Simulated Annealing using Hybrid Monte Carb

R.Salazar¹, R.Toral^{1;2}

(1) D epartam ent de F sica, U niversitat de les Illes Balears
(2) Instituto M editerraneo de Estudios A vanzados (IM ED EA, U IB-C SIC)
07071 Palm a de M allorca, Spain.

M arch 23, 2024

A bstract

W e propose a variant of the Sim ulated Annealing m ethod for optim ization in the multivariate analysis of di erentiable functions. The m ethod uses global actualizations via the H ybrid M onte C arlo algorithm in their generalized version for the proposal of new con gurations. W e show how this choice can improve upon the perform ance of simulated annealing m ethods (m ainly when the number of variables is large) by allowing a more elective searching scheme and a faster annealing schedule.

KEYW ORDS: Simulated Annealing. Hybrid Monte Carlo. Multivariate minimization.

1 Introduction

An important class of problem s can be formulated as the search of the absolute minimum of a function of a large number of variables. These problem s include applications in diment function as Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Economy, Computer Design, Image processing, etc.[1]. Although in some occasions, such as the NP-complete class of problem s[2], it is known that no algorithm can surely ind the absolute minimum in a polynomial time with the number of variables, some very successful heuristic algorithms have been developed. Amongst those, the Simulated Annealing (SA) method of Kirkpatrick, G elatt and Vecchi[3], has proven to be very successful in a broad class of situations. The problem can be precisely de ned as inding the value of the N {dimensional vector x ($x_1; x_2; ...; x_N$), which is an absolute minimum of the real function E (x). For large N, a direct search method is not elective due to the large con guration space available. Moreover, more sophisticated methods, such as downhill simplex or those using the gradient of E (x) [4], are likely to get stuck in local minimum and, hence, might not able to reach the absolute minimum.

SA is one of them ost e ective m ethods devised to overcom e these di culties. It allow sescaping from localm in in a through tunnelling and also by accepting higher values of E(x) with a carefully chosen probability [3]. The m ethod is based on an analogy with Statistical Physics: the set of variables $(x_1; :::; x_N)$ form the phase space of a ctitious physical system. The function E(x) is considered to be the system 's energy and the problem is reduced to that of nding the ground state con guration of the system. It is known that if a system is heated to a very high tem perature T and then it is slow by cooled down to the absolute zero (a process known as annealing), the system will no itself in the ground state. The cooling ratem ust be slow enough in order to avoid getting trapped in some m etastable state. At tem perature T, the probability of being on a state with energy E (x) is given by the G ibbs factor:

$$P(x) / exp(E(x)=T):$$
 (1)

From this relation we can see that high energy states can appear with a nite probability at high T. If the tem perature is lowered, those high energy states become less probable and, as T ! 0, only the states near the minimum of E (x) have a non {vanishing probability to appear. In this way, by appropriately decreasing the tem perature we can arrive, when T ! 0, to the (absolute) minimum energy state. In practice, the method proceeds as follows: at each annealing step k there is a well de ned tem perature T (k) and the system is let to evolve long enough such that it therm alizes at tem perature T (k). The tem perature is then lowered according to a given annealing schedule T (k) and the process is repeated until the tem perature reaches T = 0.

To completely specify the SA method, one should give a way of generating representative con gurations at temperature T, and also the variation of the temperature with annealing step, T (k). For the generation of the congurations, the M onte C arlomethod (M C) is widely used [5, 6, 7]. M C introduces an stochastic dynamics in the system by proposing conguration changes $x \, \cdot \, x^0$ with probability density function (pdf) $g(x^0 j_x)$, i.e., if the system variables adopt presently the value x, the probability that the new proposed value lies in the interval $(x^0; x^0 + dx^0)$ is $g(x^0 j_x) dx^0$. This proposal is accepted with a probability $h(x^0 j_x)$. M uch freedom is allowed in the choice of the proposal and acceptance probabilities. A su cient condition in order to guarantee that the G ibbs distribution is properly sampled, is the detailed balance condition:

$$g(x^{0}\dot{x})h(x^{0}\dot{x})\exp(E(x)=T) = g(x\dot{x}^{0})h(x\dot{x}^{0})\exp(E(x^{0})=T)$$
: (2)

O noe the proposal pdfg $(x^0 \dot{x})$ has been conveniently specied, the acceptance probability h $(x^0 \dot{x})$ is given as a convenient solution of the previous detailed balance equation. U sually (see next section) the proposal probability $g(x^0 \dot{x}) = g(x)$ is a symmetric function of the difference $x = x^0 = x$, g(x) = g(-x) and a commonly used solution to the detailed balance equation is the M etropolis choice:

$$h(x^{0}x) = m in (1; exp[(E(x^{0}) E(x)) = T]);$$
 (3)

although other solutions have been also widely used in the literature.

