

Practical Bayesian Optimization of Objectives with Conditioning Variables

Michael Pearce
Centre for Complexity Science
Warwick University
Coventry, UK

Janis Klaise
Seldon Technologies
London, UK

Matthew Groves
Centre for Doctoral Training in
Mathematics for Real-World Systems
Warwick University
Coventry, UK

Abstract

Bayesian optimization is a class of data efficient model based algorithms typically focused on global optimization. We consider the more general case where a user is faced with multiple problems that each need to be optimized conditional on a state variable, for example given a range of cities with different patient distributions, we optimize the ambulance locations conditioned on patient distribution. Given partitions of CIFAR-10, we optimize CNN hyperparameters for each partition. Similarity across objectives boosts optimization of each objective in two ways: in modelling by data sharing across objectives, and also in acquisition by quantifying how a single point on one objective can provide benefit to all objectives. For this we propose a framework for conditional optimization: ConBO. This can be built on top of a range of acquisition functions and we propose a new Hybrid Knowledge Gradient acquisition function. The resulting method is intuitive and theoretically grounded, performs either similar to or significantly better than recently published works on a range of problems, and is easily parallelized to collect a batch of points.

1 Introduction

Expensive black box functions arise in many fields such as fluid simulations (Picheny and Ginsbourger, 2013), engineering wing design (Jeong et al., 2005), and machine learning parameter tuning (Snoek et al., 2012). In this work we consider the more general case where the expensive function must be optimized for a range of settings, or conditioned on a *state*, often called a context, nuisance variable or source. This has many applications as follows.

Physics simulators: the optimal packing fraction of particles in a container varies with particle size (Ginsbourger et al., 2014b). A nuclear fusion reactor has multiple plasma states each requiring unique controls (Char et al., 2019; Chung et al., 2020).

Algorithm Parameter Tuning: given a set of graphs one may find the best coloring algorithm for each graph (Smith-Miles et al., 2014). For a selection of datasets one can optimize model training hyperparameters (Bardenet et al., 2013) for each dataset. We consider CNN optimizer parameters for partitions of CIFAR-10.

Robust Engineering: when designing a wing for a range of environment conditions and flow angles, a safety engineer needs to find flow angle of *worst case* stresses of the wing for each environment.

Logistics: given a range of warehouses spread over a country that each face different sales demand, one must optimize the stock control policy of each warehouse (Poloczek et al., 2016). Given a range of cities with different population distributions, for each city one must optimize ambulance locations (Dong et al., 2017). We also consider these two applications.

In this work we shall refer to variables that are to be optimized as *actions*, though parameters, decision variables, and solutions are often used. There are many variations of the conditional setting. In contextual optimization (Paul et al., 2018), at each iteration a context (or state) is passed to the optimization algorithm, the algorithm chooses an action and the reward is returned. Studied applications include drug design (Krause and Ong, 2011) in which an algorithm can visit molecules (states) in a round-robin fashion and chooses a test chemical (action) at each iteration. Optimization with warm starts, dynamic objectives, transfer learning (Morales-Enciso and Branke, 2015; Feurer et al., 2015; Poloczek et al., 2016; Perrone et al., 2018) may be interpreted as contextual optimization




Figure 1: Top: GP model. Each state (vertical slice) is an objective function to maximise. At each iteration the algorithm must determine $(s, x)^{n+1}$ that provides information about the optima of all states (black line). Bottom: the acquisition function value of each local Monte-Carlo state using hybrid Knowledge Gradient.

where the state remains constant for multiple time steps in which multiple actions can be evaluated. Such methods have been applied to the aforementioned many warehouses example and to hyperparameters of neural networks for sequentially arriving datasets.

Many applications in these works may also be viewed as serialised versions of conditional optimization problems. In drug design, an experimenter may be free to choose both the molecule and test chemical for each experiment, in hyperparameter tuning, if a collection of datasets is already in user possession, the user is free to choose both the dataset and parameters to train next. Both the context/state and the action is under algorithm control and the goal is to *maximise all states simultaneously*. See Figure 1.

In multi information source, or multi-fidelity optimization (Huang et al., 2006a; Poloczek et al., 2017; Kandasamy et al., 2017) one has multiple functions over action space, each one corresponds to a source (or state) and has a different query cost. The goal is to optimize an expensive source (target state) by sequentially evaluating actions on cheaper sources while exploiting similarity across sources. The conditional setting is a generalization where all sources are targets and (for simplicity) we assume all sources/states have equal query cost.

Past works have referred to this setting as profile optimization (Ginsbourger et al., 2014a), conditional op-

timization (Sambakhé et al., 2019), offline contextual optimization (Char et al., 2019), collaborative tuning (Bardenet et al., 2013), and continuous multi-task optimization (Pearce and Branke, 2018). In this work we also adopt *conditional optimization*.

This paper makes the following contributions:

1. A framework for conditional Bayesian optimization with theoretical guarantees: ConBO
2. A new competitive global optimization method that is cheap to compute: Hybrid Knowledge Gradient
3. Extensive evaluation on fully open source conditional optimization problems from various domains.

2 Related Work

We focus on conditional algorithms. We define such algorithms as those that consider a set of functions, each corresponding to a state. For each iteration, the algorithm is free to choose both the state and action. The goal is to find the peak of each function, all of the conditional optima, see Figure 1.

The SCoT algorithm (Bardenet et al., 2013) consider discrete states and visits states in a round-robin fashion and chooses actions using expected improvement. The authors consider hyperparameters of machine learning algorithms for multiple datasets, all of which are considered to be available upfront. As SCoT predetermines the sequence of states it is unnecessarily restrictive, and also cannot be applied to problems with continuous states.

The Profile Expected Improvement (PEI) algorithm (Ginsbourger et al., 2014b) does consider continuous state and proposes an acquisition function for the next state action pair by measuring expected improvement of a new outcome over the best predicted outcome within the same state. The recent PEQI method (Sambakhé et al., 2019) extends PEI to noisy problems using SKO (Huang et al., 2006b). These algorithms significantly improve upon SCoT by allowing the algorithm to *dynamically* determine the state as well as the action of each sampled state action pair. However, the proposed acquisition functions only quantify the benefit of a new sample by the effect it may have at finding the maxima within the sampled state, it does not account for how a sample may help to find the maxima of similar states.

The REVI algorithm (Pearce and Branke, 2018) aims to improve upon these methods and explicitly quantifies the benefit a new sample will have for finding the maxima of all states. At each iteration, the method

discretizes both state and action domains and treating a continuous problem as a discrete one. Given a hypothetical state action point to sample, the Knowledge Gradient by discretization (over actions) quantifies how the new sample will benefit each state in the discretized set of states. The sum of these benefits provides an estimate of overall benefit. The method suffers the curse of dimensionality, increasing dimension leads to exponentially increasing discretization size with corresponding exponential space and time requirements. Using a smaller discretization suffers discretization errors that can largely undermine any benefit of accounting for all states and actions.

Most recently, the MTS method (Char et al., 2019) uses a novel kernel with a length scale that varies across states. This is combined with a multi-task Thompson sampling method for collecting new data. Note that this method also requires a discretization, over real state-action space or Fourier space, and has cubic cost with the size of the discretization. Further, Thompson sampling, like earlier works, does not account for how one sample provides benefit for optimizing all states, fundamental structure of conditional problems.

While REVI and MTS appear to be the strongest algorithms, both suffer from practical issues, REVI is exponentially expensive and MTS does not utilise the structure of the problem.

In this work, we propose a method that both exploits the basic structure of conditional optimization, like REVI, while also being much more practical and computationally favourable, like SCoT, PEI or PEQI, and therefore amenable to much more challenging real world problems.

3 Problem Statement

Adopting the convenient terminology of bandits, we assume that we have an expensive black box function that takes as input both a *state* in state space $s \in S$ and an *action* in action space $x \in X$ either of which may be continuous or discrete. The expensive function returns a noisy scalar *reward*,

$$f(s, x) : S \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (1)$$

There is a distribution over states $\mathbb{P}[s]$ that encodes the priority or weighting of states. Given a budget of N function calls, we sequentially choose points (s, x) and observe a noisy reward $f(s, x)$. The objective is to learn the best action for every state, or a policy $\pi : S \rightarrow X$, that maximises expected output for all states,

$$\text{Total Reward} = \int_S \mathbb{E}[f(s, \pi(s))] \mathbb{P}[s] ds, \quad (2)$$

where the expectation is over the stochasticity in rewards. If there is only a single state, the reward function is a single objective, the policy is a single action, and the problem reduces to global optimisation. If S is a finite set, the integral reduces to a summation. In this work we consider the following applications:

CNN hyperparameters: the CIFAR-10 dataset contains 10 classes, we split this into five datasets, $S = \{1, \dots, 5\}$, of two classes each with uniform state density $\mathbb{P}[s] = 1/5$. Using a 5 layer CNN, we optimize dropout rates, batch size and Adam parameters, $X \subset \mathbb{R}^7$. $f(s, x)$ is the validation accuracy.

Ambulances in a square: (Dong et al., 2017) given a range of 30km×30km city maps, each city is parameterized by the mode of its population distribution $s \in S = [0, 30]^2$. $\mathbb{P}[s]$ is a truncated Gaussian around the centre of the map; most cities, like Paris, are densest in the centre while others are densest at a coast line like Singapore. The action space is the 2D coordinates of three ambulance bases, $x \in X = [0, 30]^6$, and for each city s one must find bases x to minimise journey times $f(s, x)$ to patients over a simulated day.

