms along with average computation time. It is noted that RMPS and GA perform more or less better than SA. It should be also noted that RMPS in general yields reasonable solution in lesser time than GA and SA in most of the cases. Using RMPS upto 9 and 15 folds improvement in computation times are obtained over GA and SA respectively. Although GA yielded better solutions in some of the cases at the cost of more computation time, it should be noted that in the case of RMPS, taking the value of *step size threshold* (ϕ) smaller than its default value (i.e., 10^{-6}), better solution might be obtained with more computation time. Because smaller value of *step size threshold* would employ finer search (possibly) resulting in more accurate solution.

As mentioned in Section 3, to minimize any convex function using RMPS, it is sufficient to perform only one *run*. RMPS can be made even faster for solving convex problem by increasing the *step decay rate* parameter. In Section C of the supplementary material we provide a comparative performance study RMPS, GA and SA for minimizing convex objective functions. In Table S2 of the supplementary material, it is shown that we obtain up to 40 and 92 folds improvement over GA and SA using modified version of RMPS which is specially designed for convex minimization.

4.1 | High-dimensional benchmark function optimization

To compare the performance of RMPS with that of GA and SA, 100 and 1000 dimensional Ackley's function, Griewank function, Rastrigin function, Schwefel function, Sphere function and the Sum of square function (Jamil & Yang 2013) are considered. The domains on which these functions are minimized are given by $[-5, 5]^n$, $[-10, 10]^n$, $[-5.12, 5.12]^n$, $[-500, 500]^n$, $[-5.12, 5.12]^n$ and $[-5.12, 5.12]^n$ respectively. Schwefel function attains the global minimum value 0 at $\mathbf{x} = (420.9687, \dots, 420.9687)$ within the corresponding domain while all other functions attain the global minimum value 0 at the origin. While minimizing a particular function on a given domain, 10 distinct randomly generated (under 10 consecutive random number generating seeds in MATLAB) initial points are considered and that same set of 10 starting points are used for GA, SA and RMPS. For GA and SA, the smallest of the 10 obtained objective values are noted along with average computation times (Table 2). For RMPS, both the maximum and the minimum of the 10 obtained objective function minimums and the average computation times are noted down for each case. In Table 2, it is noted that RMPS generally outperforms GA and SA. In all the cases, even the maximum of the minimums of the obtained solutions by RMPS (over 10 different starting point cases) is better than the minimum values obtained for GA and SA. A noticeable improvement for using RMPS over GA and SA is visible especially in the case of solving the 1000 dimensional problems. Using RMPS we get up to 32 and 368 folds improvement in computation time over GA (in case of 100-dimensional Sum squares function) and over SA (in case of 1000-dimensional Sum squares function) respectively. It




FIGURE 3 Comparison of time required for minimizing 1000 dimensional (a) Ackley (b) Griewank (c) Rastrigin (d) Schwefel (e) Sphere (f) Sum Square functions using Genetic Algorithm (GA), Simulated Annealing (SA) and Recursive Modified Pattern Search (RMPS). Objective function values were noted down every 10 seconds over the period of first 30 minutes. Starting point was generated randomly and same starting point is used for all considered algorithms.

is also noted that minimum and the maximum of the 10 obtained minimums obtained by RMPS are close to each other for almost every cases. It signifies, performance of RMPS is, in general, less dependent on the starting point.

In Figure 3, a comparative study of RMPS, GA and SA is made based on the improvement of the value of the 1000 dimensional objective functions in first 30 minutes starting from same initial points. For all the functions except Sum squares function, the objective values are plotted in absolute scale, while for Sum squares function, the objective values are plotted in natural \log scale. It is observed that RMPS outperforms GA and SA by a large margin.

4.2 | Boundary point solution cases

It is interesting to gauge the performances of the blackbox optimization methods when the true solution lies at a boundary point of the restricted domain. So we take the domains of Ackley's function, Griewank function, Rastrigin function, Schwefel function, Sphere function and the Sum of square function are taken to be $[0, 5]^n$, $[0, 10]^n$, $[0, 5.12]^n$, $[0, 420.97]^n$, $[0, 5.12]^n$ and $[0, 5.12]^n$ respectively. Note that, in each case, the true solution is a boundary point. The results (based on 10 randomly generated starting points, similar to the previous cases) are provided in Table S3 of the supplementary material. It is noted that in this case also RMPS generally outperforms GA and SA. Using RMPS we get up to 40 and 77 folds improvement in computation time over GA (in case of 100-dimensional Sum squares function) and over SA (in case of 1000-dimensional Sum squares function) respectively. In this case also, it is noted that the best and the worst solutions obtained by RMPS are quite closer which implies once again that the results obtained by RMPS are less dependent on the starting points, in general.

4.3 | Minimizing 5000 dimensional benchmark functions

In Table 3, we note down the maximum and minimum values of the obtained solutions after minimizing the 5000 dimensional objective functions with RMPS starting from 3 distinct randomly generated (under 3 random number generating seeds in MATLAB) initial points. Along with the case where the true global minimum is an interior point on the domain, we also consider the scenario where the true global minimum is a boundary point. The average computation time in each case is also noted down in Table 3. We again note down both the best and the worst solution cases out of scenarios corresponding to 3 starting points. It is noted that, in this case also, the obtained best and the worst solutions are quite close to each other (for both boundary and non-boundary cases). For GA and SA, due to requirement of excessive amount of time to solve these high-dimensional problems, we do not include their performance under this scenario in this paper.

5 | ESTIMATING OPTIMAL COMBINATION OF BIOMARKER FROM ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE DATA

In precision medicine, the patients are often classified into multiple disease categories based on the values of the biomarkers or pathological test results. Recently, several articles (e.g., Pepe, Cai, and Longton (2006); Pepe and Thompson (2000)) proposed classifying the subjects into multiple classes using the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC) as it requires less distributional assumptions compared to a few other comparable approaches. Consider there are H outcome categories and $\{\mathbf{X}_j\}_{j=1}^H$ denote the values of d dimensional biomarkers coming from corresponding classes. Suppose $X_j \sim F_j$ where F_j denotes some continuous multi-variate distribution. Then the linear score obtained by combining the biomarkers is for class j given by $\beta^T \mathbf{X}_j = \sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k X_{jk}$, where β denotes the optimal coefficient for combining biomarkers. Assuming higher linear score corresponds to higher disease/class category, the diagnostic accuracy based on these linear scores can be measured by maximizing the Hypervolume Under Manifold (HUM) given by $D(\beta) = P(\beta^T \mathbf{X}_H > \dots > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_1)$ (Li & Fine 2008).

