Unsure When to Stop? Ask Your Semantic Neighbors

Ivo Gonçalves
NOVA IMS, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
1070-312 Lisbon, Portugal
igoncalves@novaims.unl.pt

Sara Silva
BioISI - BioSystems & Integrative Sciences Institute,
Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon
1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal
sara@fc.ul.pt

Carlos M. Fonseca
CISUC, Department of Informatics Engineering,
University of Coimbra
3030-290 Coimbra, Portugal
cmfonsec@dei.uc.pt

Mauro Castelli
NOVA IMS, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
1070-312 Lisbon, Portugal
mcastelli@novaims.unl.pt

arXiv:1706.06195v1 [cs.NE] 19 Jun 2017

ABSTRACT

In iterative supervised learning algorithms it is common to reach a point in the search where no further induction seems to be possible with the available data. If the search is continued beyond this point, the risk of overfitting increases significantly. Following the recent developments in inductive semantic stochastic methods, this paper studies the feasibility of using information gathered from the semantic neighborhood to decide when to stop the search. Two semantic stopping criteria are proposed and experimentally assessed in Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming (GSGP) and in the Semantic Learning Machine (SLM) algorithm (the equivalent algorithm for neural networks). The experiments are performed on real-world high-dimensional regression datasets. The results show that the proposed semantic stopping criteria are able to detect stopping points that result in a competitive generalization for both GSGP and SLM. This approach also yields computationally efficient algorithms as it allows the evolution of neural networks in less than 3 seconds on average, and of GP trees in at most 10 seconds. The usage of the proposed semantic stopping criteria in conjunction with the computation of optimal mutation/learning steps also results in small trees and neural networks.

KEYWORDS

Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming, Semantic Learning Machine, Generalization, Overfitting, Stopping Criteria

ACM Reference format:
Ivo Gonçalves, Sara Silva, Carlos M. Fonseca, and Mauro Castelli. 2017. Unsure When to Stop? Ask Your Semantic Neighbors. In *Proceedings of GECCO '17, Berlin, Germany, July 15-19, 2017,* 8 pages.
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3071178.3071328

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
GECCO '17, Berlin, Germany
© 2017 ACM. 978-1-4503-4920-8/17/07…$15.00
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3071178.3071328

1 INTRODUCTION

Supervised learning refers to the task of inducing a general pattern from a provided set of examples. A common issue in supervised learning is the possibility that the resulting models could be simply learning the provided set of examples, instead of learning the underlying pattern. A model that is incurring in such a behavior is commonly said to be overfitting. Genetic Programming (GP) [10] has been extensively applied in supervised learning tasks. Despite this, it was uncommon in the early years of GP to find approaches aimed at improving the generalization of the resulting models. Kushchu [11] mentioned that at that point, the issue of generalization in GP had not received the attention it deserved. In fact, it was even uncommon to measure the performance in a set of unseen data. Notably, in Koza [10] most of the problems presented did not use separate training and unseen data, so performance was never evaluated on unseen cases [11]. Eiben and Jelasity [2] also mentioned that at that point, it was uncommon to report unseen data results in the larger evolutionary computation area.

The interest in studying generalization and overfitting in GP has been recently increasing [1, 3, 4, 6–9]. Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming (GSGP) [13] has also contributed to this rising interest by defining a set of variation operators that have been shown to perform more effectively than the corresponding Standard GP operators [4, 13]. These variation operators are known as geometric semantic operators. The reasoning behind these geometric semantic operators can be used to create equivalent operators for other representations or computational models. This was the case of feedforward neural networks, where Gonçalves et al. [5] derived the original GSGP mutation operator to be applicable to neural networks. This operator was then incorporated in a neural network construction algorithm named Semantic Learning Machine (SLM). The SLM algorithm shares similar properties with GSGP. Within the context of these geometric semantic methods, this paper explores the feasibility of using information gathered with the geometric semantic operators to decide when to stop the search process. The selection of a suitable stopping point can potentially avoid the overfitting issue.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contextualizes GSGP and the SLM. Section 3 presents the proposed semantic stopping criteria. Section 4 describes the experimental methodology. Section 5 presents and discusses the results, and section 6 concludes.

2 GEOMETRIC SEMANTIC METHODS

2.1 Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming

The GSGP formulations are valid under two assumptions. The first assumption is that the task at hand is a supervised learning task, i.e., given a set of data with known targets, the goal is to build an individual (or model) that learns the underlying patterns in the data. The second assumption is that the error of an individual is computed as a distance to the known targets. GSGP derives its name from the fact that its operators follow some particular geometric properties [12] over the semantic space. In this context, the semantics of an individual are defined as the outputs of that individual over a set of data instances. In GSGP, each individual is seen as a point in the semantic space. The most interesting property of the semantic space is that the associated fitness landscape is always unimodal for any supervised learning problem. This implies that there are no local optima, i.e., with the exception of the global optimum, every point in the search space has at least one neighbor with better fitness, and that neighbor is reachable through the application of the variation operators. As this type of landscape eliminates the local optima issue, it is potentially much more favorable in terms of search effectiveness and efficiency. Moraglio et al. [13] specified geometric semantic operators for three domains: boolean, arithmetic, and conditional rules. Since this paper is based on real-valued semantics, the geometric semantic operators presented here are the ones from the arithmetic domain.