Assemble to order: (Xie et al., 2016) a company owns many stock warehouses and each one faces a different level of demand $s \in [0.5, 1.5]$. The distribution of demand $\mathbb{P}[s]$ is uniform. Stock is depleted as customer orders arrive and are fulfilled, and stock levels are controlled by setting targets for replenishment, $x \in X = [0, 20]^8$. The objective, $f(s, x)$, is sales profit minus holding costs over a month.

4 The Conditional Bayesian Optimization Algorithm

We first discuss the fitting of the Gaussian process model and the policy. We then motivate the acquisition value for a single state and how this is integrated over states yielding the acquisition function. Integrating over states increases the computational burden hence we propose Hybrid Knowledge Gradient as a solution.

At a stage after having observed n data points, $\{(s^i, x^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where $y^i = f(s^i, x^i)$, we fit a Gaussian process from the joint space $S \times X$ to outputs $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\tilde{X}^n = ((s, x)^1, \dots, (s, x)^n)$ and $Y^n = (y^1, \dots, y^n)$. A Gaussian process is defined by a prior mean and prior covariance function, $\mu^0(s, x)$, $k^0((s, x), (s', x'))$ which are chosen for each application, for more information see Rasmussen and Williams (2004). After observing n data points, let $K = k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{X}^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the posterior mean is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^n(s, x) &= \mu^0(s, x) \\ &+ k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n)(K + \sigma_0^2 I)^{-1}(Y^n - \mu^0(\tilde{X}^n)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and the posterior covariance is given by

$$k^n(s, x, s', x') = k^0(s, x, s', x') + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n)(K + \sigma_0^2 I)^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, s', x'). \quad (4)$$

For state s , the predicted optimal action x defines a policy

$$\pi^n(s) = \arg \max_x \mu^n(s, x). \quad (5)$$

Although we don't use them in our experiments, a common approach for applying GPs to higher dimensions is additive kernels (Kandasamy et al., 2015; Krause and Ong, 2011). These assume the function decomposes into a sum of functions, each one depending on an exclusive subset of variables e.g. $f((x_1, x_2)) = f_1(x_1) + f_2(x_2)$. If the state and action variables are in different subsets the policy becomes $\pi^n(s) = \arg \max_x \mu_1^n(s) + \mu_2^n(x) = \arg \max_x \mu_2^n(x)$, it is independent of the state. Additive structure assumes *no interaction* between variables while conditional optimization is only necessary *with interaction*. Thus in settings with additive structure, one may fix all non-interacting state and action variables and apply conditional optimization only to additive components containing both state and action variables.

Collecting a new data point y^{n+1} at $(s, x)^{n+1}$ will update the Gaussian process model for all points $S \times X$, updating the predicted peak of all states affecting the policy. To construct an acquisition function for conditional optimization, we start by looking for standard acquisition functions that account for how the model changes at *unsampled* locations $(s', x') \neq (s, x)^{n+1}$. Specifically, the popular Expected Improvement (EI) (Jones et al., 1998) and upper confidence bound (UCB) (Kandasamy et al., 2016) methods are both functions of the *mean and variance at the sampled point only*, $\mu^n((s, x)^{n+1})$, $k^n((s, x)^{n+1}, (s, x)^{n+1})$. Methods that utilise other points in the domain include Entropy search (ES and PES) that measures the mutual information between the new output $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}]$ and the (induced) location of the peak $\mathbb{P}[x^*|\tilde{X}^n, Y^n]$, Max-value entropy search (MES) (Wang and Jegelka, 2017) measures mutual information between the new output $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}]$ and the largest output $\mathbb{P}[\max y|\tilde{X}^n, Y^n]$, and Knowledge Gradient (KG) (Frazier et al., 2009) that measures the expected new peak posterior mean $\mathbb{E}[\max \mu^{n+1}(x)]$ caused by a new y^{n+1} at x^{n+1} . Unlike EI and UCB, we classify ES, MES, KG as ‘‘globally aware’’.

Each state s_i defines a single global optimization problem over $x \in X$, using ES, PES, MES or KG, the acquisition value for state s_i given a sample elsewhere at $(s, x)^{n+1}$ may be computed. In this work we adopt KG for its Bayesian decision theoretic derivation that extends seamlessly to the conditional setting. For KG,

the benefit for state s_i given a sample at $(s, x)^{n+1}$ is the expected increase in predicted reward for the best action within state s_i . We denote this as $\text{KG}_c(\cdot)$ given by

$$\text{KG}_c(s_i; (s, x)^{n+1}) = \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}}[\max_{x'} \mu^{n+1}(s_i, x') | (s, x)^{n+1}] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s_i, x'').$$

We discuss numerical evaluation of $\text{KG}_c(\cdot)$ in Section 4.1. Similar expressions for entropy methods, $\text{ES}_c(\cdot)$, $\text{PES}_c(\cdot)$, $\text{MES}_c(\cdot)$, are derived in the Supplementary Material. Integrating over states s_i yields the total acquisition value

$$\int_S \text{KG}_c(s; (s, x)^{n+1}) \mathbb{P}[s] ds. \quad (7)$$

For discrete S the integral is replaced by summation. For continuous S , the integral over states s cannot be computed analytically and so we use Monte Carlo with importance sampling. When using a kernel that factorises $k(s, x, s', x') = \sigma_0^2 k_S(s, s') k_X(x, x')$, like squared exponential or Matérn, similarity across states is encoded in $k_S(s, s')$. This naturally leads to the proposal distribution $q(s|s^{n+1}) \propto k_S(s, s^{n+1})$. In our continuous state experiments, we use the Matérn kernel and a Gaussian proposal distribution with mean s^{n+1} and the state kernel length scales, l_s , as standard deviations,

$$q(s|s^{n+1}) \sim \mathcal{N}(s|s^{n+1}, \text{diag}(l_s^2)). \quad (8)$$

We generate $n_s = 20$ samples $S_{MC} = \{s_1, \dots, s_{n_s}\}$, finally the acquisition function is

$$\text{ConBO}(s^{n+1}, x^{n+1}) = \sum_{s_i \in S_{MC}} \frac{\mathbb{P}[s_i]}{q(s_i|s^{n+1})} \text{KG}_c(s_i; (s, x)^{n+1}). \quad (9)$$

Figure 1 shows a set of sampled states and the $\text{KG}_c(\cdot)$ for each one. Each KG term directly measures increase in predicted reward for one state and the above sum measures reward increases across all states, this is a direct surrogate for maximizing the true objective (Equation 2). For entropy based methods, ConBO becomes a sum of Shannon information units thereby indirectly optimizing the true objective. The randomly sampled states S_{MC} may be resampled with each call to $\text{ConBO}(s, x)$ and gradients estimated enabling the optimal $(s, x)^{n+1}$ to be found with a stochastic gradient ascent optimizer such as Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014). Selecting each point according to maximising ConBO is also myopically optimal in a value of information framework:

Theorem 1 *Let $(s^*, x^*) = \arg \max \text{ConBO}(s, x)$ be a point chosen for sampling. (s^*, x^*) is also the point that maximises the myopic Value of Information, the increase in predicted policy reward.*




Figure 2: Methods for computing $\text{KG}(x^{n+1})$ at $x^{n+1} = 7$. Left: $\mu^n(x)$ and samples of $\mu^{n+1}(x)$ determined by a scalar $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Centre-left: KG_d replaces X with up to 3000 points $x_i \in X_d$ and $\mu^{n+1}(x_i)$ is linear in Z . Centre-right: KG_{MC} samples up to 1000 functions $\mu^{n+1}(x)$ functions and maximises each of them numerically. Right: KG_h samples up to 5 functions $\mu^{n+1}(x)$ and maximizes them numerically, the arg max points x_1^*, \dots, x_5^* are used as X_d in KG_d .

Further, in finite search space, with an infinite sampling budget all points will be sampled infinitely:

Theorem 2 *Let S and X be finite sets and N the budget to be sequentially allocated by ConBO. Let $n(s, x, N)$ be the number of samples allocated to point s, x within budget N . Then for all $(s, x) \in S \times X$ we have that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} n(s, x, N) = \infty$.*

The law of large numbers ensures that the algorithm learns the true expected reward for all points. Proofs are given in the Supplementary Material.

4.1 Hybrid Knowledge Gradient

By definition, KG is more expensive than EI and UCB. Further, the function $\text{KG}_c(s_i, (s, x)^{n+1})$ must be computed once for each sampled state s_i , the computational cost is therefore n_s times the global acquisition function equivalent. To alleviate this cost, we propose a novel, efficient algorithm for computing KG. In the following section we assume constant s for brevity, reducing to the global optimization setting. Given a hypothetical location x^{n+1} , KG quantifies the value of a new hypothetical observation y^{n+1} by the expected increase in predicted reward of the optimal action, i.e. the expected increase in the peak of the posterior mean

$$\text{KG}(x^{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}} [\max_{x'} \mu^{n+1}(x') | x^{n+1}] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(x''). \quad (10)$$

However, $\max_{x'} \mu^{n+1}(x')$ has no direct formula and approximations are required which we describe next. At time n , the new posterior mean is unknown, however, it may be written as $\mu^{n+1}(x) = \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x; x^{n+1})Z$ where $\tilde{\sigma}(x; x^{n+1})$ is a deterministic function and the scalar $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ captures the randomness of y^{n+1} , see SM. Previously, $\text{KG}(x)$ has been computed in the following two ways.