Since $D(\beta)$ cannot be maximized directly, one alternative to estimate the combination vector is by maximizing its empirical estimate (Zhang & Li 2011). Suppose the sample values are given by $\{\mathbf{X}_{ij} : j = 1, \dots, H, i_j = 1, \dots, n_j\}$, where n_j denotes the sample size of j -th class; the total sample size is $n = \sum_{j=1}^H n_j$. Then the empirical estimate of HUM (EHUM) is given by

$$D_E(\beta) = \frac{1}{n_1 n_2 \dots n_H} \sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i_2=1}^{n_2} \dots \sum_{i_H=1}^{n_H} I(\beta^T \mathbf{X}_{i_H} > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_{i_{(H-1)}} > \dots > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_{i_1}).$$

However there remains a few computational issues in order to maximize EHUM function as follows. Firstly, evaluation of objective function can be very expensive for higher number of classes and large sample scenarios. Secondly, the EHUM objective function is a sum over step functions which make it discontinuous and not suitable for derivative based optimization techniques. Lastly, the possible multi-modal nature of EHUM makes it even harder to maximize. To alleviate the computational burden of maximizing EHUM function, Hsu and Chen (2016) proposed to obtain the optimal combination vector by maximizing

$$P_A(\beta) = \frac{1}{H-1} \sum_{j=1}^{H-1} P(\beta^T \mathbf{X}_{j+1} > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_j)$$

(see Section D of the supplementary material for the detailed formulation). For the rest of the paper, we name it Upper and Lower Bound Approach (ULBA). Compared to EHUM, although ULBA objective function computationally less expensive to evaluate, rest of the challenges for maximizing EHUM (e.g., discontinuity, possible multi-modal nature) also applies for ULBA as well.

The global optimization of discontinuous and (possibly) multi-modal objective function EHUM with respect to β becomes more challenging as the number of classes and sample size increase. So instead of estimating the whole optimal combination vector simultaneously, Pepe et al. (2006) proposed Step-down algorithm where, the biomarkers are ordered based on their individual EHUM values. Then the biomarker with highest individual EHUM value is included. Afterwards, sequentially one biomarker is included at a time and their coefficients are calculated solving univariate optimization one at a time. A brief description of step-down algorithm is provided in Section D of the supplementary material. Similar technique can also be used to optimize ULBA criteria as well. In short, Step-down alleviates the computational burden of solving a multivariate optimization problem by breaking it into sequence of univariate optimization problems. We use RMPS algorithm to maximize EHUM and ULBA criteria. Note that, $D_E(\beta)$ and $P_A(\beta)$ are not identifiable. Therefore, while optimizing using RMPS, we set the value of the first biomarker to be 1 or -1 (based on which coefficient results in higher individual EHUM or ULBA value) and then rest $d - 1$ biomarkers are estimated. We consider the upper and lower bounds of the domain of the possible values of the biomarker coefficients to be 10 and -10 for all coordinates respectively.




FIGURE 4 Based on Alzheimer's dataset, Upper and Lower Bound Approach (ULBA) ($P_A(\beta)$) and Empirical Hypervolume Under Manifold (EHUM) ($D_E(\beta)$) objective functions are maximized using Stepdown and RMPS algorithms. The boxplot of the scores of the true classes are shown. The dotted lines represent the Youden's Index calculated from the dataset. EHUM objective function values are also noted down at the calculated for the optimal biomarker combination vector obtained for each of the 4 cases.

We consider a dataset (Luo & Xiong 2012) on 14 biomarkers (neuropsychometric tests) whose values are available 108 Alzheimer's patients belonging to 3 different stages of the disease. 14 markers are given as follows: global (*factor1*), temporal (*ktemp*), parietal (*kpar*), frontal (*kfront*), logical memory (*zpsy004*), digital span forward (*zpsy005*), digital span backward (*zpsy006*), information (*zinfo*), two measures of visual retention (*zbentc*, *zbentd*), Boston naming (*zboston*), mental control (*zmentcon*), word fluency (*zworflu*), and associate learning (*zassc*). Due to higher correlation among *factor1*, *ktemp* and *zpsy004* (Luo & Xiong 2012), we only consider *ktemp* and drop other two biomarkers among these three biomarkers, with a total of 12 biomarkers.

We maximize both ULBA and EHUM objective functions using step-down and RMPS algorithms. Stepdown algorithm is coded in MATLAB and we use `fminsearch` function of solving the sequence of univariate optimization problems. RMPS is coded in MATLAB as well. In Figure 4 we provide the boxplots of the linear scores obtained for three different stages of Alzheimer's patients in each scenario. EHUM objective function values are also noted down corresponding to the obtained optimal biomarker combination vector for considered methods. It is noted that the EHUM values obtained for optimal combination vector by maximizing $D_E(\beta)$ and $P_A(\beta)$ using RMPS are higher than that of Step-down for both cases. It is also noted that the classification of the linear scores with Youden's Index (Youden 1950), yields comparatively more non-overlapping cluster using (combination vectors estimated using) RMPS compared to that obtained from stepdown technique.