Definition 2.1. **Geometric Semantic Crossover**: Given two parent functions $T_1, T_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the geometric semantic crossover returns the real function $T_{XO} = (T_1 \cdot T_R) + ((1 - T_R) \cdot T_2)$, where T_R is a random real function whose output values range in the interval $[0, 1]$.

Definition 2.2. **Geometric Semantic Mutation**: Given a parent function $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the geometric semantic mutation with mutation step ms returns the real function $T_M = T + ms \cdot (T_{R1} - T_{R2})$, where T_{R1} and T_{R2} are random real functions.

An important consideration is that the geometric semantic mutation can reach any point in the semantic space, starting from any other point. On the other hand, in order for the geometric semantic crossover to produce an offspring which is better than both parents, the target semantics must be (at least partially) between the semantics of both parents. Theoretically, this means that the mutation operator should be more robust. This was confirmed in practice [4, 13]. In the same works it was also empirically confirmed that a hill climbing strategy is indeed more efficient than a standard population-based strategy. Since there are no local optima, the search can be focused around the best individual without any conceivable disadvantage. Moraglio et al. [13] named this hill climbing strategy as Semantic Stochastic Hill Climber (SSHC). As a common hill climber, SSHC keeps only the best individual, and it uses only the geometric semantic mutation to advance the search process. At each generation a sample of offsprings is produced, and the new best is selected from the current best and the offsprings to survive to the next generation. SSHC is the GSGP variant used in this paper as it is more efficient than the standard population-based strategy.

An important question raised from the original GSGP work, was the issue of generalization. Moraglio et al. [13] did not measure the performance of the individuals in unseen data. Therefore, the generalization ability of the individuals produced by GSGP was unknown. Gonçalves et al. [4] showed that the resulting GSGP generalization is greatly dependent on a particular detail of the geometric semantic mutation. If the mutation operator generates T_{R1} and T_{R2} without any particular concern on the structure of the trees, the result is considerable overfitting. To differentiate, this mutation version was named unbounded mutation. On the other hand, if T_{R1} and T_{R2} are generated with a bounding function at the root node, the outcome is a competitive generalization. This mutation version was named bounded mutation. Applying a bounding function to T_{R1} and T_{R2} results in bounding the semantic variation also on unseen data. If a logistic function ($f(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$) is used as a bounding function, then the output of each random subtree ranges in the interval $[0, 1]$ and, consequently, the output resulting from subtracting these random subtrees ranges in the interval $[-1, 1]$. After applying the mutation step, the semantic variation (or perturbation) added to the parent always ranges in the interval $[-ms, ms]$. By itself, this does not guarantee a competitive generalization. For a detailed discussion on this issue the reader is referred to [4]. Since the bounded mutation yields better generalizations, it is the one used in this paper.

2.2 Semantic Learning Machine

The SLM [5] is formulated under the same assumptions of GSGP. It also follows the same hill climbing strategy as SSHC. Similarly to the case of the GSGP mutation, the equivalent geometric semantic mutation for neural networks (NNs) is also a relatively simple combination of NNs. To simplify the description, the SLM mutation operator is referred to as GSM-NN, from Geometric Semantic Mutation - Neural Networks. This operator was originally specified for NNs with a single hidden layer [5], but it was subsequently extended to be applicable to any number of hidden layers [7]. This paper only assesses the SLM in the single hidden layer variant. As such, the following GSM-NN description only applies to the single hidden layer case.

From an already existing NN (a parent NN), GSM-NN generates a random NN, and joins both in the same resulting NN. The first step of GSM-NN is to create the random NN. In this case, the random NN created is the simplest possible, i.e., it is a NN with a single hidden neuron. The weights from the input layer to the hidden neuron are randomly generated between -1.0 and 1.0 with uniform probability. The weight from the hidden neuron to the output neuron is the learning step (ls). This learning step is equivalent to the mutation step in the GSGP mutation. It influences the amount of semantic variation for each application of the operator. The second step of GSM-NN is to join the parent NN with the random NN. In this case of a single hidden layer NN, this join operation is rather simple since the parent NN and the random NN do not influence each other directly. Their semantics are simply combined at the output neuron to produce the final semantics resulting from the GSM-NN application. Because of this, GSM-NN can always perform an incremental evaluation at each mutation application. In other words, regardless of the size of a NN, the evaluation only needs to occur in the new part of the NN (the random NN). The contribution of the rest of the NN (the parent NN) is already computed, and

therefore does not need to be reevaluated. This makes the SLM algorithm very efficient in practice.

