

# DOUBLY BAYESIAN OPTIMIZATION

Alexander Lavin\*

## ABSTRACT

Probabilistic programming systems enable users to encode model structure and naturally reason about uncertainties, which can be leveraged towards improved Bayesian optimization (BO) methods. Here we present a probabilistic program embedding of BO that is capable of addressing main issues such as problematic domains (noisy, non-smooth, high-dimensional) and the neglected inner-optimization. Not only can we utilize programmable structure to incorporate domain knowledge to aid optimization, but dealing with uncertainties and implementing advanced BO techniques become trivial, crucial for use in practice (particularly for non-experts). We demonstrate the efficacy of the approach on optimization benchmarks and a real-world drug development scenario.

**Keywords:** Probabilistic programming; Bayesian optimization; Gaussian process; uncertainty quantification

## 1 Introduction

It is often the case in machine learning and data science problems that we wish to optimize an objective function that is expensive to evaluate, noisy or uncertain, and/or lacks structure and derivatives. Bayesian optimization (BO) is a powerful approach, with applications from drug design [1] to robotics [2, 3], A/B testing [4] to environment monitoring [5]. Yet BO encounters issues in medium-sized parameter spaces (upwards of 5 dimensions), and in complex structured domains where expert knowledge could be useful. In practice experimenting with BO techniques can be cumbersome – there’s often a complexity vs per-iteration performance tradeoff – and advanced methods are non-trivial to implement.

Probabilistic programming would appear to be a natural paradigm for BO, offering a structured approach to probabilistic modeling and reasoning under uncertainty. Probabilistic programming languages (PPL) aim to simplify probabilistic modeling and inference by providing language constructs for defining probabilistic generative models and inference algorithms [6, 7, 8, 9]. A core philosophy is decoupling modeling and inference: a *model program* implicitly defines a distribution on random variables whilst the system back-end implements general-purpose inference methods.




Figure 1: We motivate probabilistic programmed Bayesian optimization towards speeding up the drug discovery process. Shown here is the molecular fingerprinting [10] used in our experiments (Sec. 4.2).

Here we present a novel probabilistic program-embedding of Bayesian optimization<sup>2</sup>. Our work was inspired by the “Bespoke Auto-tuner” (BOAT) framework [11, 12].

Our specific contributions are:

1. Proposal of a probabilistic domain-specific language (DSL) for Bayesian optimization. We present implementations of Gaussian process models and optimization algorithms that behoove the use of probabilistic programmed Bayesian optimization in practice. The language notably features *inference metaprogramming* [7].
2. Empirical validation on benchmark optimization problems, while demonstrating the utility of probabilistic programming to improve Bayesian optimization, specifically incorporating domain knowledge via model program

\*alexdlavin@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Hence the article name, given the Bayesian approach implicit in both probabilistic programming and in the method for optimization

structure, utilizing the probabilistic representation of uncertainty in the face of noise and risks, and a Thompson sampling method for use with probabilistic programs in nested optimization.

3. Demonstration that the implementation of advanced Bayesian optimization methods becomes trivial in G3PO, which we illustrate with several Bayesian optimization methods used in industry. In similar vein, the ease of developing in G3PO enables the user to more readily experiment and iterate over their modeling choices, a driving aim of the probabilistic programming field.
4. Results on real-world drug discovery problems, highlighting the efficacy of probabilistic programmed Bayesian optimization for use by non-ML experts (i.e. pharmaceutical researchers).

This work significantly builds on [13], which proposed a proposed a probabilistic DSL towards data-efficient robotics methods. The use of C++ embedded DSL was motivated by the robotics applications, and the implementation details heavily influenced by [11, 12, 14].

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Probabilistic Programming

Probabilistic programming systems (PPS)<sup>3</sup> represent probabilistic generative models as programs written in a specialized language that provides syntax for the definition and conditioning of random variables [6, 7, 8, 9]. Specifically, a PPS implements two required constructs: the ability to draw values at random from distributions, and the ability to condition values of variables (which allow data from real world observations to be incorporated into a probabilistic program) [15] – typically with `sample` and `observe` primitives, respectively. Importantly, the set of random variables is dynamically typed such that programs may differ from execution to execution.

Execution of probabilistic programs by inference algorithms is different from execution of deterministic programs. Running many program “particles” simultaneously (thousands or millions), the observed data values induce a conditional probability distribution over the execution traces. These approximations and expected values we want to characterize by performing inference. The system back-end runs inference methods that are capable of operating on arbitrary model programs – commonly referred to as an “inference engine”. Typically forward-simulation sampling methods (namely SMC and particle MCMC [16]) or variational inference are used.