6 | DISCUSSION

In this paper we propose a derivative-free blackbox optimization technique using modified pattern search for optimizing any function over hyper-rectangular domain. RMPS is shown to perform upto 40 times and 368 times faster compared to GA and SA respectively. The novel features of the proposed algorithm are as follows:

- RMPS is derivative-free, which is crucial for optimizing any discontinuous, complex structured function with intractable derivative values.
- While optimizing n dimensional blackbox function, upto $2n$ parallel threads can be used for computation. In Table S4 of the supplementary material, based on a case study, it is shown how usage of parallel computing can make RMPS even faster when the objective function is computationally very expensive.
- Theoretically RMPS is shown to yield the global solution over the compact space if the objective function is locally convex and differentiable over that space.
- RMPS is shown to be well salable for higher dimensional (upto 5000 dimensional problem) optimization problems and it yields better results in lesser computational time compared to other blackbox optimization techniques, in general.
- By simulation experiments it is shown that the performance of RMPS is, in general, equally good for all considered starting points and it's performance does not depend a lot on the starting point (shown for upto 5000 dimensional problems, see Table 2 and 3).
- RMPS is shown to perform well even when the true solution is a boundary point.
- When the objective function is known to be convex beforehand, RMPS can be made further scalable by changing the values of a couple of tuning parameters.

Using RMPS we estimate the optimal coefficients for combining the neuropsychometric test results from the subjects with Alzheimer's disease to classify them into three different stages of the disease. RMPS is used to maximize the estimates of HUM which are discontinuous and (possibly) multi-modal in nature. It is shown that using RMPS better classification can be performed compared to existing step-down algorithm. In order to praise the ability of RMPS to use parallel threads, we consider another case study where matrix completion is performed with Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) penalty (see Section D, Figure S3, S4 of the supplementary material). Due to very expensive nature of the objective function, benefits of using parallel computing is more visible for that case study (see Table S4 of the supplementary material).

Variations of RMPS algorithm has been already used successfully on several articles (e.g., Das and Ghosal (2017)) for solving high-dimensional complex optimization problems. In future, the idea of RMPS can be extended for optimizing blackbox functions on several possible constrained spaces e.g., over the space of positive definite matrices, orthonormal matrices, spherically and simplex constrained parameter spaces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would really like to thank Dr. Rudrodip Majumdar, Dr. Debraj Das, Dr. Suman Chakraborty and Dr. Subhashis Ghoshal for helping me with their valuable comments to improve the first version of this draft.

Author contributions

P.D. proposed the algorithm, derived the theoretical properties, conducted performance study of the proposed algorithm with other methods and applied to the real dataset.

Financial disclosure

None reported.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interests.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The following supporting information is made available as part of the online article:

1. Supplementary material (attached).
2. MATLAB and R (using RCPP) codes for RMPS are made available in the following link: <https://github.com/priyamdas2/RMPS>.
3. Data used for real data analysis can be found in the following link: https://github.com/priyamdas2/RMPS/blob/master/Real_data_HUM/AL_MATLAB.csv.

References

- Audet, C. (2014). A survey on direct search methods for blackbox optimization and their applications. *Mathematics without boundaries: Surveys in interdisciplinary research, chapter 2*, 31-56.
- Audet, C., Bechard, V., & Digabel, S. L. (2008). Nonsmooth optimization through mesh adaptive direct search and variable neighborhood search. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 41(2), 299-318.
- Audet, C., & Dennis, J. (2006). Mesh adaptive direct search algorithms for constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17(1), 188-217.
- Audet, C., Jr., J. D., & Digabel, S. L. (2008). Parallel space decomposition of the mesh adaptive direct search algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(3), 1150-1170.
- Bethke, A. D. (1980). Genetic algorithms as function optimizers.
- Boggs, P., & Tolle, J. (1996). Sequential quadratic programmings. *Acta Numerica*, 1-52.
- Byrd, R., Gilbert, J., & Nocedal, J. (2000). A trust region method based on interior point techniques for nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 89(1), 149-185.
- Candes, E., & Recht, B. (2009). Exact matrix completion via convex optimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 9, 717-772.
- Candes, E., & Tao, T. (2010). The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 56(5), 2053-2080.
- Conn, A., Scheinberg, K., & Vicente, L. (2009). Introduction to derivative-free optimization. *Mathematics without boundaries: Surveys in interdisciplinary research, MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization, SIAM*.
- Custodio, A., & Madeira, J. (2015). Glods: Global and local optimization using direct search. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 62(1), 1-28.
- Das, P., & Ghosal, S. (2017). Analyzing ozone concentration by bayesian spatio-temporal quantile regression. *Environmetrics*, 28(4), e2443.
- Digabel, S. L. (2011). Algorithm 909: Nomad: Nonlinear optimization with the mads algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 37(4(44)), 1-15.
- Fan, J., & Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(456), 1348-1360.
- Fermi, E., & Metropolis, N. (1952). Numerical solution of a minimum problem. los alamos unclassified report la-NS-1492. *Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, USA*.
- Fraser, A. (1957). Simulation of genetic systems by automatic digital computers i. introduction. *Australian Journal of Biological Sciences*, 10, 484-491.