In order to guarantee an equivalent comparison between the SLM and SSHC, all hidden neurons added in the application of GSM-NN have the hyperbolic tangent as their activation function. This guarantees that, for each application of the operator, the semantic variation always ranges in the interval $[-ls, ls]$, where ls represents the learning step. This results from the fact that the outputs of the hyperbolic tangent range in the interval $[-1, 1]$. Similarly, in the SSHC variant considered here the semantic variation always ranges in the interval $[-ms, ms]$, where ms represents the mutation step. It is important to remark that the GSM-NN operator excludes the need to use backpropagation to adjust the weights of the network. The GSM-NN operator allows the SLM algorithm to effectively explore the space of NNs. For further details the reader is referred to [5] and [7].

3 SEMANTIC STOPPING CRITERIA

The two semantic stopping criteria proposed here are intended to assess the feasibility of using the semantic neighborhood as a source of information to detect suitable stopping points in semantic supervised learning methods. A suitable stopping point is a point within the search where no further induction is possible with the available data. A common outcome of continuing the search beyond this point is overfitting the training data. In the best case scenario, the search enters generalization plateau in which the generalization achieved stabilizes. In either case, the best decision is to stop the search. Within this context, the term semantic neighborhood is used to define the set of models (neighbors) that are reachable from a given reference model when a given semantic mutation operator is applied. The reference model considered here is always the best model in terms of training data performance. A sampling of the semantic neighborhood is performed at each iteration/generation, and the decision of when to stop is based on the information of each semantic sample. Since the semantic methods considered in this paper follow a hill climbing strategy, a semantic sampling is already performed at each iteration/generation in order to advance the search. Therefore, the semantic stopping criteria studied here do not require any additional sampling. The underlying idea of these stopping criteria is to assess what the trend within the search is, and based on that decide a suitable stopping point that can avoid overfitting and/or reduce the computational time of the search method.

3.1 Error Deviation Variation

The Error Deviation Variation (EDV) criterion is based on the variation of the error deviation within the semantic neighborhood. In this context, the term error deviation is used to refer to the sample standard deviation of the absolute errors of a given model over the training instances. This criterion is only concerned with the models that improve over the current best model in a given iteration/generation. From these models, the criterion measures the percentage of models that reduce the error deviation in comparison with the error deviation of the current best model. In other words, from the neighbors that are better than the current best, the criterion measures the percentage of those that have a lower error deviation. This information allows to determine when the training error reduction starts to be conducted less uniformly across training instances. This may indicate that overfitting is starting to occur. The search is stopped when the criterion measure drops below a given stopping threshold (parameter). Since this criterion is based on the error deviation, it does not prevent the algorithm from finding models with a large semantic (output) deviation, as this may actually be desired given the target semantics. The criterion also does not prevent the next best model to have a larger error deviation than the previous best, as this flexibility could be important in the learning process. The search is only stopped if a considerable majority of the models are improving the training performance at the expense of larger error deviations.

3.2 Training Improvement Effectiveness

The Training Improvement Effectiveness (TIE) criterion is based on measuring the effectiveness of the semantic variation operator used to perform the sampling. In this context, the effectiveness of the operator is defined as the percentage of times that the operator is able to produce a neighbor that is superior to the current best model. During each iteration/generation, the effectiveness is measured with respect to the sample considered. As in the EDV criterion, the search is stopped when the effectiveness of the operator drops below a given stopping threshold. The reasoning underlying this criterion is that, if training error improvements are harder to find, then possibly these improvements are being forced at the expense of the resulting generalization.

4 EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY

The experimental methodology is based on Gonçalves et al. [4], since this work has recently provided results for SSHC in two out of three datasets used in this paper. These datasets are the bioavailability (Bio), the plasma protein binding (PPB), and the median lethal dose (LD50). They have respectively: 359 instances and 241 features; 131 instances and 626 features; and 234 instances and 626 features. These real-world high-dimensional regression datasets describe relationships between pharmaceutical drugs and pharmacokinetics parameters.

Table 1 provides the experimental parameters. Furthermore, errors are computed as the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) between the outputs of a model and the targets of the dataset. The error on unseen data is referred to as generalization error. For each run a randomly selected data partition is performed. Each method uses the same data partition in equivalent runs. Notice that sample size refers to the number of models generated in the initialization and at each iteration/generation in SLM and SSHC. The term step is used as a simplification to refer to the learning step in SLM and the mutation step in SSHC. Two different step strategies are studied with the proposed stopping criteria: the Fixed Step (FS), and the Optimal Step (OS). As the name implies, FS variants (SLM-FS and SSHC-FS) use the same fixed step throughout the runs, while OS variants (SLM-OS and SSHC-OS) compute the optimal step for each application of the mutation operator by using the Moore-Penrose inverse. The computation of optimal steps under the SLM algorithm is explored for the first time in this paper. Gonçalves et al. [5] only assessed the SLM algorithm under fixed steps. SLM-FS