KG by discretization (Frazier et al., 2009; Scott et al., 2011): in Equation 10, the maximizations

may be performed over a discrete set of d points $x' \in X_d \subset X$. Denoting $\underline{\mu} = \mu^n(X_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(x^{n+1}) = \tilde{\sigma}(X_d; x^{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then

$$\text{KG}_d(x^{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}_Z [\max\{\underline{\mu} + \tilde{\sigma}(x^{n+1})Z\}] - \max \underline{\mu}.$$

The $\max\{\underline{\mu} + \tilde{\sigma}(x^{n+1})Z\}$ is a piece-wise linear function of Z and the expectation over $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ is analytically tractable. The output is a *lower bound* of the true $\text{KG}(x)$ over the continuous set. The MISO algorithm (Poloczek et al., 2017) used KG_d with 3000 uniformly random distributed points. This method suffers the curse of dimensionality, X_d must grow exponentially with dimension of X . Even when using a dense discretization, X_d may contain many unnecessary points x_i that do not form part of $\max \mu^{n+1}(X_d)$, see Figure 2 centre-left plot.

KG by Monte Carlo (Wu and Frazier, 2017; Toscano-Palmerin and Frazier, 2018): given x^{n+1} , the method samples up to $n_z = 1000$ values of Z . For each Z_j , construct $\mu_j^{n+1}(x) = \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x; x^{n+1})Z_j$ and the peak output value of each $\mu_j^{n+1}(x)$ is found using a continuous numerical `Optimizer()` (e.g. L-BFGS, CG),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KG}_{MC}(x^{n+1}) = & \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_j \text{Optimizer}_{x'}(\mu^n(x') + \tilde{\sigma}(x'; x^{n+1})Z_j) \\ & - \text{Optimizer}_{x''}(\mu^n(x'')). \end{aligned}$$

The resulting average is an *unbiased* estimate of true $\text{KG}(x)$ and scales better to higher dimensional X as the univariate Z is discretized by Monte Carlo samples instead of X . However, similar Z_j values will have similar $\max \mu_j^{n+1}(x)$ making many calls to `Optimizer()` redundant. See Figure 2 centre right.

We instead propose a simple natural mixture of the above two approaches that scales to higher dimensional X and reduces redundant `Optimizer()` calls.

Hybrid KG: given x^{n+1} , first following KG_{MC} we use $n_z = 5$ values of Z_j and for each $\mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x; x^{n+1})Z_j$ we find the argmax x_j^* using `Optimizer()`. Second, following KG_d we treat the set of peak locations as a *dynamic optimized discretization* $X_d^* = \{x_1^*, \dots, x_{n_z}^*\}$ to analytically compute a lower bound of the true $\text{KG}(x)$. Let $\underline{\mu}^* = \mu^n(X_d^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}^*(x^{n+1}) = \tilde{\sigma}(X_d^*; x^{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$, then

$$\text{KG}_h(x^{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}_Z[\max \underline{\mu}^* + \tilde{\sigma}^*(x^{n+1})Z] - \max \underline{\mu}^*.$$

Compared to KG_d , the hybrid method removes redundant points in the discretization X_d , all X_d^* points contribute to $\max \mu^{n+1}(X_d^*)$ and there are far fewer points. Compared to KG_{MC} , instead of sampling many Z_j and finding many x_j^* , far fewer Z_j are sampled and fewer need to be x_j^* found.

To ensure asymptotic convergence, in a discrete domain, we require that the acquisition function is non-negative, $\text{KG}_h(x) \geq 0$, and the acquisition function is zero where GP variance is zero, $\text{KG}_h(x) = 0 \iff k^n(x, x) = 0$. Therefore, always choosing $x^{n+1} = \arg \max \text{KG}_h(x)$ ensures only points with GP variance will be revisited until all points have no variance i.e. the true function is known for all points. We can ensure these properties by setting $n_z \geq 2$ and at least one Z_j is equal to zero.

Theorem 3 *Let $n_z \geq 2$ and let $\underline{Z} = \{Z_j | j = 1, \dots, n_z\}$. If $0 \in \underline{Z}$ then $\text{KG}_h(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$ and if x is sampled infinitely often $\text{KG}_h(x) = 0$.*

Proof is in the SM. The Z_j values can be fixed, for $n_z = 5$ we use equal Gaussian quantiles $\underline{Z} = \{\Phi^{-1}(0.1), \Phi^{-1}(0.3), \dots, \Phi^{-1}(0.9)\}$ where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the Gaussian CDF. Using quantile spacing and odd n_z ensures $Z_j = \Phi^{-1}(0.5) = 0$ is included which satisfies the assumptions of asymptotic convergence. See Fig.2 (right).

The computational complexity of a single call to ConBO requires the posterior variance ($O(n^2)$) and $n_s n_z$ runs of `Optimizer()`. Assuming `Optimizer()` internally makes n_{calls} to the posterior mean $O(n)$, ConBO total complexity is $O(n^2 + n n_{calls} n_s n_z)$. Note this is linear in $n_s n_z$, the size of the dynamic optimal discretization over $S \times X$. Thompson sampling with discretization uses one operation that scales as $O(n^2(n_s n_z) + n(n_s n_z)^2 + (n_s n_z)^3)$ in the worst case and to reduce cost special techniques are required e.g. Fourier features, CG matrix inversion.

5 Experiments

We consider synthetic benchmarks, the three applications described in Section 3, and in the SM we also present parallelization results and global optimization

experiments comparing KG variants to other methods. We observe that KG_{MC} performs worse in the same computation time hence we exclude KG_{MC} methods from the conditional experiments.

5.1 Synthetic Functions

We perform low dimensional toy experiments in an ideal setting as a sanity check where the error due to discretizations will be minimal. We use the popular Branin-Hoo and Rosenbrock test functions in 2D corresponding to the (state, action) domain as displayed in Figure 3.

Global Algorithms on Conditional Problems We first modify the synthetic conditional benchmark to construct a range of problems that vary only by the width of the state space. Zero width corresponds to a singleton state space (e.g. $S = \{0\}$ for Rosenbrock) so that the problem reduces to global optimization, whilst a width of one corresponds to the original continuum of states (e.g. $S = [-2, 2]$ for Rosenbrock). We apply expected improvement and hybrid Knowledge Gradient, these acquisition functions aim to find the single global maximum over $S \times X$. We also apply ConBO that tries to find the maximum of each state. All methods use the fitted GP to define the policy, therefore differences are solely due to the acquisition function. Results are in Figure 3. When state space width is zero, all methods achieve near zero opportunity cost (OC), both global and conditional algorithms find the optimal action of the single state. As state space width increases to one, there are increasingly more states to optimize. ConBO consistently achieves near zero total OC over test states. Meanwhile global methods have increasing OC with state space width, these methods prioritise sampling high reward states neglecting the optimization of every state and failing to converge.




Figure 3: Opportunity cost (simple regret) on two synthetic functions with varying state space width. A width of zero reduces the problem to global optimization for which global methods, EI, KG_h , perform well. Increasing state space width to include more states to optimize, the ConBO algorithm performance is consistent while global methods suffer.




Figure 4: Opportunity Cost across a range of synthetic test problems. The dummy baseline, KNN, is worst in all cases, policy gradient is better however the Gaussian process based methods all perform better. UNI and EI are not conditional algorithms yet outperform PEQI. Amongst other conditional algorithms, MTS, REVI and ConBO methods all perform significantly better. ConBO-3 is outperformed by ConBO-5 demonstrating the improvement with more accurate KG_h .

Conditional Algorithms Using the same synthetic functions with full state space width, we consider a uniform and a triangular state distribution $\mathbb{P}[s]$. For baselines, we adopt two policy based methods. **KNN**: randomly collected data, the policy returns the best observed action from 10 nearest neighbor states and serves as a dummy baseline. **PG**: policy gradient, a parametric quadratic policy $\pi_\theta(s)$ is learnt by maximising observed rewards, data collection samples states from $\mathbb{P}[s]$ then ϵ -greedy actions. For a controlled experiment, all BO methods fit a GP defining the policy and only differ by data collection (using a different policy e.g. recommend global optimum x or single x best on average over states, is clearly inferior and we do not investigate it here). **UNI**: random data collection, **PEQI**: given (s, x) , computes 0.75 quantile improvement of (s, x) over highest 0.75 quantile within the same state. **REVI**: discretizes $S \times X$, computes KG_d for each state. **MTS**: discretizes $S \times X$, draws a sample output vector, the state with highest improvement over the policy action for the same state is chosen with the corresponding action. **ConBO-k**: given (s, x) , 20 states are importance sampled, KG_h with $k = 3, 5$ points is used. **EI**: expected improvement, optimization over $S \times X$ treating all inputs as actions, the same as in the previous section.

Results are in Figure 4. Policy based methods KNN and PG consistently perform worse than the Gaussian process methods (which may be viewed as value based as they predict the reward of any state-action pair). Surprisingly, the conditional BO algorithm PEQI performs similarly to UNI and much worse than EI. In all cases, the conditional methods outperform all non-conditional methods.