- Geris, L. (2012). *Computational modeling in tissue engineering*. Springer.
- Goldberg, D. (1989). *Genetic algorithms in search, optimization, and machine learning*. Operations Research Series, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Goodner, J., Tsianos, G., Li, Y., & Loeb, G. (2012). Biosearch: A physiologically plausible learning model for the sensorimotor system. *Proceedings of the Society for Neuroscience Annual Meeting*.
- Granville, V., Krivanek, M., & Rasson, J. P. (1994). Simulated annealing: A proof of convergence. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 16, 652-656.
- Hsu, M., & Chen, Y. (2016). Optimal linear combination of biomarkers for multi-category diagnosis. *Statistics in Medicine*, 35(2), 202-213.
- Jamil, M., & Yang, X. (2013). A literature survey of benchmark functions for global optimization problems. *Int. J. of Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation*, 4(2).
- Jones, D., Schonlau, M., & Welch, W. (1998). Efficient global optimization of expensive black box functions. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 13(4), 455-492.
- Kennedy, J., & Eberhart, R. (1995). Particle swarm optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks, Piscataway, NJ, USA, 1942-1948*.
- Kirkpatrick, S., Gelatt, C., & Vecchi, M. (1983). Optimization by simulated annealing. *Australian Journal of Biological Sciences*, 220(4598), 671-680.
- Kolda, T., Lewis, R., & Torczon, V. (2003). Optimization by direct search: New perspectives on some classical and modern methods. *SIAM Review*, 45(3), 385-482.
- Lewis, R., & Torczon, V. (1999). Pattern search algorithms for bound constrained minimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 9(4), 1082-1099.
- Li, J., & Fine, J. (2008). ROC analysis with multiple classes and multiple tests: methodology and its application in microarray studies. *Biostatistics*, 9(3), 566-576.
- Luo, J., & Xiong, C. (2012). Diagtest3grp: An r package for analyzing diagnostic tests with three ordinal groups. *J Stat Softw.*, 51(3), 1-24.
- Marquardt, D. (1963). An algorithm for least-squares estimation of nonlinear parameters. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 11, 431-441.
- Martelli, E., & Amaldi, E. (2014). Pgs-com: A hybrid method for constrained non-smooth black-box optimization problems: Brief review, novel algorithm and comparative evaluation. *Computers and Chemical Engineering*, 63, 108-139.
- Martinez, J., & Sobral, F. (2003). Constrained derivative-free optimization on thin domains. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 56(3), 1217-1232.
- Pepe, M., Cai, T., & Longton, G. (2006). Combining predictors for classification using the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve. *Biometrics*, 62(1), 221-229.
- Pepe, M., & Thompson, M. (2000). Combining diagnostic test results to increase accuracy. *Biostatistics*, 1(2), 123-140.
- Potra, F., & Wright, S. (2000). Interior-point methods. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 4, 281-302.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1), 267-288.
- Torczon, V. (1997). On the convergence of pattern search algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 7, 1-25.
- Youden, W. (1950). Index for rating diagnostic tests. *Cancer*, 3, 32-35.
- Zhang, Y., & Li, J. (2011). Combining multiple markers for multi-category classification: An ROC surface approach. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 53(1), 63-78.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY



Priyam Das. Dr. Das is originally from Kolkata (The city of Joy), currently working as a Research fellow in the Department of Biomedical Informatics at Harvard Medical school. Dr. Das completed his Ph.D. in Statistics from North Carolina University (NCSU) in 2016. He also completed M.S. in Mathematics from NCSU in 2016 with thesis on blackbox optimization techniques. This article is an extension of his Master's thesis. Dr. Das's current research areas include parallelized blackbox optimization in high-dimensions (>1M parameters), multi-threaded CPU and GPU computing, Natural Language Processing (NLP), Mixture Markov (and hidden Mixture Markov) Model based subject identification, Bayesian clustering of tree and distribution-free classification methods.

Function names	RMPS (min. value)	GA (min. value)	SA (min. value)	RMPS (avg. time)	GA (avg. time)	SA (avg. time)
Ackley Function	0.00012	4.95E-06	2.46E-06	0.072	0.312	0.548
Bukin Function N6	0.101226	0.021039	0.00986	0.053	0.255	0.505
Cross-in-Tray Function	-2.06261	-2.06261	-2.06257	0.063	0.156	0.404
Drop-Wave Function	-1	-1	-0.93625	0.053	0.153	0.571
Eggholder Function	-959.641	-956.918	-888.949	0.062	0.256	0.505
Gramacy & Lee (2012) Function (n=1)	-0.86901	-0.86901	-0.86901	0.016	0.147	0.249
Griewank Function	2.25E-07	0.007396	0.007525	0.057	0.166	0.501
Holder Table Function	-19.2085	-19.2085	-19.2085	0.074	0.163	0.51
Langermann Function	-4.15581	-4.15581	-4.15486	0.087	0.176	0.479
Levy Function	9.9E-11	4.64E-12	1.46E-06	0.084	0.166	0.549
Levy Function N 13	1.66E-10	4.56E-11	7.47E-07	0.075	0.182	0.401
Rastrigin Function	8.65E-09	4.79E-10	1.42E-05	0.069	0.179	0.476
Schaffer Function N2	1.66E-11	1.39E-13	0.005998	0.062	0.184	0.425
Schaffer Function N4	0.292579	0.295289	0.298868	0.288	0.164	0.375
Schwefel Function	2.55E-05	2.55E-05	118.4384	0.068	0.261	0.503
Shubert Function	-186.731	-186.731	-186.731	0.052	0.173	0.439
Bohachevsky Functions 1	3.98E-07	7.49E-12	8.74E-09	0.076	0.202	0.54
Bohachevsky Functions 2	0.218313	1.63E-10	2.24E-07	0.07	0.201	0.449
Bohachevsky Functions 3	9.01E-08	8.55E-11	1.65E-06	0.062	0.209	0.471
Perm Function 0, $n, \beta (= 10)$	1.42E-08	3.14E-09	8.68E-08	0.057	0.207	0.472
Rotated Hyper-Ellipsoid Function	1.07E-08	2.75E-12	3.62E-08	0.072	0.18	0.589
Sphere Function	4.36E-11	1.99E-11	7.88E-08	0.054	0.162	0.429
Sum of Different Powers Function	8.32E-13	2.81E-15	1.05E-06	0.068	0.149	0.486
Sum Squares Function	6.54E-11	5.16E-13	5.98E-08	0.072	0.165	0.465
Trid Function	-2	-2	-2	0.047	0.158	0.411
Booth Function	-5.3E+07	-5.3E+07	-5.3E+07	0.031	0.227	0.299
Matyas Function	2.27E-11	2.18E-13	5.98E-06	0.062	0.183	0.457
McCormick Function	-1.91322	-1.91322	-1.91322	0.066	0.157	0.42
Power Sum Function (n=4)	2.06E-05	0.001365	0.000538	3.008	0.825	0.892
Zakharov Function	1.13E-10	6.55E-12	4.5E-07	0.071	0.173	0.497
Three-Hump Camel Function	4.61E-11	2.92E-11	6.57E-07	0.067	0.167	0.499
Six-Hump Camel Function	-1.03163	-1.03163	-1.03163	0.07	0.17	0.469
Dixon-Price Function	1.6E-10	2.71E-10	6.29E-08	0.054	0.191	0.398
Rosenbrock Function	6.57E-06	0.000567	0.000104	1.202	0.416	0.459
De Jong Function N5	0.998004	0.998004	0.998004	0.078	0.165	0.483
Easom Function	-1	-1	-1.5E-09	0.053	0.157	0.262
Michalewicz Function	-1.8013	-1.8013	-1.8013	0.079	0.163	0.464
Beale Function	-0.15509	-0.15509	-0.15509	0.072	0.186	0.41
Branin Function	0.397887	0.397887	0.397888	0.066	0.17	0.477
Colville Function (n=4)	-469.313	-469.313	-469.313	0.204	0.251	1.177
Forrester et al. (2008) Function	-6.02074	-6.02074	-6.02074	0.017	0.154	0.182
Goldstein-Price Function	3	3	3	0.078	0.185	0.49
Perm Function $n, \beta (= 0.5)$	4.04E-11	2.34E-10	9.22E-07	0.067	0.24	0.359
Powell Function (n=4)	4.48E-07	2.26E-05	5.69E-05	0.609	0.564	0.991
Styblinski-Tang Function	-78.3323	-78.3323	-78.3323	0.078	0.16	0.453

