

This is a repository copy of *Hyper-quicksort: energy efficient sorting via the Templar framework for Template Method Hyper-heuristics*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/88239/>

Version: Accepted Version

Conference or Workshop Item:

Swan, Jeremiah and Burles, Nathan John orcid.org/0000-0003-3030-1675 (2015) Hyper-quicksort: energy efficient sorting via the Templar framework for Template Method Hyper-heuristics. In: 39th CREST Open Workshop: Measuring, Testing and Optimising Computational Energy Consumption, 23-24 Feb 2015, UCL.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Hyper-quicksort: energy efficient sorting via the TEMPLAR framework for Template Method Hyper-heuristics

jerry.swan@cs.stir.ac.uk
nathan.burles@york.ac.uk

Motivation

Scalability remains an issue for program synthesis:

- We don't yet know how to generate sizeable algorithms from scratch.
- *Generative* approaches such as *GP* still work best at the scale of *expressions* (though some recent promising results [6]).
- **Formal** approaches require a strong *mathematical background*.
- ... but *human ingenuity* **already** provides a vast repertoire of *specialized algorithms*, usually with known asymptotic behaviour.

Given these limitations, how can we best use **generative hyper-heuristics** to **improve** upon **human-designed algorithms**?

The Template Method Pattern

- The **'Template Method' Design Pattern** [1] divides an algorithm into a *fixed skeleton* with one or more *variant* parts.
- The *fixed* parts *orchestrate the behaviour* of the *variant* parts.
- Example: Quicksort performance depends on the quality of the *pivot*, so we can treat the *pivot function* as a *variant part*:

```
DoubleArray qsort(DoubleArray arr) {  
    double pivot = pivotFn( arr );  
    // ^^^ pivotFn can be varied generatively  
    return qsort( arr.filter( < pivot ) )  
        ++ arr.filter( = pivot )  
        ++ qsort( arr.filter( > pivot ) );  
}
```

Template Method Hyper-heuristics [10]

- So if we can express an algorithmic framework in template method terms, then we can *learn good implementations* for the *variant parts*.
- By ‘good’, we mean ‘biased towards the distribution to which the algorithm is exposed’.
- If our algorithms are *metaheuristics*, this means that they are *not subject to the ‘No Free Lunch’ theorem* [8], since the distribution over problem instances is *biased away from uniform* by the training set.
- Successfully demonstrated this approach to learn more effective GA selection and mutation operators [11, 9].

A framework for generative hyper-heuristics

Generative hyper-heuristics can be specified by:

- A list of **variation points** describing the parts of the algorithm to be automatically generated.
- An **algorithm template** expressing the algorithm skeleton. The template produces a *customized version of the algorithm* from *automatically-generated implementations* of the variation points.
- A **fitness function** to evaluate the customized algorithm.
- An **algorithm factory** that *searches the space of variation points* to produce an *optimized version of the algorithm*.

A functional description

For algorithm with function signature $I \rightarrow O$:

- $VP : (I_1 \rightarrow O_1) \times (I_2 \rightarrow O_2) \times \dots \times (I_n \rightarrow O_n)$.
- $\text{Template} : VP \rightarrow (I \rightarrow O)$.
- $\text{Fitness} : (I \rightarrow O) \rightarrow V$.
- $\text{Factory} : VP \times \text{Template} \times \text{Fitness} \rightarrow (I \rightarrow O)$.

Why a Framework?

Generative HH are *laborious to implement* on a per-case basis, but *non-trivial to generalize*:

- The Factory is typically implemented via GP and is invoked repeatedly ...
- ... but popular GP implementations such as ECJ [3] and PushGP [7] *expect to be the 'top' of the system* ...
- ... hence are not easy to use for generative hyper-heuristics.
- Fitness of one VP depends on the other VPs, so *some fiddly software engineering is required* to enable 'dependency inversion'.
- *Heterogeneous signatures of VPs* needs special handling to retain any notion of type-safety.
- To prevent overfitting, cross-validation should be built-in to the fitness function by default.