5.2 CNN Training Hyperparameters

We apply MTS, REVI, and ConBO variants and we adopt the recently proposed kernel used for BO with Common Random Numbers (Pearce et al., 2019),

$$k((s, x), (s', x')) = \sigma_0^2 M(x, x'; \underline{l}) + \delta_{s's} (\sigma_1^2 M(x, x'; \underline{l}) + \sigma_3^2).$$

where $M(x, x'; \underline{l})$ is a Matérn $\frac{5}{2}$ kernel with length scales \underline{l} . The first term models a common trend function across all states and the second term models how each state independently differs from the trend. The differences are composed of another Matérn and the constant kernel to model a global offset e.g. one dataset may have universally lower validation error. This kernel has far fewer parameters than a full multi-task product kernel, it is easy to fit and scales to arbitrary number of states (or datasets) without adding extra parameters.

In this problem setting, learning hyperparameters over similar datasets, one may expect that the optimal hyperparameters would be the same for all datasets. Therefore, as a baseline we apply EI to learn the hyperparameters of the first dataset (state 1). We then evaluate the objective function (validation error) on the rest of the datasets using the best observed hyperparameters from dataset 1, we refer to this as **EI + Transfer**.

Policy Optimization versus Data Optimization: in discrete state settings where the number of states is much lower than the sampling budget $|S| \ll N$, a user may desire to find good observed (stochastic) values \max_y for each state instead of finding $\pi(s) = \arg \max_x \mathbb{E}[f(s, x)]$. Here, we refer to the former as *data optimization* (DO) and the latter as *policy optimization* (PO). For stochastic simulation, PO methods are used to find actions that have reproducible average rewards as the actions will be deployed for




Figure 5: Left: validation error. Centre-left: validation error after 50 samples. Centre-right: validation error after 100 samples. Right: algorithm overhead in seconds. After 50 samples, none of the multi-task models outperform the baseline, EI + Tr (dashed line) suggesting all datasets can use similar hyperparameters. For the larger budget 100, all models outperform the baseline by 0.1% suggesting that for more fine-tuning, each dataset requires different hyperparameters. In all cases, performing data optimization significantly increases performance.

real world use. In neural network training we mainly intend to find a network with good validation error regardless of the hyperparameters as the network will be deployed for real world use, hence DO is preferred. Past work (Pearce and Branke, 2018) showed that a PO method can be used to warm start a DO method by performing PO and reserving samples at the end to allocate one per state with action determined by EI (which is a DO algorithm). This was shown to significantly outperform using a DO algorithm for all samples. We apply this “DO trick” to all algorithms in this experiment.

Results are shown in Figure 5. For the medium budget of 50 samples, ConBO performs best of the standard algorithms yet it is still worse than the baseline. Applying the final round of DO improves all results to match the baseline. For the large budget of 100 samples, all methods outperform the baseline suggesting dataset specific fine-tuning of hyperparameters is required to achieve best results. Again, DO provides a significant boost to performance of all methods.

Gaussian process kernel parameter learning required approximately 2–5 seconds using Tensorflow. In figure 5 (right) we show the run time of each algorithm excluding model fitting and network training, purely acquisition function optimization time. MTS and ConBO-3 are quickest while ConBO-5 increases linearly over ConBO-3 and REVI takes much longer.

In future work we intend to investigate more hyperparameter specific extensions such as early stopping, variable training set size, pretraining etc. In these preliminary experiments we consider the base case and treat the training process as a black box.

5.3 Ambulances and Warehouses

We apply all the methods from Section 5.1 to two benchmarks from the www.SimOpt.org library for simulation optimization problems. The ambulance problem (AMB) consists of a range of cities with different population distributions and one must optimize ambulance base locations for each city. The Assemble-to-order problem (ATO) consists of a range of warehouses that face different demand and for each warehouse the target stock level must be optimized.

Results are shown in Figure 6. Of the policy based methods, PG performs poorly and does not show on the plots whilst KNN performs poorly on AMB and performs well on ATO suggesting AMB is a more difficult problem. Of the GP based methods, EI performs well. Although it is not a conditional algorithm we include it to highlight that sometimes the simplest idea can also work, note that learning the global optimum $\arg \max_{s,x} f(s,x)$ also learns the corresponding part of the policy for the “optimum” state $\pi(s^*)$. However we emphasize that this behaviour will not generalize to other problems as shown by the synthetic results and the premature convergence on the ATO problem. Of the conditional methods, MTS, REVI, and ConBO-3 all perform similarly, either slightly (AMB) or largely (ATO) outperforming UNI. ConBO-5 uses a more accurate acquisition function and is the only method that learns a good policy on both problems. This implies that these problems are more difficult than the synthetics and CNN and truly stress test conditional algorithms.

Parallelization Unique to the conditional setting, one may execute function calls on different states in parallel as long as the states are far apart and there is little interaction. In SM we use sequential batch construction




Figure 6: Left: average journey times across a range of cities. Right : average profit across a range of warehouses. ConBO-5 and EI perform best on these benchmarks.

by penalization (González et al., 2016) for ConBO and observe almost perfect linear scaling in AMB and mixed results on ATO with almost no added computation overhead.

6 Conclusion

We propose ConBO, a simple theoretically grounded algorithm framework for conditional Bayesian optimization. We investigate this method on a range of problems and in all benchmarks compared to state of the art methods ConBO-5 was either best or joint best algorithm providing the most reliable consistent performance, with ConBO-3 a cheaper alternative. We also emphasise the caution required with additive kernels and the conflict of data optimization versus policy optimization.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ayman Boustati for helpful discussions and code review. We are grateful for the emotional feline support of Fred, Tonks, Luna, and her highness Ogden Balmer Von Stropplslouth the Third.

References

- R. Bardenet, Mátyás Brendel, Balázs Kégl, and Michele Sebag. Collaborative hyperparameter tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 199–207, 2013.
- Ian Char, Youngseog Chung, Willie Neiswanger, Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Andrew Oakleigh Nelson, Mark Boyer, Egemen Kolemen, and Jeff Schneider. Offline contextual bayesian optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4629–4640, 2019.
- Youngseog Chung, Ian Char, Willie Neiswanger, Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Andrew Oakleigh Nelson, Mark D Boyer, Egemen Kolemen, and Jeff Schneider. Offline contextual bayesian optimization for nuclear fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01793*, 2020.
- Naijia Anna Dong, David J Eckman, Xueqi Zhao, Shane G Henderson, and Matthias Poloczek. Empirically comparing the finite-time performance of simulation-optimization algorithms. In *2017 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, pages 2206–2217. IEEE, 2017.
- Matthias Feurer, Jost Tobias Springenberg, and Frank Hutter. Initializing bayesian hyperparameter optimization via meta-learning. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- P. Frazier, W. Powell, and S. Dayanik. The knowledge-gradient policy for correlated normal beliefs. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 21(4):599–613, 2009. ISSN 10919856.
- D. Ginsbourger, J. Baccou, C. Chevalier, F. Perales, N. Garland, and Y. Monerie. Bayesian adaptive reconstruction of profile optima and optimizers. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 2(1):490–510, 2014a.
- David Ginsbourger, Jean Baccou, Clément Chevalier, Frédéric Perales, Nicolas Garland, and Yann Monerie. Bayesian adaptive reconstruction of profile optima and optimizers. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 2(1):490–510, 2014b.
- Javier González, Zhenwen Dai, Philipp Hennig, and Neil Lawrence. Batch bayesian optimization via local

- penalization. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 648–657, 2016.
- Matthew Groves, Michael Pearce, and Juergen Branke. On parallelizing multi-task bayesian optimization. In *2018 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, pages 1993–2002. IEEE, 2018.
- José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, James Requeima, Edward O Pyzer-Knapp, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Parallel and distributed thompson sampling for large-scale accelerated exploration of chemical space. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1470–1479. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Deng Huang, Theodore T Allen, William I Notz, and R Allen Miller. Sequential kriging optimization using multiple-fidelity evaluations. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 32(5):369–382, 2006a.
- Deng Huang, TT Allen, WI Notz, and RA Miller. Sequential kriging optimization using multiple-fidelity evaluations. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 32(5):369–382, 2006b.
- Shinkyu Jeong, Mitsuhiro Murayama, and Kazuomi Yamamoto. Efficient optimization design method using kriging model. *Journal of aircraft*, 42(2):413–420, 2005.
- D. R. Jones, M. Schonlau, and W. J. Welch. Efficient global optimization of expensive black-box functions. *Journal of Global optimization*, 13(4):455–492, 1998. ISSN 09255001.
- Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Jeff Schneider, and Barnabás Póczos. High dimensional bayesian optimisation and bandits via additive models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 295–304, 2015.
- Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Gautam Dasarathy, Junier B Oliva, Jeff Schneider, and Barnabás Póczos. Gaussian process bandit optimisation with multi-fidelity evaluations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 992–1000, 2016.
- Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Gautam Dasarathy, Jeff Schneider, and Barnabás Póczos. Multi-fidelity bayesian optimisation with continuous approximations. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 1799–1808. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Jeff Schneider, and Barnabás Póczos. Parallelised bayesian optimisation via thompson sampling. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 133–142, 2018.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Andreas Krause and Cheng S Ong. Contextual gaussian process bandit optimization. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2447–2455, 2011.
- S. Morales-Enciso and J. Branke. Tracking global optima in dynamic environments with efficient global optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 242:744–755, 2015.
- Supratik Paul, Michael A Osborne, and Shimon Whiteson. Contextual policy optimisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10662*, 2018.
- M. Pearce and J. Branke. Efficient information collection on portfolios. Technical report, University of Warwick, 2016.
- Michael Pearce and Juergen Branke. Continuous multi-task bayesian optimisation with correlation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 270(3):1074–1085, 2018.
- Michael Pearce, Matthias Poloczek, and Juergen Branke. Bayesian optimization allowing for common random numbers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09259*, 2019.
- Valerio Perrone, Rodolphe Jenatton, Matthias W Seeger, and Cédric Archambeau. Scalable hyperparameter transfer learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 6845–6855, 2018.
- Victor Picheny and David Ginsbourger. A nonstationary space-time gaussian process model for partially converged simulations. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 1(1):57–78, 2013.
- Matthias Poloczek, Jialei Wang, and Peter I Frazier. Warm starting bayesian optimization. In *2016 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, pages 770–781. IEEE, 2016.
- Matthias Poloczek, Jialei Wang, and Peter Frazier. Multi-information source optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4289–4299, 2017.
- C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2004. ISBN 026218253X.
- Diariétou Sambakhé, Lauriane Rouan, Jean-Noël Bacro, and Eric Gozé. Conditional optimization of a noisy function using a kriging metamodel. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 73(3):615–636, 2019.
- Warren Scott, Peter Frazier, and Warren Powell. The correlated knowledge gradient for simulation optimization of continuous parameters using gaussian process regression. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(3):996–1026, 2011.