The various SA m ethods di eressentially in the choice of the proposal probability g(x) and the annealing schedule T (k). O ne can reason that the cooling schedule T (k) m ight not be independent of the proposal probability g(x), i.e. T (k) should be chosen consistently with the selected g(x) in such a way that the con guration space is e ciently sampled. In the next section we brie y review the main choices used in the literature. W e mention here that most of them involve only the change of one single variable x_i at a time, i.e. they consist generally of small local moves. N of these local moves constitute what is called a M onte C arlo Step (M C S). The reason for using only local moves is that the acceptance probability given by (3) is very small if all the variables are random ly changed at once, because the change in energy $E(x^0) = (x)$ is an extensive quantity that scales as the number of variables N. Hence, the acceptance probability near a m inim um of E(x) becomes exponentially small. Since x is a small quantity, the cooling schedule must be consequently small, because a large cooling rate would not allow the variables to therm alize at the given tem perature. It is then conceivable that the use of a global update schem e could in prove upon the existing m ethods by allow ing the use of larger cooling rates.

In this paper we investigate the e ect of such a global update dynam ics. Speci cally, we use the

Hybrid M onte C arb (HM C) algorithm [8] for the generation of the representative congurations at a given temperature. By studying some examples, we show that the use of this global dynamics allows quite generally an exponentially decreasing cooling schedule, which is the best one can probably reach with other methods. A nother advantage of the use of the HM C is that the number of evaluations of the energy function E(x) is greatly reduced. Finally, we mention that the use of a generalized HM C [9, 10] allows to treat e ciently minimization problems in which the range of variation is different for each variable.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in section II we brie y review some of the existing SA methods; in section III we explain how to implement Hybrid M onte Carlo in an optimization problem; in section IV we use some standard test functions to compare our method with previous ones; and in section V we end with some conclusions and outlooks.

2 Review of Simulated Annealing Methods

Am ongst the m any choices proposed in the literature, we mention the following:

-Boltzm ann Simulated Annealing (BSA) [11]: Based on a functional form derived for many physical systems belonging to the class of Gaussian-Markovian systems, at each annealing step k the algorithm chooses a proposal probability given by local moves governed by a Gaussian distribution:

$$g(x) = \exp - \frac{j x j^2}{2T (k)} :$$
(4)

The M etropolis choice (3) is then used for the acceptance. This choice for the proposal probability and the use of purely local m oves in ply that the annealing schedule m ust be particularly slow: T (k) = $T_0 = \ln(1 + k)$, for some value of the cooling rate .

-Fast Sim ulated Annealing (FSA) [12]: States are generated with a proposal probability that has a G aussian { like peak and Lorentzian long { range tails that im ply occasional long jumps in con guration space. These eventual long jumps make FSA more e cient than any algorithm based on any bounded variance distribution (in particular, BSA). The proposal probability at annealing step k is a N { dim ensional Lorentzian distribution :

g(x) T(k)(jxj² + T(k)²)
$$\frac{N+1}{2}$$
: (5)

O ne of the most signi cant consequences of this choice is that it is possible to use a cooling schedule inversely proportional to the annealing step k, T (k) = $T_0 = (1 + k)$, which is exponentially faster than the BSA.

-Very Fast Simulated Reannealing (VFSR) [13]: In the basic form of this method, the change x is generated using the set of random variables $y = (y_1; :::; y_N)$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i} = (\mathbf{B}_{i} \quad \mathbf{A}_{i})\mathbf{y}_{i}; \tag{6}$$

(A $_{i}$ and B $_{i}$ are the minimum and maximum value of the i{th dimension range). The proposal probability is de ned as

$$g(y) = \frac{Y}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2(jy_i \ j + T_i(k)) \ln (1 + 1 = T_i(k))}}$$
(7)

Notice that di erent tem peratures $T_i(k)$ can be in principle used for the updating of di erent variables x_i . For the acceptance probability, one uses the M etropolis choice (3) with yet another tem – perature $T_0(k)$. This proposal allow s the following annealing schedule: $T_i(k) = T_i(0) \exp((-ik^{\frac{1}{N}}))$, i = 0;1;:::;N, which is not very e cient for large number of variables N. A more detailed description of the VFSR algorithm can be found in [13].