Table 1: Parameters used in the experiments

Parameter	Value
Data partition	Training 70% - Unseen 30%
Runs	30
Sample size	100
SSHC initialization	Ramped Half-and-Half, maximum depth 6
SSHC function set	+, -, *, and / (protected)
SSHC terminal set	Input variables, no constants

and SSHC-FS use a step of 1 for the Bio and PPB datasets (as in Gonçalves et al. [4]), and a step of 100 for the LD50 dataset. The higher step used in the LD50 dataset is explained by the higher order of magnitude of the errors. Claims of statistical significance are based on Mann-Whitney U tests, with Bonferroni correction, and considering a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. A non-parametric test is used because the data are not guaranteed to follow a normal distribution. All evolution plots presented in the next section are based on the median values over the 30 runs of some particular measure. The median is preferred over the average as it is more robust to outliers. Training error evolution plots are based on the training error of the best model at each generation. Generalization error evolution plots are based on the generalization error of the best model selected according to the training error.

5 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

To help the description the following simplifications are used: SLM-FS EDV describes SLM-FS using the EDV criterion; SLM-FS TIE describes SLM-FS using the TIE criterion; SLM-OS EDV describes SLM-OS using the EDV criterion; SSHC-FS EDV describes SSHC-FS using the EDV criterion; SSHC-FS TIE describes SSHC-FS using the TIE criterion; SSHC-OS EDV describes SSHC-OS using the EDV criterion. The TIE criterion is not applicable to the OS variants as the effectiveness of the mutation operator in this case can be empirically confirmed to be almost always 100%. This means that no stopping occurs for OS variants (SLM-OS and SSHC-OS) under the TIE criterion for reasonable stopping thresholds.

5.1 Semantic Learning Machine

As an initial assessment, figure 1 presents the evolution of the measures used in the stopping criteria, and their complementary measures in SLM-FS. These plots show the medians of each value throughout the runs when the semantic stopping criteria are not applied. The first row presents the measures related with the EDV criterion, and the second row presents the measures related with the TIE criterion. The blue solid lines represent the measures that are directly used in the criteria to determine the stopping point. The red dashed lines are the respective complementary measures.

Starting with the EDV criterion (first row) in the Bio and PPB datasets, in the beginning of the runs the algorithm is very effective in generating models that are superior to the current best and, at the same time, reduce the error deviation (ED). This is shown by the line labeled as ED decrease. Until around iteration 50, the values of this measure are usually over 90% in both datasets. Between iterations 50 and 100, a quick decrease of this measure occurs, as well as the consequent increase of the complementary measure (labeled as ED increase). The ED decrease measure drops below 20%, while the ED increase measure increases to over 80%. This indicates that the algorithm is mostly finding models that are superior to the current best at the expense of increasing the error deviation. It will be clear ahead that the area where this quick disruption occurs does indeed signal that no further induction seems to reliably possible. In the LD50 dataset, the ED decrease measure also starts at very high values. However, a similar quick disruption is not as apparent from the median values presented. It will be clear ahead that a quick disruption also occurs in each run of the LD50 dataset. The fact that this disruption happens at considerably different iterations in different runs, makes the median values misleading.

In the TIE criterion (second row), a clear pattern occurs across all datasets. Initially, the effectiveness of the variation operator (labeled as error decrease) is around 50%. In other words, generating a model which is superior to the current best is approximately as likely as generating a model which is inferior to the current best. This should be expected in the fixed step version of the mutation operator, as approximately 50% of the models are generated in the direction of the target semantics, and the other 50% are generated in the opposite direction. Similarly to what occurs in the EDV criterion, a disruption of this scenario happens between iterations 50 and 100 in the Bio and PPB datasets, and before iteration 30 in the LD50 dataset. Particularly noticeable in the Bio and PPB datasets, is the fact that this disruption in the TIE criterion occurs a few iterations later than in the EDV criterion. After this disruption the effectiveness of the variation operator drops below 25% across all datasets. The evolution of the measures used in the stopping criteria for the other variants tested (SLM-OS, SSHC-FS, and SSHC-OS) presents a similar behavior. These remaining results are not shown given the space restrictions.

The next step is to assess the robustness of the stopping criteria with respect to the associated threshold. Intuitively, middle values (such as 25%) should be more robust to sampling variations, while extreme stopping thresholds (5% or 45%) should lead to larger outcome variations. This paper considers 25% to be the default stopping threshold for both criteria, while also experimentally assessing the outcomes for 15% and 35%. Table 2 presents the generalization errors, number of iterations, and training errors, resulting from the application of the stopping criteria to SLM-FS and SLM-OS with different stopping thresholds. Each performance outcome is presented with the median, average, and standard deviation (SD). These results show that the different stopping thresholds result in remarkably similar outcomes under each corresponding SLM variant. These results reflect very similar stopping points. This is a desirable outcome as no tuning of the stopping threshold seems to be required. Therefore, these stopping criteria are not simply shifting the burden of deciding when to stop, to a separate search over different threshold values. The remaining analysis considers the results with the default stopping threshold for both criteria (25%).