More formally, a model program specifies a joint distribution  $p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$  over data  $\mathbf{y}$  and variables  $\mathbf{x}$ . The probability of an execution trace can be defined as

$$p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{n=1}^N p(y_n | \zeta_{g_n}, \mathbf{x}_n) p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{x}_{n-1})$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_n$  is the  $n$ -th `observe`’d data point,  $p(y_n | \zeta_{g_n})$  is its normalized likelihood,  $\zeta_{g_n}(\mathbf{x}_n)$  is the program argument with random procedures  $g_n(\mathbf{x}_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is the ordered set of all random choices with  $p(\mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{x}_{n-1})$  its normalized prior probability, and  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are the sets of all latent and observing random procedures, respectively [8].

For more detailed derivation and further information on probabilistic programming we refer the reader to the recent tutorial [17].

### 2.2 Bayesian Optimization

Given an arbitrary objective function  $f : \vartheta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that can be evaluated for a point  $\theta \in \vartheta$  to produce potentially noisy outputs, the aim of BO is to find the global maximum  $\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta \in \vartheta} f(\theta)$ .

BO relies on both a probabilistic surrogate model  $\hat{f}$  and an acquisition function  $\alpha$  to define a strategy for efficiently maximizing  $f$ . That is, from  $\hat{f}$  we can estimate the expected value and uncertainty in  $f(\theta)$  for all possible parameterizations  $\theta \in \vartheta$ , and  $\alpha : \vartheta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  guides the parameter search by assigning an expected utility of evaluating  $f$  at a given  $\theta$ . This process is shown in Alg. 1, where we accumulate a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  from evaluating parameter sets on the true objective, and  $M$  specifies our “evaluation budget” for doing so (e.g. iterations, or computation time).

The most common probabilistic model used in BO, and the one we consider in this article, is a Gaussian process (GP) [18]. Crucially, the GP’s ability to express model uncertainty allows us to tradeoff exploration and exploitation for efficient optimization. Nonetheless, other probabilistic models are possible such as random forests [19] and Bayesian neural networks [20].

---

<sup>3</sup>Note we use probabilistic programming *system* (PPS) and *language* (PPL) somewhat interchangeably.

Acquisition functions aim to maximize “utility”, defined in terms of expectations over the surrogate model posterior; in Algorithm 1, utility guides the search over the acquisition surface  $\alpha$ . Commonly used choices include expected improvement (EI) [21], upper confidence bound (UCB) [22], and predictive entropy search [23]. The acquisition function balances exploration vs. exploitation, and can be critical to the performance of BO, thus making up a significant portion of the BO literature. Here we focus on EI, as it generally shows favorable results in practice and has several useful extensions in literature. For further information on Bayesian optimization we refer the reader to the recent review [24].

### 3 Bayesian Program Optimization

Alg. 1 below (left) shows the standard Bayesian optimization algorithm, where step 2 of the for-loop is the “inner-optimization” of the acquisition surface (discussed later). The right algorithm (Alg. 2) shows our Thompson sampling approach to the inner-optimization step.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Bayesian optimization

---

**Input:** data  $\mathcal{D}$ , surrogate model  $\hat{f}$ , acquisition function  $\alpha$   
**Output:** performance pairs  $\{\theta_m, y_m\}_{m=1:M}$   
**for**  $m = 1$  **to**  $M$  **do**  
    1. Train the model  $\hat{f}$  from  $\mathcal{D}$   
    2. Find  $\theta^*$  that minimizes the acquisition surface  $\alpha(\theta)$   
    3. Evaluate  $y_m = f(\theta^*)$  on the real system  
    4. Update  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \{(\theta_m^*, y_m)\}$   
**end for**

---



---

#### Algorithm 2 Thompson sampling particle programs

---

*At Bayesian optimization iteration  $m$  with set of models  $\Omega$ , execute inner-optimization at step 2 in Alg. 1:*  
**Init:**  $best_m = \{-inf, null\}$   $\triangleright \{\text{value}, \text{theta}\}$   
**for**  $\omega$  **in**  $\Omega$  **do**  
    **for**  $k = 1$  **to**  $L$  **do**  
        1. Sample a particle  $\omega_k$  from the posterior distribution (of models (particles))  
        2.  $best_k \leftarrow$  select  $\theta_{k,m}$  that maximizes  $\omega_k$ ’s predicted performance  
        3. Update  $best_m \leftarrow \max(best_k, best_m)$   
    **end for**  
**end for**  
**Output:**  $\theta_m^* \leftarrow best_m[1]$