-D ownhill Sim plex with Annealing (D SA) [4]: This method combines the D ownhill Sim plex (D S) method (which is basically a searcher for local minima) with a Metropolis like procedure for the acceptance. The D S sam ples the conguration space by proposing moves of the \sim plex". A sim plex being a geometrical gure with N + 1 vertices in the N {dimensional phase space. The moves are usually rejections, expansions, and contractions. The acceptance part is implemented by adding logarithmically distributed random variables proportional to the temperature to the energy before the move and subtracting a similar random variable after the move. The move is accepted if the energy difference is negative. A coording to reference [4] different annealing schedules T (k) should be used for different problems. In the implementation we have made of this method (see section IV) an exponential decay has been used.

3 Hybrid Simulated Annealing

The alternative method we propose {Hybrid Simulated Annealing (HSA) { uses the Hybrid M onte Carlo (HMC)[8] in their generalized version [9, 10] to generate the representative con gurations.

We rst review the HMC method.

In its simplest and original form, HMC introduces a set of auxiliary momenta variables p $(p_1; :::; p_N)$ and the related H am iltonian function H (x; p):

H (x;p) = E (x₁;:::;x_N) +
$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} p_{i}^{2} = E(x) + p^{2}=2:$$
 (8)

From the Gibbs factor:

$$P(x;p) / exp[H(x;p)=T] = exp[E(x)=T]exp[p^2=2T];$$
 (9)

we deduce that, from the statistical point of view, the momenta p are nothing but a set of independent, G aussian distributed, random variables of zero mean and variance equal to the system tem perature T. There is no simple closed form for the proposal probability $g(x^0\dot{x})$, and the proposal change x ! x^0 is done in the following way: rst, a set of initial values for the momenta p are generated by using the G aussian distribution exp[$p^2=2T$] as suggested by the equation (9); next, H am ilton's equations of motion, $x_i = p_i$, $p_i = F_i$, where $F_i(x) = 0$ (E (x)=0x_i is the \force" acting on the variable x_i , are integrated numerically using the leap{frog algorithm with a time step t:

$$x_{i}^{0} = x_{i} + tp_{i} + \frac{t^{2}}{2}F_{i}(x)$$
(10)
$$p_{i}^{0} = p_{i} + \frac{t}{2}F_{i}(x) + F_{i}(x^{0}); \qquad i = 1; ...; N:$$

The proposal x^0 is obtained after n iterations of the previous basic integration step. In other words: by num erical integration of H am ilton's equations during a \time" n t. The value x^0 m ust now be accepted with a probability given by:

$$h(x^{0}x) = m in (1; exp[(H(x^{0}; p^{0}) H(x; p)) = T]):$$
(11)

Notice that this acceptance probability uses the total H am iltonian function H (x;p) instead of simply the function E (x) as in the m ethods of last section (com pare (11) and (3))[14]. A lthough H am ilton's equations exactly conserve the energy $H_{-}=0$, the di erence H H (x $^{0};p^{0}$) H (x;p) is not equal to zero due to the nite time step discretization errors and one has quite generally H = 0 (N t¹) for some value of 1. In this way, although the m apping is a global one, i.e. all the variables are updated at once, it is still possible to have an acceptance probability of order unity by properly choosing the time step t and one can have large changes in phase space at a sm all cost in the H am iltonian. Notice that the H am iltonian di erence H being sm all, does not necessarily im ply that E is sm all and once can in principle accept m oves which in ply a large change in the energy E (x).