- Kate Smith-Miles, Davaatseren Baatar, Brendan Wreford, and Rhyd Lewis. Towards objective measures of algorithm performance across instance space. *Computers and Operations Research*, 45:12–24, 2014. ISSN 03050548. doi: 10.1016/j.cor.2013.11.015. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2013.11.015>.
- Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P Adams. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2951–2959, 2012.
- Saul Toscano-Palmerin and Peter I Frazier. Bayesian optimization with expensive integrands. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08661*, 2018.
- Zi Wang and Stefanie Jegelka. Max-value entropy search for efficient bayesian optimization. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pages 3627–3635. JMLR. org, 2017.
- Jian Wu and Peter I Frazier. Discretization-free knowledge gradient methods for bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06541*, 2017.
- Jing Xie, Peter I Frazier, and Stephen E Chick. Bayesian optimization via simulation with pairwise sampling and correlated prior beliefs. *Operations Research*, 64(2):542–559, 2016.

A Theoretical Results

We restate the theorems from the main paper and provide each proof. Firstly, in Theorem 1 we show that that ConBO with knowledge gradient myopically maximises *Value of Information* in a Bayesian decision theoretic framework. In Theorem 2 we show that in discrete settings ConBO will sample all pairs infinite often. Finally, in Theorem 3 we prove conditions for hybrid KG to satisfy the results of Theorems 1 and 2.

Theorem 1 *Let $(s^*, x^*) = \arg \max \text{ConBO}(s, x)$ be a point chosen for sampling. (s^*, x^*) is also the point that maximises the myopic Value of Information, the increase in predicted policy reward.*

Proof of Theorem 1 Given all the information available at time n , \tilde{X}^n, Y^n and the model $\mu^n(s, s)$, $k^n(s, x, s'x')$, for any given state and action s, x , and a given realization of the true reward function $f()$, in a Bayesian decision theoretic framework, the loss is given by the output of the function

$$\text{Loss}(s, x) = -f(s, x),$$

the expected loss is the risk function

$$\text{Risk}(s, x) = \mathbb{E}[\text{Loss}(s, x) | \tilde{X}^n, Y^n] = \mathbb{E}[-f(s, x) | \tilde{X}^n, Y^n] = -\mu^n(s, x).$$

For convenience we assume conditioning on \tilde{X}^n, Y^n for the remaining equations. The optimal action minimizes risk

$$x^{\text{optimal}} = \arg \min_x \text{Risk}(s, x) = \arg \min_x -\mu^n(s, x).$$

Alternatively, $\pi(s) = \arg \max_x \mu^n(s, x)$ is the Bayesian decision theoretic optimal action given all data available at time n . The total risk is the risk of optimal actions is for all states, or the risk of the policy

$$\text{Total Risk}(n) = - \int_s \max_x \mu^n(s, x) \mathbb{P}[s] ds$$

which is the negative of the models best prediction of true reward given data up to time n where we have made n an explicit argument for convenience. Next assume we are able to collect more data to update the model, choose $(s, x)^{n+1}$ and observe y^{n+1} . The myopic *Value of Information* is defined as the data that minimizes future risk

$$\text{VoI}((s, x)^{n+1}) = -\mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}}[\text{Total Risk}(n+1) | (s, x)^{n+1}] \quad (11)$$

$$(12)$$

Note that that $\arg \max \text{VoI}((s, x)^{n+1})$ is not affected by adding terms that do not depend on $(s, x)^{n+1}$. Thus we may subtract the current Total Risk(n). Finally, the difference between risks simplifies to

$$\mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}} \left[\int_s \max_x \mu^{n+1}(s, x) \mathbb{P}[s] ds \middle| (s, x)^{n+1} \right] - \int_{s'} \max_x \mu^n(s', x) \mathbb{P}[s] ds' \quad (13)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}} \left[\int_s \max_x \mu^{n+1}(s, x) - \max_x \mu^n(s, x) \mathbb{P}[s] ds \middle| (s, x)^{n+1} \right] \quad (14)$$

$$= \int_s \mathbb{E}_{y^{n+1}} \left[\max_x \mu^{n+1}(s, x) | (s, x)^{n+1} \right] - \max_x \mu^n(s, x) \mathbb{P}[s] ds \quad (15)$$

$$= \int_s \text{KG}_c(s; (s, x)^{n+1}) \mathbb{P}[s] ds \quad (16)$$

$$= \text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) \quad (17)$$

Therefore $\arg \max \text{VoI}((s, x)^{n+1}) = \arg \max \text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1})$. \square

Theorem 2 *Let S and X be finite sets and N the budget to be sequentially allocated by ConBO. Let $n(s, x, N)$ be the number of samples allocated to point s, x within budget N . Then for all $(s, x) \in S \times X$ we have that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} n(s, x, N) = \infty$.*

We require some intermediate results, firstly ConBO is non-negative.

Lemma 1 Let $(s, x) \in S \times X$, then $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) \geq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 1

$$\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) = \sum_{s'} \mathbb{E}_Z [\max_{x'} \mu^n(s', x') + \tilde{\sigma}(s', x'; (s, x)^{n+1}) Z] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (18)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s'} \mathbb{E}_Z [\mu^n(s', \pi^n(s')) + \tilde{\sigma}(s', \pi^n(s'); (s, x)^{n+1}) Z] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (19)$$

$$= \sum_{s'} \max_{x'} \mu^n(s', x') + \tilde{\sigma}(s', \pi^n(s'); (s, x)^{n+1}) \mathbb{E}_Z[Z] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{s'} \max_{x'} \mu^n(s', x') - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (21)$$

$$= 0 \quad (22)$$

□

Secondly, we require that $\text{ConBO}(s, x)$ reduces to zero for an infinitely sampled pair. Note that for deterministic $f(s, x)$, the result simplifies to $\text{ConBO}(s, x)$ is zero for any sampled pair.

Lemma 2 Let $(s, x)^{n+1} \in S \times X$ with $n(s, x) = \infty$, then $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 2 Given infinitely many finite variance observations of $f(s, x)$, we have that $\mu^n(s, x) = \mathbb{E}[f(s, x)]$ and posterior variance is zero $k^n(s, x, s, x) = 0$. By the positive definiteness of the kernel we also have that $k^n(s, x, s', x') = 0$ for all $(s', x')^{n+1} \in S \times X$ (see Pearce and Branke (2016) Lemma 3). It follows that $\tilde{\sigma}(s', x'; (s, x)^{n+1}) = 0$ for all $(s', x') \in S \times X$ and thus

$$\text{KG}_c(s'; (s, x)^{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}_Z [\max_{x'} \mu^n(s', x') + \tilde{\sigma}(s', x'; (s, x)^{n+1}) Z] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (23)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_Z [\max_{x'} \mu^n(s, x') + 0 \cdot Z] - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (24)$$

$$= \max_{x'} \mu^n(s, x') - \max_{x''} \mu^n(s', x'') \quad (25)$$

$$= 0 \quad (26)$$

and therefore $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) = \int_s 0 \mathbb{P}[s] ds = 0$. □

Thirdly, we require the inverse of Lemma 2, that points for which $\text{ConBO}(s, x) > 0$ must have non-zero variance $k^n(s, x, s, x) > 0$ (and therefore cannot be infinitely sampled).

Lemma 3 Let $(s, x)^{n+1} \in S \times X$ be a point for which $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) > 0$, then $n(s, x) < \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 3 $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1}) > 0$ implies that there exists an $s \in S'$ such that $\text{KG}_c(s'; (s, x)^{n+1}) > 0$. By the contrapositive of Lemma 3 in Poloczek et al. (2017), we must have that $k^n(s', x', (s, x)^{n+1})$ is *not* a constant function of x' . If $(s, x)^{n+1}$ is infinitely sampled, then $k^n(s', x', (s, x)^{n+1})$ is a constant function of x' , thus $(s, x)^{n+1}$ is not infinitely sampled. □

Finally, combining the previous Lemmas we can complete the proof.