All variants avoid overfitting and result in competitive generalizations even though the OS and FS variants result in considerably different stopping points. As expected, the computation of optimal steps results in a considerably faster training error reduction. This




Figure 1: Evolution of the measures related to the EDV (first row) and the TIE (second row) criteria for SLM-FS

Table 2: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) results for generalization error, number of iterations, and training error, resulting from the application of the stopping criteria to SLM-FS and SLM-OS with different stopping thresholds

Dataset	SLM variant	Threshold	Generalization error			Iterations			Training error		
			Median	Average	SD	Median	Average	SD	Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	15%	31.0	30.9	1.0	61.5	60.8	2.3	30.0	30.1	0.9
		25%	31.0	30.9	1.0	61.0	60.6	2.1	30.1	30.1	0.8
		35%	31.0	30.9	1.0	61.0	60.6	2.1	30.1	30.1	0.8
	FS TIE	15%	29.6	29.7	1.3	72.5	72.4	1.8	28.5	28.4	0.6
		25%	29.6	29.7	1.3	72.0	72.3	1.7	28.5	28.4	0.6
		35%	29.8	29.9	1.4	72.0	71.5	4.1	28.5	28.6	1.1
	OS EDV	15%	30.1	30.2	1.6	3.0	3.4	1.2	29.2	29.2	0.6
		25%	30.1	30.3	1.6	3.0	3.2	1.1	29.3	29.2	0.6
		35%	30.1	30.3	1.6	3.0	3.1	1.1	29.3	29.3	0.7
PPB	FS EDV	15%	31.1	31.1	1.7	66.5	66.0	2.9	28.2	28.1	1.2
		25%	31.7	31.6	1.6	65.0	64.3	2.2	28.6	28.7	0.9
		35%	31.7	31.9	1.8	65.0	63.4	2.8	28.8	29.1	1.2
	FS TIE	15%	29.4	29.0	1.9	94.5	95.0	9.5	23.2	23.1	1.2
		25%	29.1	28.9	1.8	85.0	86.2	4.5	23.9	23.9	1.0
		35%	29.3	30.0	4.4	83.0	80.7	11.7	24.0	25.4	4.7
	OS EDV	15%	31.8	32.6	5.1	7.5	9.6	6.9	25.0	24.6	2.5
		25%	31.7	32.7	5.0	5.0	6.9	5.6	25.8	25.6	2.5
		35%	32.0	32.7	4.9	4.5	6.7	5.7	25.8	25.8	2.7
LD50	FS EDV	15%	2032.6	2058.0	187.8	27.5	30.5	9.3	1907.7	1907.8	109.8
		25%	2028.6	2049.8	186.9	25.5	27.6	7.6	1940.0	1926.4	101.9
		35%	2025.2	2049.3	187.3	25.0	26.7	7.1	1949.3	1932.0	99.4
	FS TIE	15%	2051.3	2067.3	198.7	33.5	33.4	8.7	1908.7	1887.0	93.0
		25%	2025.2	2036.8	189.8	22.0	22.2	2.4	1954.8	1962.0	79.9
		35%	2016.5	2037.8	204.9	19.0	18.2	3.4	1995.2	2002.2	84.3
	OS EDV	15%	2043.8	2067.1	201.4	5.0	6.0	3.8	1951.4	1940.2	90.3
		25%	2013.8	2052.1	188.8	3.0	3.9	2.6	1980.4	1973.1	80.5
		35%	1994.4	2014.7	203.3	1.0	2.2	2.2	2012.3	2006.5	82.3

then results in earlier stopping points across all datasets. SLM-OS EDV stops significantly faster than SLM-FS EDV (p-values: Bio 1.269×10^{-11}, PPB 2.367×10^{-11}, and LD50 2.506×10^{-11}) and SLM-FS TIE (p-values: Bio 1.389×10^{-11}, PPB 2.611×10^{-11}, and LD50 2.396×10^{-11}). In terms of generalization, the only case where a variant is significantly superior to the other two variants is in the PPB dataset, where SLM-FS TIE generalizes better than SLM-FS EDV (p-value 9.899×10^{-7}) and SLM-OS EDV (p-value 3.274×10^{-4}). Within the FS variants, SLM-FS TIE also generalizes better than SLM-FS EDV in the Bio dataset (p-value 3.878×10^{-4}). No other statistically significant differences are found in terms of generalization in the remaining comparisons. Overall, SLM-FS TIE is the most robust variant in terms of generalization. Interestingly, it almost always stops after the other variants. The only case where this does

not happen is in the LD50 dataset, where it stops at a similar point as SLM-FS EDV.