Interlude - higher-order functions in Java

```

interface Fun1<Arg, Result> {
    Result apply(Arg arg);
}
interface Fun2<Arg1, Arg2, Result> {
    Result apply(Arg1 arg1, Arg2 arg2);
}

// We can then use functions as parameters
// and return values:
Fun1<Int, String>
compose(Fun1<Int, Double> f, Fun1<Double, String> g) {
    return new Fun1<Int, String>() {
        String apply(Int arg) {
            return g.apply( f.apply( arg ) );
        }
    };
}

```

Core TEMPLAR classes

```
public interface AlgTemplate<I,O> {
    public Fun1<I,O>
    makeAlg( ProgramList programs );
}

public class AlgFactory<I,O> {
    AlgFactory(GPConfig [] variationPointConfigs ,
        AlgTemplate<I,O> template) { ... }

    ProgramList run(FitnessCases<I,O> cases ,
        LossFn<O> lossFn) { ... }
}
```

Trivial example - 'Identity' template

Just executes the generated program for the (sole) variation point:

```

class IdentityTemplate
implements AlgTemplate<Double, Double> {

    public Fun1<Double, Double>
    makeAlg(ProgramList progs) {
        // Wrap the VP in a function:
        return new Fun1<Double, Double>() {
            Double apply(Double arg) {
                return progs.get(0).execute(arg);
            }
        };
    }
}

```

Using TEMPLAR

The end-user only needs to do this¹:

```
// 1. Define an AlgTemplate subclass (previous slide).
// 2. Set up the algorithm-specifics:
AlgTemplate<Double, Double> template = new
    IdentityTemplate();
GPConfig[] vpConfigs={new RationalFunctionConfig();}
FitnessCases trainingSet = ...
FitnessCases testSet = ...

// 3. Invoke TEMPLAR:
ProgramList bestVPs = Templar.trainAndTest(template,
    vpConfigs,
    trainingSet, testSet,
    new RMSLossFn<Double>());
println("best VPs:" + bestVPs);
```

¹These examples describe *all* the code you need to write.

Next simplest example - Composition Template

```

class CompositionTemplate
implements AlgTemplate<Int ,String> {
    Fun1<Int ,String> makeAlg(ProgramList progs) {
        f = new Fun1<Int ,Double>() {
            Double apply(Int arg) {
                return progs.get(0).execute(arg);
            }
        };
        g = new Fun1<Double ,String>() {
            String apply(Double arg) {
                return progs.get(1).execute(arg);
            }
        };
        // this template just composes
        // the two variant programs ...
        return compose(f,g);
    }
}

```

HyperQuicksort

- Just follow the above steps for *any* algorithm you wish to optimize.
- We'll see how easy it is to create 'Hyper-quicksort' ...

HyperQuicksort - Pivot Function

```

abstract class PivotFn
extends Fun2<DoubleArray , Intger , Double>{
    Double apply(DoubleArray a, Int recursionDepth);
}
class SedgewickPivotFn extends PivotFn {
    // counters the case of sorted
    // (or reverse-sorted) input
    Double apply(DoubleArray a, Int recursionDepth){
        return median(a.first , a[a.length/2], a.last);
    }
}

Int quicksort(DoubleArray a, PivotFn pivotFn);
// ^ instrumented to return some measure
// of pivotFn fitness (e.g. max recursion depth)

```

HyperQuicksort - Alg Template

```

class QuicksortTemplate
implements AlgTemplate<DoubleArray, Int> {
    Fun1<DoubleArray, Int> makeAlg(ProgramList progs) -> {
        PivotFn pivotFn = (DoubleArray a, Int recursionDepth)
            -> {
                int progResult = progs[0].execute(a.size,
                    recursionDepth);
                int numSamples = min(abs(progResult), a.size);
                return median(randomSample(a, numSamples));
            };
        return (DoubleArray arg) -> Quicksort.sort(arg,
            pivotFn);
    }
}

```


HyperQuicksort - Top Level

```

// 1. Define an AlgTemplate subclass (previous slide).
// 2. Configure GP to generate pivotFn VP:
List<Var> vars = {Var("size"), Var("recursionDepth")};
List<Node> funcSet = {IfFn(), LessFn(), AddFn(), ...};
GPPParams params = ... // crossover, selection etc
GPConfig vpConfigs={new GPConfig(funcSet, vars, params);}

// 3. Invoke TEMPLAR
AlgTemplate<Double, Double> template = new
    QuicksortTemplate();
FitnessCases trainingSet = ...
FitnessCases testSet = ...
Templar.trainAndTest(template, vpConfigs, trainingSet,
    testSet, new RMSLossFn<Double>());

```

Wait - there's more . . .

- Manual creation of GP nodes for function sets on custom solution representations (e.g. Timetable, RoutePlan, AntTrail etc) is tedious.
- Following [2], `Templar.FunctionSetGenerator` uses reflection to **automatically build a function set** from *any* Java object.
- By this means, a hyper-heuristic for *Iterated Local Search over bitstrings* was up and running from scratch **in under 20 minutes**
- By following the above steps, it's quick and easy to create a template for **your favourite algorithm here**.
- All you need now is *lots of CPU time . . .*


Experiment - Setup

- EpochX for GP.
- JALEN [5] for power measurement.
 - Monitors execution time and processor utilisation to estimate power consumption.
 - Non-deterministic (e.g. other processes), and accuracy limited by platform (up to nanosecond).
 - Multiple arrays need to be sorted for each measurement (100).
 - Oracular pivot function.


