

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Locally-informed proposals in Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with applications

Chmiela Bartosz

University of Wrocław

08.07.2022

Contents

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

- 1 Markov chains
- 2 Markov chain Monte Carlo methods
- 3 Traveling salesman problem
- 4 Approximate solutions
- 5 Results
- 6 Conclusions

Markov chain

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition

A Markov chain is a stochastic process describing a sequence on some countable state space S in which the probability of each event depends only on the state of previous event.




Figure: A diagram representing a two-state Markov chain, source: wiki.

Properties

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition (Irreducibility)

A Markov chain is irreducible if there is a possibility to reach every state from every state.

Definition (Periodicity)

A state is periodic if there is a possibility of coming back to it after some period.

Definition (Stationarity)

A probability distribution $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N)$ is called stationary if it satisfies

$$\pi_j = \sum_{i \in S} \pi_i p_{ij},$$

Ergodic chains

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition (Ergodicity)

A Markov chain is ergodic when it is irreducible and aperiodic.

Theorem

Let $\{X_k\}$ be a ergodic Markov chain, then:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} p_{ij}(k) = \pi_j.$$

Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Construct a MC, which has a stationary distribution π ($\pi_i > 0$). Assume that \mathbf{Q} is stochastic matrix which is irreducible, aperiodic and $\mathbf{Q}_{i,j} > 0 \iff \mathbf{Q}_{j,i} > 0$. Let us consider a matrix defined as:

$$\mathbf{P}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}_{i,j} \min \left(1, \frac{\pi_j \mathbf{Q}_{j,i}}{\pi_i \mathbf{Q}_{i,j}} \right) & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1 - \sum_{j \in S \setminus \{i\}} \mathbf{P}_{i,j} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Theorem

A matrix defined in 1 is stochastic, irreducible, aperiodic and has a stationary distribution π .

Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Algorithm Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

- 1: Choose a state $i \in S$.
 - 2: $X_0 \leftarrow i$
 - 3: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 4: Sample $j \sim \mathbf{Q}_i = (\mathbf{Q}_{i,1}, \mathbf{Q}_{i,2}, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_{i,N})$.
 - 5: Sample $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$.
 - 6: **if** $U \leq \min\left(1, \frac{\pi_j \mathbf{Q}_{j,i}}{\pi_i \mathbf{Q}_{i,j}}\right)$ **then**
 - 7: $X_{k+1} \leftarrow j$
 - 8: **else**
 - 9: $X_{k+1} \leftarrow X_k$
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: **end for**
-

Traveling salesman problem

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition (TSP)

Given a list of cities and the distances between each pair of cities, what is the shortest possible route that visits each city exactly once and returns to the origin city?




Figure: Traveling salesman problem, source: wiki.

Traveling salesman problem

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition (Traveling salesman problem)

Given an undirected weighted graph $G = (V, E)$, $|V| = n$ find a permutation σ_{\min} of vertices such that

$$\sigma_{\min} = \arg \min_{\sigma \in S_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_{\sigma(i), \sigma(i+1)} + w_{\sigma(n), \sigma(1)} \right),$$

where S_n is a set of all permutations of vertices and $w_{i,j}$ is distance (weight) between state i and j .

Softmax

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition

For a given vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a softmax function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]^d$ is defined as

$$s(\mathbf{x})_i = \frac{e^{x_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^d e^{x_j}},$$

$$s(\mathbf{x}) = (s(\mathbf{x})_1, s(\mathbf{x})_2, \dots, s(\mathbf{x})_d).$$

$$\sigma_{\min} = \arg \min_{\sigma \in S_n} (w_{\sigma}) = \arg \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{e^{-w_{\sigma}}}{\sum_{\sigma' \in S_n} e^{-w_{\sigma'}}},$$

Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

$$\frac{\pi_j \mathbf{Q}_{j,i}}{\pi_i \mathbf{Q}_{i,j}} = e^{-(w_j - w_i)} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{Q}_{j,i}}{\mathbf{Q}_{i,j}}.$$

$$\log \left(\frac{\pi_j \mathbf{Q}_{j,i}}{\pi_i \mathbf{Q}_{i,j}} \right) = -(w_j - w_i) + \log(\mathbf{Q}_{j,i}) - \log(\mathbf{Q}_{i,j}).$$

Candidates

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Definition

A neighbour σ' of a permutation σ is a permutation, that for some k, l it satisfies $\sigma'(k) = \sigma(l)$, $\sigma'(l) = \sigma(k)$ and $\sigma'(i) = \sigma(i)$ for the rest of indices.

These neighbours are the original tour with two swapped indices. This let us consider a smaller space – there are $\binom{n}{2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \approx n^2$ neighbours if the number of vertices is n .

Random candidates (RN)

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Sample neighbours uniformly. It is equivalent to choosing random indices to swap

Random candidates (RN)

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

When given a tour σ and its neighbour σ' they differ only on those edges where swap is happening, let us say k, l . So for this situation we have tours:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= (\dots, \sigma(k-1), \sigma(k), \sigma(k+1), \dots, \\ &\quad \dots, \sigma(l-1), \sigma(l), \sigma(l+1), \dots) \\ \sigma' &= (\dots, \sigma(k-1), \sigma(l), \sigma(k+1), \dots, \\ &\quad \dots, \sigma(l-1), \sigma(k), \sigma(l+1), \dots)\end{aligned}$$

We need to remove weights $w_{\sigma(k-1), \sigma(k)}$, $w_{\sigma(k), \sigma(k+1)}$, $w_{\sigma(l-1), \sigma(l)}$, $w_{\sigma(l), \sigma(l+1)}$ and add $w_{\sigma(k-1), \sigma(l)}$, $w_{\sigma(l), \sigma(k+1)}$, $w_{\sigma(l-1), \sigma(k)}$, $w_{\sigma(k), \sigma(l+1)}$.