5.2 Semantic Stochastic Hill Climber

Similarly to table 2, table 3 presents the generalization errors, number of generations, and training errors, resulting from the application of the stopping criteria to SSHC-FS and SSHC-OS with the different stopping thresholds. The results are relatively consistent in avoiding overfitting, although they present a slightly bigger variation in comparison with the SLM results. Some negative outliers exist in terms of generalization, particularly in SSHC-OS EDV. For instance, in the LD50 dataset, the average and standard deviation are considerably influenced by a single run where the generalization error is over 70000. Without this outlier, the average generalization error for the 25% threshold would be 2135.7, and the standard deviation would be 357.5. This behavior might be related with the semantic distributions generated by the random tree initializations. As empirically shown by Gonçalves et al. [5], even for otherwise equivalent algorithms, the random initializations used within the geometric semantic mutation operator can significantly influence the outcomes. This was also discussed by Moraglio et al. [13]. A further investigation on the influence of different random tree initializations within GSGP/SSHC might clarify this issue. The remaining analysis considers the results with the default stopping threshold for both criteria (25%).

As in the case of SLM, the computation of optimal steps in SSHC also results in earlier stopping points across all datasets. SSHC-OS EDV stops significantly faster than SSHC-FS EDV (p-values: Bio 4.272×10^{-8}, PPB 3.442×10^{-10}, and LD50 4.486×10^{-10}) and SSHC-FS TIE (p-values: Bio 2.836×10^{-11}, PPB 2.638×10^{-11}, and LD50 2.235×10^{-11}). In the Bio and PPB datasets, SSHC-FS TIE achieves significantly superior generalizations than SSHC-FS EDV (p-values: Bio 5.445×10^{-3}, and PPB 3.585×10^{-3}) and SSHC-OS EDV (p-values: Bio 7.476×10^{-6}, and PPB 6.728×10^{-4}). No statistically significant differences are found in terms of generalization in the LD50 dataset. Across all datasets, the best SSHC variant always achieves a competitive generalization. As in the SLM case, the TIE criterion applied in conjunction with a fixed step yields the most robust generalizations. These generalizations also result from later stops as in the SLM case.

5.3 Additional Considerations

With respect to the direct comparisons between equivalent SLM and SSHC variants when using the same stopping criterion, SLM-FS EDV generalizes better than SSHC-FS EDV in the Bio (p-value 2.211×10^{-3}) and PPB (p-value 5.715×10^{-4}) datasets. SLM-FS TIE generalizes better than SSHC-FS TIE in the PPB dataset (p-value 2.759×10^{-4}), and SLM-OS EDV generalizes better than SSHC-OS EDV in the Bio (p-value 1.256×10^{-8}) and PPB (p-value 1.723×10^{-3}) datasets. No other statistically significant differences are found in terms of generalization in the remaining equivalent comparisons. In general, these results show that the SLM variants are more robust than the equivalent SSHC variants. As previously mentioned, this might be related with the possibly less smooth semantic distributions generated by the GP random tree initializations.

In order to assess if the proposed stopping criteria do not stop too early, each variant is extended for more iterations/generations to determine if no further induction is indeed possible. Figure 2 presents the evolution plots with the generalization (first row) and training (second row) errors when no stopping is applied. The vertical lines represent the median stopping point for each variant. When both stopping criteria apply, the first stopping point represents the EDV stop, with the single exception occurring in the LD50 dataset where SLM-FS TIE stops earlier than SLM-FS EDV. The clear trend across all datasets and variants is that, after at least the best stopping point, the corresponding variant either starts to overfit or it simply stabilizes the generalization error. This hints that no further induction improvement is possible with the available data. Even if the generalization error stabilizes across the iterations/generations, there is no advantage in continuing the search as this would only increase model size and computational time. Notice also that after the stopping points, each corresponding variant is still able to effectively decrease the training error. This is particularly important to consider in the fixed step variants that use the TIE criterion, as this means that the step is not simply too high for the search to be effective. Therefore, the FS TIE variants are indeed detecting risky overfitting regions.

Table 4 presents the number of hidden neurons of the resulting Neural Networks for each SLM variant. Notice that since one hidden neuron is added at each successful iteration, the total number of hidden neurons is the number of iterations plus the initial random node. The resulting Neural Networks are relatively small, particularly for SLM-OS EDV with at most 8 hidden neurons on average. The results for the number of tree nodes of each SSHC variant are presented in table 5. The same reasoning applies here with SSHC-OS EDV producing small trees, in particular in the PPB and LD50 datasets. Notice that despite the considerable size of the trees produced by SSHC-FS TIE, this variant is able to surpass the other SSHC variants in terms of generalization in two out of the three datasets.