In order to generate con gurations at temperature T, one still must satisfy the detailed balance condition, equation (2). One can prove that su cient requirements for this detailed balance condition to hold are that the mapping given by eqs.(10) satis es time reversibility and area preserving [16]. These two properties are exactly satis ed by H am ilton's equations and are also kept by the leap { frog integration scheme. Under those conditions, the G ibbs distribution (1) for the original variables x is properly sampled. It is possible to further generalize the HMC method by using more generalm appings satisfying the conditions of time reversibility and area preserving. In reference [10] \pm was shown that those conditions were satis ed by the mapping induced by n iterations of the follow ing basic step:

$$x_{i}^{0} = x_{i} + t \sum_{j=1}^{X^{N}} A_{ij} p_{j} + \frac{t^{2}}{2} \sum_{j;k=1}^{X^{N}} A_{ik} A_{jk} F_{j}(x);$$

$$p_{i}^{0} = p_{i} + \frac{t^{X^{N}}}{2} A_{ji} F_{j}(x) + F_{j}(x^{0});$$

$$i = 1; ...; N;$$

$$(12)$$

where A_{ij} is an arbitrary matrix. This mapping can be thought as the leap { frog num erical integration of the follow ing equations of motion:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x & & & \\ \underline{x_i} & = & A_{ij}p_j; & & (13) \\ \\ \underline{p_i} & = & & A_{ji}F_j; & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array}$$

An straightforward calculation shows that these equations, although not being H am iltonian, still conserve energy, $H_{-} = 0$, and the main features m entioned above of the standard HMC m ethod are still m aintained. Convenient choices for matrix A_{ij} are: diagonal in Fourier space (Fourier acceleration), or a diagonal matrix: $A_{ij} = A_{i \ ij}$. This last choice allows an elective integration time step $t_i = A_i$ t dilement for each variable (com pare with (10)):

$$x_{i}^{0} = x_{i} + t_{i}p_{i} + \frac{t_{i}^{2}}{2}F_{i}(x); \qquad (14)$$
$$p_{i}^{0} = p_{i} + \frac{t_{i}}{2}[F_{i}(x) + F_{i}(x^{0})]; \qquad i = 1; :::; N$$

The possibility of using di erent time steps for each variable accounts for the fact that the range of variation m ight di er for each variable. This is the case, for instance, of Corana's function (see next section).

Sum m ing up, the HMC proceeds by generating representative con gurations by using a proposal obtained by some of the mappings given above. This proposal must now be accepted with a probability given by (11). In this paper, we have used mainly the basic mapping given by (10)

except in one case (C orana's function) in which the mapping (14) has been used instead. The tem perature must then be decreased towards zero as in other SA m ethods. Notice that in the case T = 0 the random component of the evolution (the momenta variables) in Eq.(10) is zero and then the proposal coincides with that of gradient m ethods.

The HMC has been extensively used in problem s of Statistical Physics[17]. For our purpose here, we have found that the use of the previous H am iltonian based global update of the statistical system associated with the energy E (x), allows a much more elective annealing schedule and searching scheme than, for instance, the Boltzm ann, Fast annealing and Very Fast Reannealing methods mentioned above. In particular we have been able to use quite generally an exponential annealing schedule: T (k) = T_0e^{-k} . Moreover, since in HMC the acceptance decision is taken after all the N variables have been updated, the number of energy function evaluations is greatly reduced. This turns out to be important in those problems in which the calculation of the energy function E (x) takes comparatively a large amount of computer time.

4 Results

In order to com pare our algorithm with the di erent ones proposed in the literature, we have used a set of ve test functions: a multidim ensional paraboloid, a function from De Jong's test[18], Corana's highly multi{modal function [19] and two other functions with many local minima. We now de ne and describe in some detail these functions.

The rst function, $f_1(x)$, is a N {dimensional paraboloid:

$$f_{1}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{2}:$$
 (15)

Here we use the test value N = 200 and to compare with the results in [20], we also use the value N = 3. A lthough this is a particularly simple function with a single minimum $f_1 = 0$ located at $x_i = 0$, i = 1 ::: N, it ultimately describes the late stages of the behaviour of the SA algorithm when we are near a local or global minimum of any dimensional function.

The second function, $f_2(x)$, is a two dimensional (N = 2) function taken from De Jong's test

typically used for benchm arking G enetic A lgorithm s[18]:

$$f_{2}(\mathbf{x}) = {}^{4} 0.002 + {}^{\chi^{25}}_{j=1} [j + (\mathbf{x}_{1} \ a_{j})^{6} + (\mathbf{x}_{2} \ b_{j})^{6}]^{15};$$
(16)

where the vectors a, b have the following 25 components:

this function has 25 localm inim a, and the globalm inim um is $f_2 = 0.998004$, at $x_1 = x_2 = -32$.