TABLE 1 Comparison of minimum values achieved and the average computation time (in seconds, computed in MATLAB R2014a) for minimizing benchmark functions with RMPS, GA and SA starting from 10 starting points in each cases. The dimension of all the problems are 2 unless the value of the dimension (i.e., n) is mentioned with the name of the function. Please refer to the appendix for the domain of search for each function.

Functions	RMPS (min)	RMPS (max)	GA (min)	SA (min)	RMPS (avg. time)	GA (avg. time)	SA (avg. time)
Ackley's (n = 100)	1.03E-05	1.17E-05	3.75E-04	7.87E-00	3.5	68.1	54.0
Griewank (n = 100)	7.06E-11	1.17E-05	1.00E-03	1.45E-00	5.3	30.0	46.3
Rastrigin (n = 100)	3.65E-07	4.14E-07	4.14E-07	5.01E+02	20.1	62.9	51.8
Schwefel (n = 100)	1.27E-03	1.27E-03	7.86E+03	1.93E+04	43.7	58.9	65.9
Sphere (n = 100)	6.93E-10	8.91E-10	4.49E-04	8.02+01	1.9	47.3	49.8
Sum squares (n = 100)	3.45E-08	4.62E-08	3.83E-04	1.63E-00	2.2	72.2	96.2
Ackley's (n = 1000)	1.09E-05	1.12E-05	4.42E-00	9.92E-00	534.5	5865.7	5984.7
Griewank (n = 1000)	9.98E-11	1.48E-10	2.49E-00	7.45E-00	655.7	2580.3	4573.0
Rastrigin (n = 1000)	3.86E-06	3.95E-06	2.79E+03	7.63E+03	3938.4	6391.2	5591.7
Schwefel (d = 1000)	1.27E-02	1.27E-02	2.15E+05	1.95E+05	8664.6	9646.3	9448.8
Sphere (n = 1000)	7.77E-09	8.36E-09	1.13E+03	1.70E+03	225.5	3971.4	7920.2
Sum squares (n = 1000)	3.89E-06	4.21E-06	1.86E+05	1.34E-00	256.6	4805.3	94542.4

TABLE 2 Comparative study of RMPS, GA and SA for minimizing 100 and 1000 dimensional Ackley, Griewank, Rastrigin, Schwefel, Sphere and Sum squares functions. Benchmark functions are minimized starting from 10 randomly generated starting points from the corresponding domains using RMPS, GA and SA. The minimum of the 10 obtained minimum values of the objective functions is noted down for each method. For RMPS, also the maximum of these 10 obtained minimum objective function values is noted down as well. Average computation times over 10 starting point scenarios for each method is noted down (in seconds). RMPS outperforms other methods and the closeness of the min. and max. of the 10 obtained function minimum values (by RMPS, corresponding to 10 different starting points) implies the performance of RMPS is less dependent on the starting point, in general.

Functions	Non-Boundary solution case			Boundary solution case		
	Min. value	Max. value	Avg. time (minutes)	Min. value	Max. value	Avg. time (minutes)
Ackley's	1.75E-05	1.78E-05	697.53	1.07E-05	1.11E-05	681.47
Griewank	3.89E-08	4.53E-08	904.79	9.47E-09	1.32E-08	568.58
Rastrigin	7.87E-03	7.87E-03	417.03	3.67E-06	3.75E-06	720.60
Schwefel	3.64E-01	3.87E-01	5862.39	6.37E-02	6.37E-02	4917.78
Sphere	1.01E-05	1.01E-05	342.13	4.02E-08	4.11E-08	365.64
Sum squares	9.79E-05	9.94E-05	544.64	9.91E-05	1.03E-04	428.12

TABLE 3 Performance evaluation of RMPS, GA and SA for minimizing 5000 dimensional Ackley, Griewank, Rastrigin, Schwefel, Sphere and Sum squares functions. Benchmark functions are minimized starting from 3 randomly generated starting points from the corresponding domains using RMPS, GA and SA. Two scenarios are considered, namely boundary solution case and interior point (non-boundary) solution case. The minimum and the maximum of the 3 obtained minimum values of the objective functions are noted down. Average computation times over 3 starting point scenarios for RMPS is noted down (in minutes). The closeness of the min. and max. of the 3 obtained function minimum values (by RMPS, corresponding to 3 different starting points) implies the performance of RMPS is less dependent on the starting point, in general.

How to cite this article: Das P., (2019), Black-box optimization on hyper-rectangle using Recursive Modified Pattern Search and application to ROC-based classification problem, *Stat*, 2019;00:1–6.