Proof of Theorem 2 By Lemmas 1 and 2, any infinitely sampled points become minima of the function $\text{ConBO}(s, x)$. By construction, the ConBO algorithm choose points at maxima $(s, x)^{n+1} = \arg \max \text{ConBO}(s, x)$. Thus in the infinite budget limit, we have $\text{ConBO}(s, x) = 0$ for all $(s, x) \in S \times X$ by the contrapositive of Lemma 3 we have that $n(s, x) = \infty$ for all points. □

Theorem 3 Let $n_z \geq 2$ and let $\underline{Z} = \{Z_j | j = 1, \dots, n_z\}$. If $0 \in \underline{Z}$ then $\text{KG}_h(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$ and if x is sampled infinitely often $\text{KG}_h(x) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3 First consider the base case $n_z = 2$. Let $\underline{Z} = \{0, Z_2\}$ and given x^{n+1} , let $X^* = \{x_1^*, x_2^*\}$ be the optimal discretization as found by Algorithm 2. Then $x_1^* = \arg \max \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x; x^{n+1}) \cdot 0 = \arg \max \mu^n(x)$

and therefore $\mu^n(x_1^*) = \max_x \mu^n(x)$. Let $\mu^* = \mu^n(X^*)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}^* = \tilde{\sigma}(X^*, x^{n+1})$. Then we have that

$$KG_h(x^{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}_Z [\max\{\mu_1^* + \tilde{\sigma}_1^* Z, \mu_2^* + \tilde{\sigma}_2^* Z\}] - \max_x \mu^n(x) \quad (27)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\max\{\max_x \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}_1^* Z, \mu_2^* + \tilde{\sigma}_2^* Z\} \right] - \max_x \mu^n(x) \quad (28)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_Z \left[\max\{\tilde{\sigma}_1^* Z, \mu_2^* - \max_x \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}_2^* Z\} \right] \quad (29)$$

$$\geq \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}_Z [\tilde{\sigma}_1^* Z], \mathbb{E}_Z [\mu_2^* - \max_x \mu^n(x) + \tilde{\sigma}_2^* Z] \right\} \quad (30)$$

$$= \max \left\{ 0, \mu_2^* - \max_x \mu^n(x) \right\} \quad (31)$$

$$= 0 \quad (32)$$

where we Jensen's inequality in the penultimate line and we use that $\mu_2^* < \max_x \mu^n(x)$ in the final line. The result extends to the case for $n_z > 2$ trivially. The proof for $KG_h(x) = 0$ at infinitely sampled points follows the proof of Lemma 2. \square

B Computing ConBO and Hybrid Knowledge Gradient

Algorithm 1 Computing ConBO. The algorithm requires a new point, discretization sizes, past data and posterior GP functions and an optimizer.

Require: \tilde{x}^{n+1} , n_s , n_z , \tilde{X}^n , Y^n , $\mu^n(s, x)$, $k^n(s, x, s'x')$, σ_ϵ^2 , **Optimizer()**

Precompute and cache $\left(k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{X}^n) + \sigma_\epsilon^2 I\right)^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1})$

$C \leftarrow 0$

for i **in** $1, \dots, n_s$ **do**

$s_i \sim N(s_i | s^{n+1}, \text{diag}(l_s^2))$

$KG_i \leftarrow \text{Algorithm2}(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, s_i, \dots)$

$w_i \leftarrow \mathbb{P}[s_i] / N(s_i | s^{n+1}, \text{diag}(l_s^2))$

$C \leftarrow C + w_i KG_i / n_s$

end for

return C

Algorithm 2 Computing Hybrid Knowledge Gradient. The algorithm requires a new point, a state, a discretization size, past data, posterior GP functions and an optimizer.

Require: \tilde{x}^{n+1} , s , n_z , \tilde{X}^n , Y^n , $\mu^n(s, x)$, $k^n(s, x, s'x')$, σ_ϵ^2 , **Optimizer()**

$\tilde{X}^{n+1} \leftarrow \tilde{X}^n \cup \{\tilde{x}^{n+1}\}$

$X^* \leftarrow \{\}$

Precompute and cache $\left(k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{X}^n) + \sigma_\epsilon^2 I\right)^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1})$

for j **in** $1, \dots, n_z$ **do**

$Z_j \leftarrow \Phi^{-1} \left(\frac{2j-1}{2n_z} \right)$

\tilde{Y}_j^{n+1} from Equation 35

$\mu_j^{n+1}(s, x) \leftarrow \mu^0(s, x) + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^{n+1}) \tilde{Y}_j^{n+1}$

$x_j^* \leftarrow \arg \max_x \mu_j^{n+1}(s, x)$ using **Optimizer()**

$\tilde{X}^* \leftarrow \tilde{X}^* \cup \{x_j^*\}$

end for

$\underline{\mu} \leftarrow \mu^n(s, X^*)$

$\underline{\sigma} \leftarrow \frac{k^n((s, X^*), \tilde{x}^{n+1})}{\sqrt{k^n(x^{n+1}, x^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2}}$

$\text{KG} \leftarrow \text{Algorithm3}(\underline{\mu}, \underline{\sigma})$

return KG

Algorithm 3 Knowledge Gradient by discretization. This algorithm takes as input a set of linear functions parameterised by a vector of intercepts $\underline{\mu}$ and a vector of gradients $\underline{\sigma}$. It then computes the intersections of the piece-wise linear epigraph (ceiling) of the functions and the expectation of the output of the function given Gaussian input. Vector indices are assumed to start from 0.

Require: $\underline{\mu}, \underline{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_A}$

```

 $O \leftarrow \text{order}(\underline{\sigma})$            # get sorting indices of increasing  $\underline{\sigma}$ 
 $\underline{\mu} \leftarrow \underline{\mu}[O], \underline{\sigma} \leftarrow \underline{\sigma}[O]$  # arrange elements
 $\bar{I} \leftarrow [0, 1]$            # indices of elements in the epigraph
 $\tilde{Z} \leftarrow [-\infty, \frac{\mu_0 - \mu_1}{\sigma_1 - \sigma_0}]$  # z-scores of intersections on the epigraph
for  $i = 2$  to  $n_z - 1$  do
    (★)
     $j \leftarrow \text{last}(I)$ 
     $z \leftarrow \frac{\mu_i - \mu_j}{\sigma_j - \sigma_i}$ 
    if  $z < \text{last}(\tilde{Z})$  then
        Delete last element of  $I$  and of  $\tilde{Z}$ 
        Return to (★)
    end if
    Add  $i$  to end of  $I$  and  $z$  to  $\tilde{Z}$ 
end for
 $\tilde{Z} \leftarrow [\tilde{Z}, \infty]$ 
 $\underline{A} \leftarrow \phi(\tilde{Z}[1:] ) - \phi(\tilde{Z}[-1])$            # assuming python indexing
 $\underline{B} \leftarrow \Phi(\tilde{Z}[1:] ) - \Phi(\tilde{Z}[-1])$ 
 $\text{KG} \leftarrow \underline{B}^T \underline{\mu}[I] - \underline{A}^T \underline{\sigma}[I] - \max \underline{\mu}$  # compute expectation
return KG
    
```

B.1 Deriving One-Step Look-ahead Posterior Mean $\mu^{n+1}(s, x)$

At iteration n during optimization, let the training inputs be $\tilde{X}^n = ((s^1, x^1), \dots, (s^n, x^n))$ and the training outputs $Y^n = (y^1, \dots, y^n)$. Given a prior mean and kernels functions, $\mu^0(s, x) : S \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $k^0(s, x, s', x') : S \times X \times S \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Finally let the new sample point be $(s, x)^{n+1} = \tilde{x}^{n+1}$.

Updating the mean function with data from the 0^{th} step to n^{th} step is given by

$$\mu^n(s, x) = \mu^0(s, x) + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n) \underbrace{K^{-1} (Y^n - \mu^0(\tilde{X}^n))}_{\text{define } \tilde{Y}^n} \quad (33)$$

$$= \mu^0(s, x) + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n) \tilde{Y}^n \quad (34)$$

where $K = k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{X}^n) + \sigma_\epsilon^2 I$. $\mu^n(s, x)$ may also be written as a weighted average of a modified $\tilde{Y}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ vector as defined above. Computing the new posterior mean reduces to augmenting $\tilde{X}^n \rightarrow \tilde{X}^{n+1}$ with \tilde{x}^{n+1} and $Y^n \rightarrow Y^{n+1}$ then computing the new $\tilde{Y}^{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Let Z be the z-score of y^{n+1} on its predictive distribution, then

$$\tilde{Y}^{n+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Y}^n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{Z}{\sqrt{k^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2}} \begin{bmatrix} -K^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (35)$$

and the above expression may be used directly in Algorithm 1 with sampled $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$. This is derived by a simple change of indices from $0 \rightarrow n$ and $n \rightarrow n + 1$, yields the one-step updated posterior mean

$$\mu^{n+1}(s, x) = \mu^n(s, x) + \frac{k^n(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1})}{k^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2} (y^{n+1} - \mu^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})). \quad (36)$$

which contains the random y^{n+1} . This may be factorized as follows:

$$\mu^{n+1}(s, x) = \mu^n(s, x) + k^n(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2}}}_{\text{standard deviation of } y^{n+1}} \underbrace{\frac{(y^{n+1} - \mu^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}))}{\sqrt{k^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2}}}_{\text{Z-score of } y^{n+1}} \quad (37)$$

$$= \mu^n(s, x) + k^n(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \frac{1}{\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})} Z \quad (38)$$

$$= \mu^n(s, x) + \tilde{\sigma}(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) Z \quad (39)$$

where the left factor is a deterministic and the right factor is the (at time n) stochastic Z-score of the new y^{n+1} value. This is clear by noting that the predictive distribution of the new output y^{n+1}

$$\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1} | \tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{X}^n, Y^n] = N(\mu^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}), k^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1}, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) + \sigma_\epsilon^2). \quad (40)$$

as a result, to sample new posterior mean functions, we may simply sample $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ values and compute Equation 38. However, this results in a quadratic cost per call to sampled poster mean function as both $k^n(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1})$ and $\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})$ have $O(n^3)$ quadratic cost. This can be easily reduced to linear instead as we now show.