The $f_3(x)$ function is the Corana's function:

$$f_{3}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} x^{N} < 0.15 \ (0.05 \ \text{sgn} \ (z_{i}) + z_{i})^{2} \ d_{i} & \text{if } \dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \ z_{i} \mathbf{j} < 0.05 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{d}_{i} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{2} & \text{otherw ise} \end{cases}$$
(17)

 $z_i = 0.2 \text{ b} \cdot \overline{y} x_i \cdot \overline{j} + 0.49999 \text{csgn}(x_i)$ (18)

 d_i is an N {dimensional vector. In our tests (and following [20] we have used N = 10 and d = (1;1000;10;100;1;1000;10;100;1;1000). This function, which has many local minima and is discontinuous and piecewise di erentiable, turns out to be one of the most di cult test functions, because the di erent variables have di erent scales of variation. The global minimum is $f_3(x) = 0$, at $x_i = 0$, i = 1 ::: N.

The $f_4(x)$ function is de ned by:

$$f_4(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\sin (4 K \mathbf{x}_i)}{\sin (2 \mathbf{x}_i)};$$
(19)

with N = 200, K = 2. This function is periodic and has $(2K 1)^N$ local minima per period. The absolute minima are at $x_i = (2m + 1)=2$, m 2 Z, i = 1:::N, and the minimum value is $f_4(x) = K$ (see gure 1).

And, nally, the $f_5(x)$ function is de ned by:

$$f_{5}(x) = \frac{\dot{x}^{N}}{\dot{x}_{ij}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \cos(4 x_{i}); \qquad (20)$$

with N = 10 and = 1:3. Again, this function has many local minima. The absolute minimum is $f_5 = 1$ at $x_i = 0$, i = 1 ::: N.

W e present results of the optim ization of these typical test functions perform ed with the methods described above: Fast Simulated Annealing (FSA), Very Fast Simulated Reannealing (VFSR), Downhill Simplex with annealing (DSA) and the Hybrid Simulated Annealing (HSA). Am ongst other quantities, we have focused, as usual in this eld, on the num ber of evaluations of the function and the CPU time needed to achieve a given accuracy in the minimum value of each function. These minimum values being exactly known for the test functions used. The results are summarized in tables (1) and (2) after averaging over 10 realizations. An accuracy value of $= 10^{-3}$ has been used, although sim ilar results hold for other values of . We have program med the algorithm s for the FSA, DSA and HSA methods, whereas the results for VFSR have been taken directly from [20]. For a given test function, we have used the same initial condition, $x_{initial}$, for each method. As a general trend, we can see that HSA perform sbetter than the otherm ethods when the num ber of variables N is large. This does not imply that HSA perform sextrem ely worse for sm all values of N . An important advantage of HSA in front of other m ethods is that the num ber of function evaluations is much smaller (in table (1) the number of function evaluations includes also the calculation of the forces necessary in the HSA method). This might turn out to be very important in those problem s in which the function evaluation takes a long computer time. We now report in som e detail the results of each test function:

As mentioned before, the f_1 function, a parabolic function with a single minimum, serves to model the behavior close to a minimum of any function, i.e. the situation for low enough temperature. W hen the number of variables is small, N = 3, it turns out that the fastest method (in the sense that it reaches the minimum in less computer time) is D SA although H SA needs less function evaluations. However, when the number of variables is large, N = 200, the cost in CPU time and number of function evaluations is very favorable to H SA. In general, the perform ance of the D SA method worsens when the problem has many minima. This is obvious when looking at the results for the D e Jong's f_2 , the C orana f_3 and the f_4 functions for which the D SA could not even nd the absolute minimum.

The f_2 function is another example in which the HSA can not o era better alternative than other m ethods, stressing the fact again that for sm all num ber of variables the use of a global actualization turns out to be irrelevant. In this case, VFSR needs less num ber of function evaluations than any other m ethod. How ever, for large num ber of variables N, the cooling schedule required for VFSR is necessarily slow (see the discussion in section 2) m aking it ine cient for large N.