APPENDIX

A RMPS AND GENERALIZED PATTERN SEARCH

Here we discuss some of the key features of RMPS along with the differences of RMPS with a few existing Pattern Search based optimization techniques (e.g., Torczon (1997)). Firstly, the restart strategy with smaller step-size decay rate is something which is possibly proposed for the first time in the context of Pattern search, to the best of our knowledge. Secondly, unlike algorithm 1 of Torczon (1997), instead of unconstrained minimization, the proposed algorithm minimizes the black-box function on a hyper-rectangle. In Fermi and Metropolis (1952) and Torczon (1997), the coordinate-wise jump sizes were kept equal inside an iteration while in the proposed algorithm, the domain of each coordinate being bounded, in every iteration, local-step sizes are modified separately for each coordinates in each direction (positive and negative), as required. In GPS, each coordinate-wise jump step-sizes are evaluated using ‘exploratory moves algorithm’ (see Torczon (1997)) while in the proposed algorithm it is straightforward and does not use ‘exploratory moves algorithm’. While optimizing a function on a hyper-rectangle, since the domain is transformed into an unit hyper-cube, the global step-size is kept same for each coordinate. So while determining the step-sizes of coordinate-wise movements, the proposed algorithm uses different strategy than the ‘exploratory moves algorithm’. The most unique feature of the proposed algorithm is the restart strategy as described in the main paper, in details.

B TUNING PARAMETERS AND THEIR ROLES

In this section, a brief description of the tuning parameters and their roles are provided which are as follows.

- **step decay rate (ρ):** ρ determines the rate of change of *global step size* at the end of each iteration. . So it is understandable that the value of ρ must be greater than 1. Taking smaller values of ρ will make the decay of step sizes slower, which would allow finer search within the domain at the cost of more computation time.
- **step size threshold (ϕ):** ϕ controls the precision of the solution. This is the minimum possible value that the *global step size* and the *local step sizes* could take. Once the *global step size* reaches below ϕ , the *run* is terminated. Taking ϕ to be smaller results in better precision in the cost of higher computation time.
- **tol_fun:** *tol_fun* denotes the minimum amount of improvement after an iteration in the solution which is required to keep the value of *global step size* unchanged. In other words, if the differences of solutions obtained in two consecutive iterations is less than *tol_fun*, the improvement is considered to be ‘not significant’ and in that scenario, the *global step size* is decreased for next iteration for employing a finer search.
- **tol_fun_2:** The second *run* onwards, whenever a *run* terminates, it is checked whether the solution returned by the current *run* is the same or different with the solution returned by the previous *run*. However, to check whether they are exactly equal, they need to be matched up to several decimal places depending on the type of storage variable used by the software. Thus it might result into performance of a lot of extra *runs* just to improve the solution at distant decimal places which might be not of our interest. Therefore, once the euclidean distance of solution points obtained from two consecutive *runs* become less than *tol_fun_2*, the algorithm is terminated and the final result is returned.

C ADDITIONAL COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE STUDY OF RMPS

The domains of the optimization problems considered in Table 1 of the main paper is provided in Table S1. Figures S1 and S2 can be used as an aid for visualization corresponding to the theoretical properties of RMPS shown in Section 3 of the main paper.

C.1 Exploiting convexity

The prior knowledge of convexity can be used to save computation time using RMPS. In order to improve computation time for minimizing convex functions, we also consider RMPS taking $\rho = 4$ which employs steeper decrease in *global step size* and *local step sizes*. In Table S2, a comparison study

of performances of RMPS, and changed RMPS with the prior knowledge of convexity (RMPS(c), (i.e., $max_runs=1, \rho = 4$ with default values of other parameters), GA and SA are provided for minimizing Sphere and Sum squares function for various dimensions starting from 10 randomly generated starting points (under 10 random number generating seeds in MATLAB) in each cases. It is noted that in each cases, RMPS(c) performs faster than RMPS. Also in terms of computation times, using RMPS(c) up to 40 folds improvement is observed compared to GA and up to 92 folds improvement is observed compared to SA.

In Table S3 we note down the comparative performance results of RMPS, GA and SA when the true solution lies at a boundary point of the domain.

D OPTIMIZATION ON HYPERVOLUME UNDER MANIFOLDS

Upper and Lower Bound Approach (ULBA)

Hsu and Chen (2016) showed the following equality holds true

$$\max\{0, (H - 1)P_A(\beta) - (H - 2)\} \leq D(\beta) \leq P_H(\beta),$$

where $P_A(\beta)$ and $P_H(\beta)$ are defined by

$$P_A(\beta) = \frac{1}{H-1} \sum_{j=1}^{H-1} P(\beta^T \mathbf{X}_{j+1} > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_j), P_H(\beta) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq H-1} P(\beta^T \mathbf{X}_{j+1} > \beta^T \mathbf{X}_j).$$

They proposed to maximize $P_A(\beta)$ in order to obtain the optimal biomarker combination. Compared to EHUM, ULBA objective function is much less expensive to compute. However, rest of the challenges for maximizing EHUM (e.g., discontinuity, possible multi-modal nature) also applies here as well.

Step-down algorithm

The step-down algorithm for maximizing any given objective function is given as follows:

- Step 1.** EHUM values of the individual biomarkers are computed and based on their individual EHUM values, they are arranged in decreasing order. Suppose $X_{(1)}$ and $X_{(d)}$ denote the biomarkers with the highest and the lowest individual EHUM values, respectively.
- Step 2.** The first two biomarkers with the highest EHUM values are taken and combined as $V_2 = X_{(1)} + \lambda_2 X_{(2)}$, where λ_2 is a parameter that needs to be estimated.
- Step 3.** The objective function for the combined biomarker V_2 is maximized with respect to λ_2 . Let $\hat{V}_2 = X_{(1)} + \hat{\lambda}_2 X_{(2)}$ denote the updated combination vector.
- Step 4.** For $i = 3, \dots, d$ define $V_i = \hat{V}_{i-1} + \lambda_i X_{(i)}$ and maximize the objective function with respect to λ_i . The combination vector obtained at i -th step is given by $\hat{\lambda}_i$.

The estimated optimal marker using step-down algorithm is given by $\hat{V}_d = X_{(1)} + \hat{\lambda}_2 X_{(2)} + \dots + \hat{\lambda}_d X_{(d)}$.