A final note on the computational time of the variants tested. Tables 6 and 7 present the computational time in seconds of each run. The usage of the proposed semantic stopping criteria and the application of incremental evaluation at each mutation operator results in demonstrably efficient search procedures. The computational times presented are computed without any form of implicit or explicit parallelization. These results show that it is possible to evolve Neural Networks with competitive generalizations in less than 3 seconds on average. The GP variants can take at most around 10 seconds to compute. This efficiency can be particularly important in turning GP into a more widely used supervised learning method, given that GP is sometimes perceived as being relatively slow.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper showed that it is feasible to use information gathered from the semantic neighborhood to determine search stopping points that result in competitive generalizations. The semantic stopping criteria proposed are directly applicable to GSGP and to the SLM algorithm. Besides achieving competitive generalizations, the proposed approach also yields computationally efficient algorithms

Table 3: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) results for generalization error, number of generations, and training error, resulting from the application of the stopping criteria to SSHC-FS and SSHC-OS with different stopping thresholds

Dataset	SSHC variant	Threshold	Generalization error			Generations			Training error		
			Median	Average	SD	Median	Average	SD	Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	15%	30.7	34.6	19.9	1029.5	1137.6	441.2	18.2	18.8	2.2
		25%	33.7	37.5	19.6	378.5	344.5	281.4	25.0	29.0	7.7
		35%	38.0	41.3	18.0	37.0	55.5	67.8	38.2	37.5	3.9
	FS TIE	15%	30.7	34.6	19.9	1364.0	1358.7	133.7	17.6	17.6	0.8
		25%	30.5	34.4	19.3	519.0	512.8	98.4	23.2	23.6	1.6
		35%	35.4	40.1	19.1	99.5	97.7	54.2	33.6	35.6	7.2
	OS EDV	15%	44.7	7.9e+07	4.1e+08	369.0	313.5	197.2	9.8	13.6	6.9
		25%	33.6	231.6	1031.8	15.5	24.4	33.8	27.7	28.2	5.9
		35%	34.9	38.5	20.2	2.0	3.2	2.2	33.7	33.5	3.5
PPB	FS EDV	15%	32.0	32.5	4.0	218.5	228.5	165.1	20.9	21.4	7.9
		25%	34.7	35.4	4.4	37.5	65.1	67.8	32.1	31.6	4.3
		35%	36.8	37.2	5.3	18.5	29.7	29.8	33.9	35.0	3.7
	FS TIE	15%	31.5	31.6	3.4	522.0	505.0	71.9	8.3	8.8	2.4
		25%	31.6	32.1	3.7	240.5	244.6	73.4	18.4	19.5	3.0
		35%	35.1	36.4	5.8	41.0	45.0	26.1	33.3	33.1	4.4
	OS EDV	15%	35.1	62.0	147.6	5.0	9.0	11.3	28.4	27.0	5.9
		25%	35.4	36.0	4.3	2.0	2.2	1.7	31.3	32.8	5.2
		35%	36.7	37.4	5.4	1.0	1.1	1.2	33.6	35.7	6.3
LD50	FS EDV	15%	2070.4	2106.5	165.4	143.0	148.0	66.2	1585.9	1570.9	204.4
		25%	2041.5	2064.3	169.8	68.5	67.5	28.1	1814.6	1829.7	179.3
		35%	2053.1	2063.1	193.9	33.0	34.8	15.8	1933.7	1971.1	158.6
	FS TIE	15%	2183.3	2189.0	169.6	261.5	270.9	66.3	1268.5	1249.6	136.2
		25%	2017.9	2059.9	168.1	81.0	82.5	31.5	1761.1	1768.5	87.8
		35%	2044.3	2057.8	204.3	23.0	20.8	7.0	2025.7	2043.8	138.2
	OS EDV	15%	2120.8	5463.5	13499.0	5.5	9.4	10.4	1875.1	1836.4	194.7
		25%	2065.3	4402.9	12423.1	2.0	3.7	3.7	1972.9	1957.5	173.1
		35%	2065.3	4332.3	12433.3	2.0	2.2	1.4	1989.7	2004.9	158.7




Figure 2: Generalization (first row) and training (second row) errors evolution plots with the median stopping points represented as vertical lines for each corresponding variant. When both stopping criteria apply, the first stopping point represents the EDV stop, with the single exception occurring in the LD50 dataset where SLM-FS TIE stops earlier than SLM-FS EDV

Table 4: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) outcomes for the number of hidden neurons of each SLM variant

Dataset	SLM variant	Number of hidden neurons		
		Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	62.0	61.6	2.1
	FS TIE	73.0	73.3	1.7
	OS EDV	4.0	4.2	1.1
PPB	FS EDV	66.0	65.3	2.2
	FS TIE	86.0	87.2	4.5
	OS EDV	6.0	7.9	5.6
LD50	FS EDV	26.5	28.6	7.6
	FS TIE	23.0	23.2	2.4
	OS EDV	4.0	4.9	2.6

Table 5: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) outcomes for the number of tree nodes of each SSHC variant

Dataset	SSHC variant	Number of tree nodes		
		Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	10170.0	9884.7	8257.3
	FS TIE	14822.0	14613.1	3003.2
	OS EDV	327.0	593.6	903.3
PPB	FS EDV	1134.0	1979.2	2052.6
	FS TIE	7815.0	7740.2	2357.8
	OS EDV	39.0	56.5	48.6
LD50	FS EDV	2131.0	2109.5	929.5
	FS TIE	2509.0	2614.5	1080.7
	OS EDV	57.0	90.9	86.4