Locally-informed proposals (LIP)

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

The idea is to balance the increase in the probability of neighbour with decrease of reverse probability, such that it will be easy to compute.

$$Q_{i,j} \propto e^{\frac{-(w_j - w_i)}{\tau}}.$$

The distribution is chosen in such a way, so that we can easily group up the terms in acceptance criterion:

$$\frac{\pi_j Q_{j,i}}{\pi_i Q_{i,j}} = e^{-(w_j - w_i)} \cdot \frac{e^{\frac{-(w_i - w_j)}{\tau}}}{e^{\frac{-(w_j - w_i)}{\tau}}} \cdot \frac{C_j}{C_i} = e^{-(w_j - w_i)(1 - \frac{2}{\tau})} \cdot \frac{C_j}{C_i},$$

Example

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Let us set $k = 2$ and $l = 7$, then the set of indices to consider is $\{1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8\}$ and the permutations:

$$\sigma = (1, \mathbf{2}, 3, 4, 5, 6, \mathbf{7}, 8, 9, \dots)$$

$$\sigma' = (1, \mathbf{7}, 3, 4, 5, 6, \mathbf{2}, 8, 9, \dots).$$

Example

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	(1,2)	(1,3)	(1,4)	(1,5)	(1,6)	(1,7)	(1,8)	(1,9)	...
2		(2,3)	(2,4)	(2,5)	(2,6)	(2,7)	(2,8)	(2,9)	...
3			(3,4)	(3,5)	(3,6)	(3,7)	(3,8)	(3,9)	...
4				(4,5)	(4,6)	(4,7)	(4,8)	(4,9)	...
5					(5,6)	(5,7)	(5,8)	(5,9)	...
6						(6,7)	(6,8)	(6,9)	...
7							(7,8)	(7,9)	...
8								(8,9)	...
9									...

Table: Neighbour representation.

Simulated annealing

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

The idea is to describe a probability of state using a cooling parameter t_k such that it reminds the cooling of a metal and may change with each step:

$$\pi_i = \frac{e^{\frac{-E_i}{t_k}}}{C},$$

where C is normalizing constant. The quotient of probabilities then is:

$$\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i} = e^{\frac{E_i - E_j}{t_k}}$$

Initial condition

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains


MCMC

TSP


Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions



(a) Random neighbours.



(b) Locally-informed proposals.

Figure: Different initial states for *berlin52*.

Simulated annealing

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains


MCMC

TSP


Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions



(a) berlin52.



(b) kroA150.

Figure: Different cooling parameters for *berlin52* and *kroA150*.

Temperature

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains


MCMC

TSP


Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions



(a) berlin52.



(b) kroA150.

Figure: Different temperature parameters for *berlin52* and *kroA150*.

Algorithms comparison

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains


MCMC

TSP


Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions



(a) berlin52, $t_k = 1$.



(b) kroA150, $t_k = 1$.

Figure: Comparing RN and LIP for *berlin52* and *kroA150* with low number of iterations.

Algorithms comparison

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains


MCMC

TSP


Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions



(a) $t_k = 1$.



(b) $t_k = \frac{3}{\log(k+2)}$.

Figure: Comparing RN and LIP for *dsj1000* with different cooling parameters.

Algorithms comparison

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

	RN			LIP		
dataset	dist.	time [s]	ratio	dist.	time [s]	ratio
berlin52	11344	1.32	1.50	9276	116	1.23
kroA150	62467	1.24	2.36	53988	454	2.04
att532	165445	1.38	5.98	78150	2462	2.82
dsj1000	199343433	1.5	10.68	89105687	6439	4.78

Table: Methods comparison, $t_k = 1$, 20000-th step.

Algorithms comparison

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

	RN			LIP		
dataset	step	distance	time [s]	step	distance	time [s]
berlin52	20000	11344	1.32	27	11198	0.22
kroA150	20000	62467	1.24	139	62459	3.64
att532	20000	165445	1.38	199	165247	24.65
dsj1000	20000	199343433	1.5	256	199338468	80.54

Table: Amount of time and number of steps required for LIP algorithm to reach the result of RN after 20000 steps, $t_k = 1$.

Conclusions

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

- LIP algorithm is decreasing the distance quicker than RN,
- LIP converges to some value, which is always smaller than the RN,
- LIP reaches better results in feasible time,
- Only first hundreds iterations matter,
- LIP algorithm is considerably slower for a longer run,

Improvements

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

- Use of interning in *Python3*,
- use of concurrency,
- sampling from Q_i using MCMC methods,
- better tuning of temperature and cooling parameters.

LIP

B.Chmiela

Markov chains

MCMC

TSP

Approximate
solutions

Results

Conclusions

Thank you for your attention.