Experiment - Pipeorgan Distribution [4]

Training set size: 70 (* 100).

Testing set size: 100 (at 9 different array lengths, * 1000).



Results



Results - Table

Array size	Middle index			Sedgewick			Hyper-quicksort (J)
	J	p	e	J	p	e	
8	0.191	7.46e-32	0.981	0.163	8.37e-32	0.980	0.094
16	0.296	1.20e-30	0.971	0.345	1.25e-31	0.979	0.173
32	0.651	8.13e-32	0.980	0.757	7.25e-32	0.981	0.410
64	1.366	4.80e-33	0.990	1.145	1.68e-30	0.970	0.976
128	3.505	4.80e-33	0.990	4.034	4.14e-33	0.991	2.341
256	8.175	4.14e-33	0.991	7.646	3.41e-32	0.983	6.387
512	19.777	4.33e-34	0.998	21.391	3.62e-34	0.999	15.268
1024	62.961	2.52e-34	1.000	42.508	6.44e-33	0.989	33.012
2048	198.438	2.52e-34	1.000	132.663	2.52e-34	1.000	70.234

Array size	Random index		
	J	p	e
8	0.446	8.37e-32	0.980
16	0.410	8.37e-32	0.980
32	0.967	4.80e-33	0.990
64	1.708	4.80e-33	0.990
128	5.221	2.52e-34	1.000
256	9.269	8.87e-34	0.996
512	27.685	2.52e-34	1.000
1024	41.245	3.61e-32	0.983
2048	111.894	3.47e-33	0.991

Experiment - Conclusions

- P-values (Mann-Whitney U-test) and effect sizes (Vargha-Delaney \hat{A}_{12}) clearly show Hyper-quicksort provides significant improvement on pipeorgan distributions.
- Intermediate results showed that minimal recursion doesn't always equate to minimal power consumption, as pivot function becomes more demanding.
- Imprecision and non-determinism of power measurement imposes time constraints on experimentation.

Conclusion and Future Work

- Algorithms can be decomposed into *templates* consisting of a fixed skeleton and a collection of variant components.
- By judicious choice of function signatures, we can use generative methods (GP etc) to create variant components that are tuned to some target distribution.
- In implementation terms, TEMPLAR makes **generative HH for any algorithm** a matter of **GP parameter tuning**.
- New methods of power consumption modelling are in development. . .

References I



Erich Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, and John Vlissides.

Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software.

Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 1995.



Simon M. Lucas.

Exploiting reflection in object oriented genetic programming. In Maarten Keijzer, Una-May O'Reilly, Simon Lucas, Ernesto Costa, and Terence Soule, editors, *Genetic Programming*, volume 3003 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 369–378. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.

References II



Sean Luke, Liviu Panait, Gabriel Balan, and Et.
ECJ 16: A Java-based Evolutionary Computation Research
System, 2007.



M. Douglas McIlroy.
A killer adversary for quicksort.
Softw., Pract. Exper., 29(4):341–344, 1999.



Adel Nouredine, Aurelien Bourdon, Romain Rouvoy, and
Lionel Seinturier.
Runtime monitoring of software energy hotspots.
In *27th IEEE/ACM Int. Conf. on Autom. Softw. Eng. 2012*,
pages 160–169. IEEE, 2012.

References III



Lee Spector, Kyle Harrington, and Thomas Helmuth.

Tag-based modularity in tree-based genetic programming.

In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, GECCO '12, pages 815–822, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.



Lee Spector, Jon Klein, and Maarten Keijzer.

The Push3 execution stack and the evolution of control.

In Hans-Georg Beyer et al, editor, *GECCO 2005: Proceedings of the 2005 conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, volume 2, pages 1689–1696, Washington DC, USA, 25-29 June 2005. ACM Press.

References IV



John Woodward and Jerry Swan.

Why classifying search algorithms is essential.

In 2010 International Conference on Progress in Informatics and Computing. (PIC-2010), 2010.



John R. Woodward and Jerry Swan.

The automatic generation of mutation operators for genetic algorithms.

In Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation conference companion, GECCO Companion '12, pages 67–74, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.

References V



John R. Woodward and Jerry Swan.

Template method hyper-heuristics.

In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference Companion on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Companion*, GECCO Comp '14, pages 1437–1438, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.



John Robert Woodward and Jerry Swan.

Automatically designing selection heuristics.

In *Proceedings of the 13th annual conference companion on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, GECCO '11, pages 583–590, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.