Table 6: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) outcomes for the computational time (in seconds) of each SLM variant run

Dataset	SLM variant	Computational time in seconds		
		Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	1.6	1.6	0.1
	FS TIE	1.9	1.9	0.1
	OS EDV	0.3	0.4	0.4
PPB	FS EDV	1.7	1.7	0.1
	FS TIE	2.2	2.2	0.2
	OS EDV	0.3	0.4	0.5
LD50	FS EDV	2.8	2.9	0.7
	FS TIE	2.6	2.7	0.7
	OS EDV	0.2	0.3	0.4

Table 7: Median, average, and standard deviation (SD) outcomes for the computational time (in seconds) of each SSHC variant run

Dataset	SSHC variant	Computational time in seconds		
		Median	Average	SD
Bio	FS EDV	7.8	7.1	5.9
	FS TIE	10.0	10.3	2.5
	OS EDV	0.9	1.3	1.7
PPB	FS EDV	0.3	0.6	0.6
	FS TIE	2.1	2.1	0.8
	OS EDV	0.1	0.1	0.2
LD50	FS EDV	1.1	1.1	0.5
	FS TIE	1.2	1.3	0.5
	OS EDV	0.2	0.3	0.4

as it allows the evolution of neural networks in less than 3 seconds on average, and of GP trees in at most 10 seconds. This paper also explored for the first time the computation of optimal learning steps under the SLM algorithm. This results in the successful evolution of neural networks in just a few iterations. The resulting networks also have a small number of hidden neurons. In GSGP, the usage of the proposed semantic stopping criteria in conjunction with the computation of optimal mutation steps also results in small trees.

As future work, an extended experimental study will help to assess the general applicability of the proposed stopping criteria. This extended experimental assessment should include other regression datasets, as well as classification datasets, and it should also include comparisons with other well-established non-evolutionary supervised learning methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially funded by project PERSEIDS (PTDC/EMS-SIS/0642/2014) and BioISI RD unit, UID/MULTI/04046/2013, funded by FCT/MCTES/PIDDAC, Portugal. Funding for this work was also provided by CONACYT project FC-2015-2/944 "Aprendizaje evolutivo a gran escala".

REFERENCES

[1] Qi Chen, Bing Xue, Lin Shang, and Mengjie Zhang. 2016. Improving Generalisation of Genetic Programming for Symbolic Regression with Structural Risk Minimisation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 709–716.

[2] Agoston E Eiben and Márk Jelasity. 2002. A critical note on experimental research methodology in EC. In *Proceedings of the 2002 Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC 2002)*, Vol. 58. 2–587.

[3] Ivo Gonçalves and Sara Silva. 2013. Balancing learning and overfitting in genetic programming with interleaved sampling of training data. In *Genetic Programming*. Springer, 73–84.

[4] Ivo Gonçalves, Sara Silva, and Carlos M Fonseca. 2015. On the generalization ability of geometric semantic genetic programming. In *Genetic Programming*. Springer, 41–52.

[5] Ivo Gonçalves, Sara Silva, and Carlos M. Fonseca. 2015. Semantic Learning Machine: A Feedforward Neural Network Construction Algorithm Inspired by Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming. In *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 9273. Springer, 280–285.

[6] Ivo Gonçalves, Sara Silva, Joana B. Melo, and João M. B. Carreiras. 2012. Random sampling technique for overfitting control in genetic programming. In *Genetic Programming*. Springer, 218–229.

[7] Ivo Gonçalves. 2017. *An Exploration of Generalization and Overfitting in Genetic Programming: Standard and Geometric Semantic Approaches*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Informatics Engineering, University of Coimbra, Portugal.

[8] Ivo Gonçalves and Sara Silva. 2011. Experiments on Controlling Overfitting in Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the 15th Portuguese Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Progress in Artificial Intelligence (EPIA 2011)*.

[9] Michael Kommenda, Michael Affenzeller, Bogdan Burlacu, Gabriel Kronberger, and Stephan M Winkler. 2014. Genetic programming with data migration for symbolic regression. In *Proceedings of the Companion Publication of the 2014 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. ACM, 1361–1366.

[10] John R. Koza. 1992. *Genetic Programming: On the Programming of Computers by Means of Natural Selection (Complex Adaptive Systems)* (1 ed.). The MIT Press.

[11] Ibrahim Kushchu. 2002. An Evaluation of Evolutionary Generalisation in Genetic Programming. *Artif. Intell. Rev.* 18 (September 2002), 3–14. Issue 1.

[12] Alberto Moraglio. 2007. *Towards a Geometric Unification of Evolutionary Algorithms*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Computer Science, University of Essex, UK.

[13] Alberto Moraglio, Krzysztof Krawiec, and Colin G Johnson. 2012. Geometric semantic genetic programming. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature-PPSN XII*. Springer, 21–31.