We next focus on the first factor $k^n(s, c, \tilde{x}^{n+1})$ which may also be factorized

$$k^n(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) = k^0(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) - k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n) K^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \quad (41)$$

$$= \underbrace{[k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^n), k^0(s, x, \tilde{x}^{n+1})]}_{k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^{n+1})} \begin{bmatrix} -K^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

Combining Equations 34 and 42 yields the following formula

$$\mu^{n+1}(s, x) = \mu^0(s, x) + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^{n+1}) \left(\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Y}^n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \frac{Z}{\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})} \begin{bmatrix} -K^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (43)$$

$$= \mu^0(s, x) + k^0(s, x, \tilde{X}^{n+1}) \tilde{Y}^{n+1}. \quad (44)$$

The quantity \tilde{Y}^n is pre-computed at the start of the algorithm iteration, the quantity $-K^{-1} k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1})$ has quadratic cost and can be computed once and used again for $\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})$. Then, sampling posterior mean functions reduces to sampling n_y values $z_1, \dots, z_{n_y} \sim N(0, 1)$ and for each value computing $\tilde{Y}_1^{n+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{n_y}^{n+1}$. Then each sampled posterior mean is just the weighted average given by Equation 44.

B.2 Choice of Optimizer()

Since evaluating Equation 44 for many points is simply a matrix multiplication, random search is cheap to evaluate in parallel. After random search, the gradient of Equation 44 with respect to (s, x) is easily computed, and starting from the best random search point, gradient ascent over $x \in X$ can be used to find the optimal action. This varies with kernel choice and application, we describe our settings in Section C.3.

We start with a set of sampled means $\mu_1^{n+1}(s, x), \dots, \mu_{n_z}^{n+1}(s, x)$ and a set of sampled states s_1, \dots, s_{n_s} . For each state s_i , the set of n_z optimal actions X_{d,s_i} is found by optimizing the n_z posterior means

$$X_{d,s_i} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_z} \left\{ \underset{x}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mu_j^{n+1}(s_i, x) \right\}$$

Finally, for each point in the $\{s_i\} \times X_{d,s_i} = \tilde{X}_{d,s_i}$ (state, action) discretization, we evaluate two quantities, firstly the vector of current posterior means $\underline{\mu}_{s_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$,

$$\underline{\mu}_{s_i} = \mu^n(\tilde{X}_{d,s_i}) \quad (45)$$

$$= \mu^0(\tilde{X}_{d,s_i}) + k^0(\tilde{X}_{d,s_i}, \tilde{X}^n) \tilde{Y}^n \quad (46)$$

and the vector of additive updates $\underline{\sigma}_{s_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$,

$$\underline{\sigma}_{s_i} = \frac{k^n(\tilde{X}_{d,s_i}, \tilde{x}^{n+1})}{\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})} \quad (47)$$

$$= k^0(\tilde{X}_{d,s_i}, \tilde{X}^{n+1}) \begin{bmatrix} -K^{-1}k^0(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{x}^{n+1}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sigma_{y^{n+1}}^n(\tilde{x}^{n+1})}. \quad (48)$$

These two vectors $\underline{\mu}_{s_i}$ and $\underline{\sigma}_{s_i}$ are both differentiable $\nabla_{\tilde{x}^{n+1}} \underline{\mu}_{s_i}$ and $\nabla_{\tilde{x}^{n+1}} \underline{\sigma}_{s_i}$ and they are used to analytically compute the peicewise-linear $\mathbb{E}_Z \left[\max \left(\underline{\mu}_{s_i} + Z \underline{\sigma}_{s_i} \right) \right] - \max \underline{\mu}_{s_i}$ which is also differentiable. Thus assuming fixed $\tilde{X}_{d,s_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{d,s_{n_s}}$, approximate gradients are computed and can be used in any stochastic gradient ascent optimizer.

C Implementation Details

C.1 REVI

At iteration n of the algorithm, we used a discretization of size $n_{disc} = 2n$, split equally amongst actions and states $n_s = n_x = \lceil \sqrt{n_{disc}} \rceil$. States are sampled from $\mathbb{P}[s]$ and actions are sampled as a latin hypercube over X . The acquisition function is optimized by 100 points of random search over $S \times X$ followed by Nelder-Mead ascent starting from the best 20 points in the random search phase.

C.2 MTS

We use a target discretization size of $n_{disc} = 3000$. Given d_s states dimensions and d_x action dimensions, we sampled states uniformly, the number of sampled states is given by $n_s = \lceil (n_{disc})^{d_s/(d_s+d_x)} \rceil$ and the number of actions per state is $n_x = \lceil n_{disc}/n_s \rceil$ such that $n_s * n_x \approx n_{disc}$. This way the discretization over all states and action dimensions is roughly constant. For each sampled state s_i , n_x actions are generated in three ways. Firstly, the policy is evaluated $x_{s_i}^\pi = \pi^n(s_i)$, we generate 40 actions around this policy action. Secondly, we take the 10 nearest neighbor states from the training set, and the points with the 4 largest y values are added to the discretization set with randomly generated neighbors. Finally, remaining actions in the n_x budget come from uniform random sampling over X . Each s_i has a bespoke action discretization. Sampled functions are drawn using the python numpy random normal generate function.

C.3 ConBO

Each sampled posterior mean function was optimized in two steps. For a given state s_i , firstly, the action discretization used by MTS, reduced to 40 points in total was used in parallel random search. The best point was then used in conjugate-gradient ascent for 20 steps.

For optimizing sampled posterior mean functions for which $z_i = 0$, that is $\mu^{n+1}(s, x) = \mu^n(s, x)$, this given by the policy $x_{s_i}^\pi = \pi^n(s_i)$. Since the same, or very similar states, may be used multiple times for different $\text{ConBO}((s, x)^{n+1})$ calls, we may use caching to avoid such repeated policy computation. Whenever the policy is queried for the optimal action for a given state, the final (state, action) pair are stored in a lookup table. Any future calls to the policy function with state s_j can check the lookup table and if very similar states exists use the same action, if a somewhat similar state exists, re-optimize the action, if no similar states exist perform a full optimization as above.

In our experiments, the cache of stored policy calls is wiped clean before any testing, ConBO is not given an unfair advantage at test time. In practical applications, this need not be the case.

C.4 Policy Gradient

The (stochastic) policy was a Gaussian with mean that is a quadratic function of the state and constant variance,

$$\pi_\theta(s) = \mathbb{P}_\theta[x|s] = N(x|s^T A s + B s + C, 0.2^2 I)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_s \times d_s}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x \times d_s}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and $\theta = \{A, B, C\}$. Given a dataset $\{(s, x, y)^i\}_{i=1}^n$, we first rescaled s and x values to the hypercube, and y -values were standardized to have mean 0 and variance 1. First

we used kernel regression to learn a baseline value

$$V(s) = \frac{\sum_i k(s, s^i) y^i}{\sum_i k(s, s^i)}$$

where $k(s, s') = \exp(-0.5(s - s')^2/0.2^2)$. The parameters θ are found by optimizing the expected advantage

$$\text{Expected advantage} = \sum_i \mathbb{P}_\theta[x^i | s^i] (y^i - V(s^i)).$$

At test time, given a state, the mean action is computed from the policy (accounting for rescaling to hypercube and back) and recommended for use.

C.5 CIFAR-10 Hyperparameter Experiment

Parameter Space:

- dropout_1 $\in [0, 0.8]$, linear scale
- dropout_2 $\in [0, 0.8]$, linear scale
- dropout_3 $\in [0, 0.8]$, linear scale
- learning_rate $\in [0.0001, 0.01]$, log scale
- beta_1 $\in [0.7, 0.99]$, log scale
- beta_2 $\in [0.9, 0.999]$, log scale
- batch_size $\in [16, 512]$, log scale

Network architecture:

```
x_in = Input(shape=(32, 32, 3))

x = Conv2D(filters=64, kernel_size=2, padding='same', use_bias=False)(x_in)
x = BatchNormalization()(x)
x = Activation("relu")(x)
x = MaxPooling2D(pool_size=2)(x)
x = Dropout(dropout_1)(x)

x = Conv2D(filters=32, kernel_size=2, padding='same', use_bias=False)(x)
x = BatchNormalization()(x)
x = Activation("relu")(x)
x = MaxPooling2D(pool_size=2)(x)
x = Dropout(dropout_2)(x)

x = Flatten()(x)
x = Dense(256, activation='relu')(x)
x = Dropout(dropout_3)(x)
x_out = Dense(2, activation='softmax')(x)

cnn = Model(inputs=x_in, outputs=x_out)

adam = optimizers.Adam(learning_rate=learning_rate,
                        beta_1=beta_1,
                        beta_2=beta_2)
cnn.compile(loss='categorical_crossentropy',
            optimizer=adam,
            metrics=['accuracy'])
```


D Batch Construction by Sequential Penalization

For global optimization, parallelizing BO algorithms to suggest a batch of q inputs, $\{x^{n+1}, \dots, x^{n+q}\}$, has been approached in multiple ways. For acquisitions functions that compute an expectation over future outcomes $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}]$, (EI, KG, ES, MES), the acquisition value of a batch can be computed using the expectation over multiple correlated outcomes $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}, \dots, y^{n+q}|x^{n+1}, \dots, x^{n+q}]$. This larger q dimensional expectation, effectively looking q steps into the future, must be estimated by Monte-Carlo. At the same time, it is a function of all q points in the batch and must be optimized simultaneously over q times more dimensions X^q . This method of parallelization quickly becomes infeasible for even moderate dimensions and batch sizes. As before, adapting the method to conditional optimisation adds another layer of Monte-Carlo integration over $s \in S$ multiplying the computational cost.