---

We now detail the the probabilistic program embedding of Bayesian optimization, referring to the DSL as “G3PO: Gaussian process probabilistic programming and optimization”

Given a program defining the joint density  $p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \theta)$  with fixed  $\mathbf{y}$ , our aim is to optimize w.r.t the subset of variables  $\theta$  while marginalizing out latent variables  $\mathbf{x}$ ,

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta \in \vartheta} p(\theta | \mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \vartheta} p(\mathbf{y}, \theta) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \vartheta} \int p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \theta) d\mathbf{x} \quad (1)$$

The target function for our BO scheme is  $\log p(\mathbf{y}, \theta)$ . The posterior of Gaussian process surrogate models (i.e. particles) is used to define the acquisition function  $\alpha$ , for which we take a Monte Carlo estimate of the integrated expected improvement (EI):

$$\alpha_{EI}(\theta) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L ((\mu_m^l(\theta) - \hat{u}_m^*) \Phi(\gamma_m^l(\theta)) + \sigma_m^l(\theta) \phi(\gamma_m^l(\theta))) \quad (2)$$

with  $\sigma_m^l(\theta) = \sqrt{k_m^l(\theta, \theta)}$  and  $\gamma_m^l(\theta) = \frac{\mu_m^l(\theta) - \hat{u}_m^*}{\sigma_m^l(\theta)}$  as in [25], where  $\phi$  and  $\Phi$  respectively represent the PDF and CDF of a unit normal distribution, the GP particles are fully specified by mean function  $\mu : \vartheta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and kernel function  $k : \vartheta \times \vartheta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $m$  indexes the BO iteration and  $l$  the particle.

The sampling approach to attain the  $L$  particles in 2 deserves some discussion. While random samples can be wasteful by clumping, we can alternatively construct a deterministic sequences that is spreads over the space (i.e. low-discrepancy). This approach is *quasi-Monte Carlo integration (QMC)* of the expected improvement, which provides faster convergence and lower error with improved sampling, for example via Sobol sequences [26].

Yet we can possibly do better with probabilistic programmed BO. Because the probabilistic programming framework exposes the full posterior of particles, we can use the posterior of the acquisition function rather than a single point estimate. From this we develop a Thompson sampling method for probabilistic programs, shown in 2 and detailed later.

The motivation is to address the “inner-optimization” problem of BO: specifically, direct numerical optimization of the expected improvement struggles to converge [27]; this occurs at the  $\min(\alpha)$  in Alg. 1 (for-loop line 2), seeking the optimal query  $\theta^*$ . One reason is the response surface is often highly multi-modal, and several concentrated evaluations (perhaps near a local optimum) make the surface jagged and difficult to navigate. Moreover, decomposing a task is a desirable tactic in high-dimension, but non-trivial when considering sub-optimizations. A good alternative is Thompson sampling [28], a randomized strategy which samples a reward function from the posterior and selects that yielding the highest simulated reward. [29] similarly replace EI with Thompson sampling, but towards distributed parallel BO, whereas we apply it specifically for the inner-optimization of particle programs; the resulting Thompson sampling procedure is quite different, as is our parallel execution of model particles. Key to our method is because we’re operating in the space of probabilistic programs we can optimize over Thompson samples drawn from the model source code, as in [12]. The procedure is shown in Alg. 2. In practice we find the Thompson sampling method to perform similar to QMC. The recently proposed MC-integration approach of [27] is another sampling-based approach to the inner-optimization problem of BO. We leave it to future experiments to compare the methods.

Even more, because the GP mean and variance is propagated throughout program execution, quantifying the specific uncertainties in our framework is trivial; we can sample model programs for *aleatoric* (system stochasticity such as observation and process noise) and *epistemic* (subjective uncertainty due to limited data) uncertainty measures. We utilize the acquisition posterior and uncertainty quantification towards improved BO methods for dealing with noise and risk, described next.