The functions in which the variables have a wide range of variation (for instance Corana's

function f_3) can be better handled using the general version of HSA. Remember that the rescaling in (14) allows an elective integration time step $t_i = A_i$ to different for each variable. So, one can tune A_i to solve electently this kind of problem s. In our case, the range of variation of the variables come essentially from the part V (x) = $d_i x_i^2$ of the C orana's function. Then, from the equations of motion $\underline{x}_i = A_i p_i$ and $\underline{p}_i = A_i F_i$ we have $x_i = A_i^2 F_i$. The force is $F_i = 2 d_i x_i$ and we have $x_i = A_i^2 d_i x_i$, so we chose $A_i = \frac{1}{d_i}$ in order that each variable has the same elective time scale for evolution.

The f_4 and f_5 functions have the feature of possessing a large number of minima (for example, f_4 has $(2K \quad 1)^N$ local minima in a period). The results show again that HSA is a much better alternative when the number of variables is large, both from the point of view of CPU time used or the number of function evaluations. We have chosen the f_4 function to compare in gure (2) the evolution of the minimum value of the function with the actual number of function evaluations, for both the FSA and HSA methods, showing again in a different manner that HSA can india better minimum with a less number of function evaluations. From the results for these functions we infer that in minimization problems with a large number of variables and a large number of local minima, the HSA has the best performance. Needless to say, we have made our best e ort to use the optimal values for the parameters in each method. It is possible, though, that these values could be further in proved and the results of tables (1) and (2) slightly modi ed. We believe, though, that this will not a lect the main conclusions of this paper.

5 Conclusions

We have shown by some examples how the use of the global update using Hybrid M onte Carlo algorithm can indeed in prove the perform ance of simulated annealing m ethods. The global updating implicit in HSA allows an elective searching scheme and fast annealing schedules and becomes highly elective, mainly in those problems with a large number of variables and a large number of m etastable minima.

It is clear from the results in the previous section that HSA requires in some cases orders of m agnitude less evaluations of the function than other m ethods and can, therefore, give a solutions in less computer time. This conclusion remains despite the fact that HSA requires some extra work when computing the evolution equations since it needs to compute also the forces F_i acting on

the di erent variables. In those cases in which the evaluation of the function takes a considerable am ount of computer time, HSA will have an optim alperform ance, since the number of function evaluations is greatly reduced as compared to other simulated annealing methods. It is conceivable also that one could then use e ciently some of the acceleration schemes (Fourier, wavelet, etc.) available for M onte C and methods in order to improve upon the convergence of the simulated annealing techniques. Further developments include applying HSA to techniques such as the C ar{P arrinello method for noting the ground state of quantum many body systems, for which the calculation of the energy function is very time consuming. W ork on this direction is under progress.

ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

W e wish to thank J. Rubio and M. Planas for several discussions. W e acknowledge nancial support from DGICyT, grants PB94-1167 and PB94-1172. R. Salazar is supported by the Agencia E sparola de Cooperacion Internacional in the Mutis program.

References

- [1] P.J.M. van Laarhoven and E.H.L. Aarts. Simulated Annealing: Theory and Applications.K luwer A cadem ic Publishers, Netherlands, 1988.
- [2] M R G arey and D S Johnson. C om puters and Intractability: A G uide to the Theory of NP { C om pleteness. Freem an, San Francisco, 1979.
- [3] S. Kirkpatrick, Jr. C D. Gelatt, and M P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. Science, 220:671{680,1983.
- [4] W. T. Vetterling W. H. Press, S.A. Teukolsky and B.P. Flannery. Numerial Recipes in FOR-TRAN: the art of scientic computing. Cambridge University, New York, 1994.
- [5] M H.Kalos and PA.W hitlock. Monte Carlo Methods. John W iley and Sons., New York, 1986.
- [6] D. Heerm ann. Computer Simulation Methods. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986.
- [7] K.Binder, editor. The Monte Carlo Method in Condensed Matter Physics. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992.
- [B] S. Duane, A. D. Kennedy, B. J. Pendelton, and D. Roweth. Hybrid monte carlo. Phys. Lett. B, 195:216{222, 1987.
- [9] R. Toral and A.L. Ferreira. Generalized Hybrid Monte{Carlo. In editors R. Gruber, M. Tomasini, editor, Proceedings of the Conference Physics Computing'94, page 265. European Physical Society, Geneva, Switzerland, 1994.
- [10] A L. Ferreira and R. Toral. Hybrid m onte carlo m ethod for conserved {order{parameter system s. Phys. Rev. E, 47 R 3848 {R 3851, 1993.
- [11] S.Germ an and D.Germ an.Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distribution and the bayesian restoration in images. IEEE Trans. Patt. Anan. Mach. Int., 6:721 (741, 1984.
- [12] H. Szu and R. Hartley. Fast simulated annealing. Phys. Lett. A, 3{4:157{162,1987.
- [13] L. Ingber and B. Rosen. Genetic algorithm s and very fast simulated reannealing: A comparison. M athl. Comput. M odelling, 16:87{100, 1992.
- [14] A similar procedure is used in [15] in the context of sampling T sallis statistics. In their method, the conguration energy difference E(x) is used instead of the total H am iltonian difference