Thompson sampling (TS) randomly suggests the next point to evaluate, x^{n+1} . TS also has the convenient mathematical property that q step look ahead is equivalent to generating q i.i.d samples (Hernández-Lobato et al., 2017; Kandasamy et al., 2018). This property was used by Char et al. (2019) to parallelize MTS.

Alternatively, sequential construction of a batch can be done in $O(q)$ time and we consider the method of González et al. (2016). First x^{n+1} is found by optimizing the chosen acquisition function $x^{n+1} = \arg \max_x \alpha(x)$. The acquisition function is then multiplied by a non-negative penalty function $\phi(x, x^{n+1})$ that penalizes x similar to x^{n+1} . The next point is found by $x^{n+2} = \arg \max_x \alpha(x)\phi(x^{n+1}, x)$, then $x^{n+3} = \arg \max_x \alpha(x)\phi(x^{n+1}, x)\phi(x^{n+2}, x)$ until a batch of q points is constructed. We use the inverted GP kernel as the penalty function

$$\phi((s, x), (s, x)^i) = 1 - \frac{k^0((s, x), (s, x)^i)}{k^0((s, x)^i, (s, x)^i)}.$$

See Figure 7 for an illustration. Previous work (Groves et al., 2018) showed that the conditional optimization setting is well suited to this construction method. Two points on dissimilar states do not interact and if they are both local peaks of the chosen acquisition function $\alpha(s, x)$, then both may be evaluated in parallel. In conditional optimization, the presence of state variables introduces multiple objective functions allowing a batch of points to be more spread out reducing interactions and possible inefficiencies. This can be achieved by penalization thus sidestepping the need for expensive nested Monte-Carlo integration. By contrast, in global optimization all q points are “crammed” into a single state, all interacting with the same objective requiring more care in batch construction techniques.




Figure 7: Left: acquisition function over $S \times X$ with a peak at $(s, x)^{n+1} = (-1.5, 2.5)$, the first point in the batch. Centre: the penalization function that down-weights any point $(s, x) \in S \times X$ according to similarity with $(s, x)^{n+1}$. Right: The product of acquisition and penalization functions, the peak at $(s, x)^{n+2} = (1.6, 3.0)$ is the second point in the batch.

This method for batch construction may be applied to any acquisition function, in our experiments we apply it to REVI and ConBO.

In practice, we optimize the acquisition function using multi start gradient ascent and keep the entire history of evaluations $\{(s_t, x_t, \alpha(s_t, x_t))\}_{t=1}^{\#calls}$. Since this history is very likely to contain multiple peaks, we simply apply the penalization to the set of past evaluations avoiding the need to re-optimize the penalized acquisition function. Therefore, efficiently parallelizing a conditional BO algorithm can be done in just a few additional lines of code.




Figure 8: Algorithm performance on the Assemble To Order (top) and Ambulances (bottom) benchmarks. Serial, parallel 4 and 8.

E Global Optimization

We perform a parameter sweep over the n_z for each KG implementation. As a baseline we consider Thompson Sampling. For test functions we take the popular Branin-Hoo, Rosenbrock and Hartmann6. See Figure 9 for results.

F Entropy Based Methods for Conditional Bayesian Optimization

Given a GP model and a dataset, $\mathbb{P}[x^*|\tilde{X}^n, Y^n]$ is the distribution over the peak of realizations of GP sample functions (abusing notation) $\mathbb{P}[x^*|\tilde{X}^n, Y^n] = \operatorname{argmax}_x GP(\mu^n(x), k^n(x, x'))$. Given a new sample input x^{n+1} , the outcome $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}, \tilde{X}^n, Y^n]$ is also a random variable that is Gaussian. For this section, to reduce cluttering notation, we suppress the dependence on \tilde{X}^n, Y^n . The mutual information between random variables y^{n+1} and x^* is defined as

$$\text{MI}(x) = \int_{x^*} \int_{y^{n+1}} \log \left(\frac{\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}, x^*]}{\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}]\mathbb{P}[x^*]} \right) \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}, x^*] dy^{n+1} dx^* \quad (49)$$

where $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}]$ depends upon x^{n+1} yet we drop it for convenience.

F.1 Entropy Search

The Entropy search algorithm decomposes the above expression using $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}, x^*] = \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}]\mathbb{P}[x^*|y^{n+1}]$ resulting in the following acquisition function

$$\text{ES}(x) = \int_{x^*} \log(\mathbb{P}[x^*]) \mathbb{P}[x^*] dx^* + \int_{y^{n+1}} \int_{x^*} \log(\mathbb{P}[x^*|y^{n+1}]) \mathbb{P}[x^*|y^{n+1}] dx^* \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}] dy^{n+1} \quad (50)$$

$$= H[x^*] - \int_{y^{n+1}} H[x^*|y^{n+1}] \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}] dy^{n+1} \quad (51)$$

where $H[x^*]$ is the entropy of the distribution $\mathbb{P}[x^*]$. For the conditional case, the outcome $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|(s, x)^{n+1}]$ is still a Gaussian random variable, and we measure the mutual information with the peak $x_{s_i}^*$ over actions constrained to a given state $\{s_i\} \times X$ that is $\mathbb{P}[x_{s_i}^*] = \operatorname{argmax}_x GP(\mu^n(s_i, x), k^n(s_i, x, s_i, x'))$. And the conditional entropy search acquisition function is simply

$$\text{ES}_c(s_i; (s, x)^{n+1}) = H[x_{s_i}^*] - \int_{y^{n+1}} H[x_{s_i}^*|y^{n+1}] \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}] dy^{n+1}. \quad (52)$$

F.2 Predictive Entropy Search

We again drop the dependence on x^{n+1} in $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}]$. The Predictive Entropy search algorithm uses an alternative decomposition of the Mutual Information using $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}, x^*] = \mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^*]\mathbb{P}[x^*]$ resulting in the following




Figure 9: The KG by discretization, KG_d , uses n_z random points in the search space X and performs worst by far. KG_{MC} uses n_z samples of the future posterior mean function and performs well on small problems but suffers from unreliable noisy convergence. KG_h consistently outperforms other KG methods and is the most reliable on all problems matching Thompson sampling but still performing worse on the Hartmann6 function. This is in contrast to the conditional setting with multiple states where integrated KG methods outperform Thomson sampling methods.

acquisition function

$$\text{PES}(x) = H[y^{n+1}] - \int_{x^*} H[y^{n+1}|x^*] \mathbb{P}[x^*] dx^*. \quad (53)$$

For the conditional case, the outcome $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|(s, x)^{n+1}]$ is still a Gaussian random variable, and we measure the mutual information with the peak x^* *constrained to a given state s_i* that is as above $\mathbb{P}[x_{s_i}^*] = \arg\max_x GP(\mu^n(s_i, x), k^n(s_i, x, s_i, x'))$. And the conditional predictive entropy search acquisition function is simply

$$\text{PES}_c(s_i; (s, x)^{n+1}) = H[y^{n+1}] - \int_{x_{s_i}^*} H[y^{n+1}|x_{s_i}^*] \mathbb{P}[x_{s_i}^*] dx^* \quad (54)$$

where the expression $H[y^{n+1}|x_{s_i}^*]$ is the (non Gaussian) distribution of y^{n+1} at $(s, x)^{n+1}$ given that the peak of state s_i is at $x_{s_i}^*$.

F.3 Max-value Entropy Search

Max-value entropy search instead measures the mutual information between the new outcome $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|x^{n+1}]$ and the largest possible outcome (again abusing notation) $\mathbb{P}[y^*] = \max_x GP(\mu^n(x), k^n(x, x'))$, the peak value of posterior sample functions. The acquisition function decomposes the mutual information into

$$\text{MES}(x) = H[y^{n+1}] - \int_{y^*} H[y^{n+1}|y^*] dy^* \quad (55)$$

The conditional version measures the mutual information between $\mathbb{P}[y^{n+1}|(s, x)^{n+1}]$ and the largest y value amongst all outcomes with the same state $\mathbb{P}[y_{s_i}^*] = \max_x GP(\mu^n(s_i, x), k^n(s_i, x, s_i, x'))$

$$\text{MES}(s_i, (s, x)^{n+1}) = H[y^{n+1}] - \int_{y_{s_i}^*} H[y^{n+1}|y_{s_i}^*] \mathbb{P}[y_{s_i}^*] dy_{s_i}^* \quad (56)$$