### 3.1 Expected improvement with uncertainty reasoning

To incorporate uncertainty reasoning in Bayesian optimization, let’s consider a noisy target function  $y = f(\mathbf{x}) + \eta$ , with measurement noise  $\eta$  that follows a zero-mean Gaussian distribution with unit variance  $\sigma_\eta^2$ . This is precisely our aleatoric uncertainty:  $\sigma_\alpha^2 = \sigma_\eta^2$ . If we train  $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})$  to approximate  $f(\mathbf{x})$  from the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , our epistemic uncertainty measure is then  $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = \mathbb{E}||f(\mathbf{x}) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})||^2$ . It follows that the *total predictive variance* is the sum  $\mathbb{E}||y - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x})||^2 = \sigma_\alpha^2 + \sigma_\epsilon^2$ .

When faced with noise the EI acquisition function presents conceptual challenges [30], because the gained utility from a given function evaluation is no longer easily defined, and there is no reasoning about the uncertainty because it is not quantified. Most work in BO doesn’t handle noise in a Bayesian way, and simplifying heuristics are known to underperform when noise levels are high [26]. Notable exceptions include “noisy EI” and “unscented BO”, which approximate the posterior of the acquisition function<sup>4</sup>. Because we have embedded BO in PP we get this Bayesian approach to handling noise/risk for free. Even more, in practice these advanced techniques are difficult to implement and experiment with, yet in our probabilistic programming framework this becomes trivial.

#### 3.1.1 Expected improvement with noisy observations

The *noisy expected improvement* of [26] is a function which integrates the EI acquisition function over the posterior distribution of  $n$  Gaussian processes (GPs) given their noisy observations. The acquisition function can be approximated by sampling  $k$  noiseless GPs from the posterior and averaging their individual expected improvements (where  $k \leq n$ ); without observation noise, NEI is exactly EI.

Using probabilistic programmed BO, we already have the GP posterior. In fact, sampling models from the posterior distribution of particles and using their individual acquisition function predictions is the defacto standard in G3PO: We use a Thompson sampling scheme that samples  $k$  of  $L$  particles, ultimately selecting the configuration  $\theta^*$  that yields the highest expected improvement of the sampled posterior. The method is shown in Alg. 2, and all experiments in the Results section 4 reflect this approach. Although not identical to the noisy EI approach of [26], our approach satisfies the same motivation. [26] additionally derive an efficient quasi-Monte Carlo sampling scheme to improve integration, and show noisy EI to consistently outperform other methods such as EI and PES. We leave it to future work to test their low-discrepancy sampling sequences within the probabilistic programming framework.

#### 3.1.2 Bayesian Optimization in risky domains

*Unscented Bayesian optimization* is able to perform sample efficient optimization while taking into consideration input noise to find safe optima, demonstrated to mitigate risk in robot grasping [34]. The underlying mechanism is applying the *unscented transform* [35] to both the acquisition function and optimal incumbent, which propagates probability distributions through nonlinear functions. Thus rather than assuming deterministic queries of the system, unscented

<sup>4</sup>We note that the knowledge-gradient [31, 32] and entropy-search [23, 33] acquisition functions also consider the posterior over  $f$ ’s domain to reason with noisy data. We leave comparisons for future work.

BO analyzes the transformed posterior distributions. From transforming the query distribution through the acquisition function we have the unscented expected improvement:  $UEI(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \omega^{(i)} EI(\theta^{(i)})$ .

See [34] for details on the unscented transform’s sampling strategy to compute  $\theta$  and  $\omega$ . Because G3PO represents BO in the space of probabilistic programs, we have this target distribution for free. We can sample the particles posterior and accumulate the  $UEI$  sum to reproduce unscented BO precisely, or we can use the Thompson sampling scheme described previously. Figure 4 shows our results with both sampling approaches, reproducing the experiment of [34].

Similarly the unscented optimal incumbent strategy,  $UOI(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \omega^{(i)} \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j(\theta^{(i)})$ , to yield  $\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} UOI(\theta)$ , is trivial to implement in G3PO. Our default approach is using the weighted particles to compute the optimal incumbent, which is a more true representation of the posterior than the  $UOI$  approximation. Additionally, it’s noted that unscented BO is a more computationally efficient strategy to BO with input uncertainties than alternative approaches, so it follows that the computationally efficient approach to safe BO is easy out-of-the-box with our framework.

In section 4.3 we elucidate this implicit uncertainty reasoning by reproducing the experiments of [34].

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Benchmark experiments




Figure 2: Left: Branin-Hoo – All probabilistic programmed BO variants converge to the global optimum 3.98, but significantly faster with probabilistic programming approaches to the inner-optimization problem. Right: Hartmann-6D – Standard BO struggles in more dimensions, and convergence to the global minimum is only achieved when we encode domain structure. See text for method details. The plots show the mean and variance over 100 trials for each experiment.