H (x) as the acceptance criterion. In general, this procedure does not properly sample the G ibbs distribution, Eq.(1), at temperature T, although it coincides with the one used in this paper as T ! 0.

- [15] I. Andricioaei and JE. Straub. Generalized simulated annealing algorithms using tsallis statistics: Application to conformational optimization of a tetrapeptide. Physical Review E, 53 x 3055 (R 3058, 1996.
- [16] T in e reversibility in plies that the original coordinates are exactly recovered after num erical integration during a time step if the momenta are reversed. A rea preserving in plies that the Jacobian of the mapping (10) is equal to one.
- [17] R. Toral. C om putational Field Teory and Pattern Form ation. In P.L.G arrido and J.M arro, editors, 3rd G ranada Lectures in C om putational Physics, page 1. Springer-Verlag, Heildelberg, 1995.
- [18] K.A.De Jong. An Analysis of the Behavior of a Class of Genetic Adaptive system. PhD thesis, University of Michigan, 1981.
- [19] A.Corana, M.Martini, and S.Ridella. M in in izing multimodal functions of continuous variables with the simulated annealing algorithm. ACM Trans. on M athem atical Software, 13:272 { 280, 1987.
- [20] S.G. Dykes and B.E. Rosen. Parallel very fast simulated reannealing by temperature block partitioning. In IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics. Humans, Information and Technology, pages 1914 (19. IEEE press, New York, USA, 1994.

Function	D im ension	F SA	VFSR	D SA	H SA
f_1	3	480	4875	79	18
f_1	200	8420000	{	474000	30
f_2	2	9900	1476	(*)	165000
f_3	10	2100000	319483	(*)	720000
f_4	200	12925000	{	(*)	163000
f_5	10	7230000	{	570000	118000

Table 1: Number of function evaluations averaged over 10 realizations, for each of the simulated annealing m ethods used for optim ization of the di erent functions to reach the absolute m inim um with an accuracy of $= 10^{-3}$. In those cases m arked (*) it was not possible to reach the absolute m inim um . For the HSA, the displayed number is the number of function evaluations including the calculations of the force.

Function	D im ension	FSA	D SA	H SA
f_1	3	0.023	0.003	0.021
f_1	200	182.898	163.763	0.039
f_2	2	0.181	(*)	5.834
f ₃	10	29.454	(*)	11.730
\mathtt{f}_4	200	1662.177	(*)	61.863
f_5	10	119.434	13 . 929	4.00

Table 2: Sim ilar to table (1) but showing the CPU time (in seconds) needed to reach the absolute m inimum with an accuracy = 10^{-3} for each of the simulated annealing m ethods explained in the text. All the program s were run on a Silicon G raphics O rigin 200 (CPU: R10000 running at 180 M H z, Speed: 15.5 SPEC fp95).



Figure 1: P lot of f_4 function, equation (19) for N = 2, in one period. Notice the presence of m any relative m inim a, but only one absolute m inim um at $x_1 = x_2 = 0.5$.



Figure 2: P lot of "energy" di erence with respect to the ground state value, versus the num ber of function evaluations, for the f_4 function (19) with N = 200 using H SA (dotted line) and F SA (continuous line), both initialized in $x_{initial} = 1.0$, the other parameters have the following values, for FSA: $T_0 = 0.8$, m = 100, = 100; and for H SA: $T_0 = 1.0$, m = 10, n = 10, t = 0.3 = 0.007, where m is the num ber of M C S used for therm alization at tem perature T (k)