E ON PARALLEL COMPUTATION WITH RMPS : MATRIX COMPLETION PROBLEM WITH SCAD PENALTY

RMPS is parallelizable and up to $2n$ parallel threads can be used while solving a n -dimensional black-box problem. However in the simulation study part, the time required for optimizing each function is noted down for single thread computing only. To perform parallel computing in MATLAB, in case `parfor` loop is used instead of `for` loop, depending on the operations performed within the loops (e.g., objective function evaluation), a scenario might arise where `for` loop works faster than `parfor` loop. Because at the beginning of the `parfor` loop, an amount of time is spent in distributing the parallelizable works to different workers and after termination of parallel jobs, some amount of time is spent for gathering the results. However no such additional time is spent when job is done in single thread (via `for` loop). So, in case the objective function is not computationally expensive enough compared to the amount of time required for distribution and collection of results in parallel computing (using `parfor` loop), it is possible for the multi-threaded job to be more time consuming compared to the single-thread computation. We note that for all the considered simulation experiments, time required using single thread computation is faster than using parallel computation. Therefore, all the results regarding computation times are noted down for single threaded computing only. However it might not be the case if the objective function is actually computationally very expensive. In order to show the benefit of using parallel computation with RMPS we consider the following case study.

The problem of recovering an unknown matrix from only a given fraction of its entries is known as matrix completion problem. Candes and Recht (2009) first proposed a method to recover a matrix from a few given entries solving a convex optimization problem. Later to solve this problem, Candes and Tao (2010) minimized nuclear norm of the matrix subject to the constraint that the given entries of the matrix should be the same. In other words, suppose we have a matrix $\mathbf{Y} = (y_{ij})_{n \times n}$ with some missing values. In that case, as mentioned in Candes and Tao (2010), the complete matrix \mathbf{Y} can be obtained by solving the following problem,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize : } \|\mathbf{X}\|_* \\ & \text{subject to : } x_{ij} = y_{ij} \text{ for all observed } (i, j), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\mathbf{M}\|_* = \sum_i \sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ denotes the nuclear norm, $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ being the i -th singular value of matrix \mathbf{M} . This problem can be solved using convex optimization technique. On a closer look, it can be noted that minimizing nuclear norm in this fashion is similar to the LASSO (Tibshirani (1996)) penalty term. Fan and Li (2001) proposed Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) penalty which was shown to have more desirable properties compared to LASSO for solving shrinkage based variable selection problems. But unlike LASSO, SCAD penalty is not a convex minimization (or concave maximization) problem. In this section, the matrix completion problem is solved using the SCAD penalty with RMPS. The matrix completion problem using SCAD penalty can be re-formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize : } \sum_i f(\sigma_i(\mathbf{X})) \\ & \text{subject to : } x_{ij} = y_{ij} \text{ for all observed } (i, j), \end{aligned} \tag{E1}$$

where $\sigma_i(\mathbf{X})$ are singular values and f_i is the SCAD penalty function dependent of tuning parameters λ and a ($= 3.7$) (see Fan and Li (2001)).

We consider a picture (Figure S3) with 61×61 pixels where approximately half (1877 to be precise) of its pixels are missing. The problem given by Equation (E1) can be seen as a black-box function of dimension of 1877 (i.e., the number of missing pixels). It is also known that the numerical value of grey level of each pixel must be between 0 and 255. This problem is solved using RMPS method. We fit the model for 30 values of λ which are $\{100, 200, \dots, 3000\}$ and only the best visual output ($\lambda = 900$) is reported in Figure S4.

Unlike the objective functions considered in the performance evaluation studies in the main paper, the evaluation of SCAD penalty based on the singular values of the matrix is very computationally intense. Thus, unlike previous cases, here using parallel computing is noted to be beneficial. It should be noted that this is a 1877 dimensional problem and therefore up to 3754 parallel threads can be used while solving it using RMPS algorithm. We use 4 parallel threads to derive the complete image given in Figure S4. For comparison of computation time required by single threading and parallel threading with 4 threads, the required computation times for first 50, 100 and 200 iterations are provided for all cases in Table S4. We get more than 3 folds improvement in computation time using parallel threading (with 4 threads) instead of single threading.

Function names	Domain	True minimum
Ackley Function	$[-32.768, 32.768]^2$	0
Bukin Function N6	$[-15, -5] \times [-3, 3]$	0
Cross-in-Tray Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	-2.0626
Drop-Wave Function	$[-5.12, 5.12]^2$	-1
Eggholder Function	$[-512, 512]^2$	-959.6407
Gramacy & Lee (2012) Function (n=1)	$[0.5, 2.5]$	unknown
Griewank Function	$[-600, 600]^2$	0
Holder Table Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	-19.2085
Langermann Function	$[0, 10]^2$	unknown
Levy Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	0
Levy Function N 13	$[-10, 10]^2$	0
Rastrigin Function	$[-5.12, 5.12]^2$	0
Schaffer Function N2	$[-100, 100]^2$	0
Schaffer Function N4	$[-100, 100]^2$	0.2926
Schwefel Function	$[-500, 500]^2$	0
Shubert Function	$[-5.12, 5.12]^2$	-186.7309
Bohachevsky Functions 1	$[-100, 100]^2$	0
Bohachevsky Functions 2	$[-100, 100]^2$	0
Bohachevsky Functions 3	$[-100, 100]^2$	0
Perm Function 0, $d(= 2), \beta(= 10)$	$[-2, 2]^2$	0
Rotated Hyper-Ellipsoid Function	$[-65.536, 65.536]^2$	0
Sphere Function	$[-5.12, 5.12]^2$	0
Sum of Different Powers Function	$[-1, 1]^2$	0
Sum Squares Function	$[-5.12, 5.12]^2$	0
Trid Function	$[-4, 4]^2$	unknown
Booth Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	0
Matyas Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	0
McCormick Function	$[-1.5, 4] \times [-3, 4]$	
Power Sum Function (n = 4)	$[0, 4]^4$	unknown
Zakharov Function	$[-5, 10]^2$	0
Three-Hump Camel Function	$[-5, 5]^2$	0
Six-Hump Camel Function	$[-3, 3] \times [-2, 2]$	-1.0316
Dixon-Price Function	$[-10, 10]^2$	0
Rosenbrock Function	$[-5, 10]^2$	0
De Jong Function N5	$[-65.536, 65.536]^2$	unknown
Easom Function	$[-100, 100]^2$	-1
Michalewicz Function	$[0, \pi]^2$	-1.8013
Beale Function	$[-4.5, 4.5]^2$	0
Branin Function	$[-5, 10] \times [0, 15]$	0.397887
Colville Function (n = 4)	$[-10, 10]^4$	0
Forrester et al. (2008) Function	$[0, 1]$	unknown
Goldstein-Price Function	$[-2, 2]^2$	3
Perm Function n(= 2), $\beta(= 0.5)$	$[-2, 2]^2$	0
Powell Function (n = 4)	$[-4, 5]^4$	0
Styblinski-Tang Function	$[-5, 5]^2$	-78.3323

TABLE S1 Domains of search regions of the benchmark functions considered in Section 4 in the main paper.




FIGURE S1 $U = \prod_{i=1}^n (u_i - r, u_i + r)$.




FIGURE S2 Neighborhood of u_i .

Functions	RMPS(c) (min value)	RMPS (max value)	GA (min value)	SA (min value)	RMPS(c) (avg. time)	RMPS (avg. time)	GA (avg. time)	SA (avg. time)
Sphere Function (n = 4)	1.02E-11	6.55E-11	1.03E-10	1.41E-04	0.012	0.03	0.207	0.945
Sphere Function (n = 20)	1.17E-10	2.22E-10	1.22E-06	4.12E-00	0.054	0.116	2.363	5.462
Sphere Function (n = 40)	2.56E-10	3.67E-10	2.09E-05	2.00E+01	0.186	0.299	6.07	9.301
Sphere Function (n = 100)	6.93E-10	8.91E-10	4.49E-04	8.02E+01	1.07	1.393	45.923	47.568
Sum squares Function (n = 4)	1.66E-11	1.91E-10	5.39E-10	1.21E-04	0.013	0.038	0.219	0.885
Sum squares Function (n = 20)	1.19E-09	2.20E-09	1.63E-06	5.79E-01	0.076	0.172	3.085	4.487
Sum squares Function (n = 40)	5.44E-09	7.49E-09	3.71E-05	7.45E-01	0.297	0.457	8.552	13.083
Sum squares Function (n = 100)	3.45E-08	4.62E-08	3.83E-04	1.63E-00	1.763	2.221	75.519	92.489

TABLE S2 Comparative study of RMPS, RMPS(c) (i.e., $max_runs=1, \rho = 4$ with default values of other parameters), GA and SA for solving convex problems Sphere and Sum squares functions for $d = 4, 20, 40, 100$ are minimized using RMPS, GA and SA starting from 10 randomly generated starting points from the corresponding domains. The minimum of the 10 obtained minimum values of the objective functions is noted down for each method. For RMPS, also the maximum of these 10 obtained minimum objective function values is noted down as well. Average computation times over 10 starting point scenarios for each method is noted down (in seconds).

Functions	RMPS (min)	RMPS (max)	GA (min)	SA (min)	RMPS (avg. time)	GA (avg. time)	SA (avg. time)
Ackley's (n = 100)	8.55E-06	1.16E-05	2.29E-00	8.75E-00	4.8	39.5	40.0
Griewank (n = 100)	5.24E-11	1.23E-02	3.28E-04	1.46E-00	5.6	50.2	45.0
Rastrigin (n = 100)	4.79E-08	9.29E-08	2.19E+01	6.81E+00	3.4	56.4	64.0
Schwefel (n = 100)	1.27E-03	1.27E-03	7.36+03	1.91+04	5.3	26.0	87.5
Sphere (n = 100)	7.32E-10	8.76E-10	5.22E-04	1.72+02	2.5	72.4	55.8
Sum squares (n = 100)	3.47E-08	4.58E-08	1.30E-03	2.20 + 01	2.7	108.0	66.7
Ackley's (n = 1000)	9.8E-06	1.12E-05	5.73E-00	9.98E-00	557.1	6079.5	4498.3
Griewank (n = 1000)	9.33E-11	1.52E-10	4.47E-00	7.25E-00	643.5	203.6	6644.6
Rastrigin (n = 1000)	6.77E-07	7.83E-07	4.14E+03	9.03E+03	528.5	6179.8	5673.5
Schwefel (n = 1000)	1.27E-02	1.27E-02	1.57E+05	1.99E+05	739.5	10898.0	10826.0
Sphere (n = 1000)	7.7E-09	8.20E-09	3.48E+03	3.00E+03	238.3	321.0	6172.5
Sum squares (n = 1000)	3.8E-06	4.12E-06	1.20E+06	1.21E+02	280.7	534.1	21576.0

TABLE S3 Comparative study of RMPS, GA and SA for minimizing 100 and 1000 dimensional Ackley, Griewank, Rastrigin, Schwefel, Sphere and Sum squares functions where the true solution is a boundary point. Benchmark functions are minimized starting from 10 randomly generated starting points from the corresponding domains using RMPS, GA and SA. The minimum of the 10 obtained minimum values of the objective functions is noted down for each method. For RMPS, also the maximum of these 10 obtained minimum objective function values is noted down as well. Average computation times over 10 starting point scenarios for each method is noted down (in seconds). RMPS outperforms other methods and the closeness of the min. and max. of the 10 obtained function minimum values (by RMPS, corresponding to 10 different starting points) implies the performance of RMPS is less dependent on the starting point, in general.




FIGURE S3 Original picture containing missing pixels.



FIGURE S4 Completed picture using SCAD penalized matrix completion with RMPS.

Iterations	1 thread (time)	4 threads (time)	Improvement (folds)
50	1325.93	391.38	3.39
100	3189.97	881.75	3.62
200	7622.24	2162.56	3.52

TABLE S4 Computation times (in seconds) required for first 50, 100 and 200 iterations of RMPS while solving matrix completion problem with SCAD penalty using single thread and 4 parallel threads.