To show the efficacy of the probabilistic programmed Bayesian optimization approach we demonstrate the inner-optimization problem on standard Bayesian optimization benchmarks (Fig. 2).

The code snippet in Listing 1 shows a “nested” EI approach for the inner-optimization step. Here we simply define a lambda function to sample predictions from the model particles, and run a numerical optimization over that function.

```
1 /* A ‘nested’ EI that samples from the model */
2 double ei_with_samples(ModelProgram& m,
3   OptParams& p, double incumbent) {
4   auto objective = [&]() {
5     auto x = sample(m);
6     return predict(m, x);
7   };
8   OptLBFGS opt(p, objective); // ‘optim::lbfgs’
9   opt.Execute();
10 }
```

Listing 1: Inner-optimization example: optimizing the acquisition function by sampling the model source code.

In the results plots of Figure 2 this approach is “source-sampling”, compared with standard BO (“vanilla”), “structured”, and “structured with source-sampling”. In this example of *structured BO* we define one GP for the first term of the Branin-Hoo equation and another GP for the second, same as the approach of the “BOAT” framework in [11, 12]. The probabilistic programming formulation of BO enables the user to easily encode domain knowledge, and with this trivial model structure the optimization converges significantly faster than vanilla BO.

Another example is towards the Hartmann six-dimensional optimization problem. With this many dimensions the standard Bayesian optimization methods are known to struggle. Indeed we observe this in the right plot of Figure 2, where the vanilla BO fails to converge. Because we have *a priori* knowledge that the target function is a four-term summation<sup>5</sup>, we can encode this in the probabilistic **ModelProgram** with four conditionally independent **InferenceEngines**, shown in Listing 2.

```

1  /* Bayesian optimization with four GP models and inference engines */
2
3  // Define a semi-parametric 'struct' for each of the four Hartmann summations
4  // Notice the template metaprogramming we use for compile-time polymorphism
5  struct FirstSum : public Particle<FirstSum> {
6      FirstSum() {
7          // Constructor samples param values s.t. each
8          // particle is initialized uniquely.
9          // Note: backend maintains a global RNG
10         alpha_ = sample(Normal(2.0, 2.0));
11         gp_.mean = sample(Normal(0.0, 5.0));
12         gp_.stdev = sample(Normal(0.0, 20.0));
13         gp_.linear_scales = {sample(Normal(0.0, 15.0)),
14                             sample(Normal(0.0, 15.0)),
15                             ...}; // go on for all six
16     }
17     // double alpha_ = -1.0; // known value for Hartmann6
18     Dist alpha_;
19     GP gp_;
20 };
21 // Define the probabilistic program model
22 struct H6Model : public ModelProgram<H6Model> {
23     H6Model() {
24         eng1_.set_num_particles(1000);
25         eng2_.set_num_particles(1000);
26         // repeat for all four engines
27     }
28     void forward(const H6Params& p) {
29         predict(eng1_, p.x1_.value(), p.x2_.value(), ...);
30         predict(eng2_, p.x1_.value(), p.x2_.value(), ...);
31         // continue for all four inference engines
32     }
33     // Define inference engines, which spawn
34     // particles of the templated type
35     SMCEngine<FirstSum> eng_;
36     SMCEngine<SecondSum> eng_;
37     // repeat for all four
38 };
39 // Declare BO parameters for Hartmann6 function
40 struct H6Params : OptParams{
41     // Set constraints — evaluated on the
42     // hypercube x_i (0, 1), for all i = 1, ..., 6.
43     H6Params() : x1_(0, 1), x2_(0, 1), x2_(0, 1),
44                 x4_(0, 1), x5_(0, 1), x6_(0, 1),
45                 max_num_iters_(1000), minimizer_(true)
46     {}
47     ParameterConstraints<double> x1_, x2_, ...;
48     double max_num_iters_;
49     bool minimizer_;

```

<sup>5</sup><https://www.sfu.ca/~ssurjano/hart6.html>

Listing 2: An example structured BO approach for the Hartmann-6D objective function. In the probabilistic programming framework it’s simple to decompose the higher-dimensional optimization task with multiple non-parametric models. For brevity we omit some code that is repeated across the four inference engines.

This simple added structure helps the BO process navigate a higher-dimensional domain, converging to the global minimum solution in Figure 2.

Beyond promising results on the benchmark BO problems, this approach has valuable implications for use in practice. First and foremost, computational efficiency: using a single model sample to evaluate the performance of a configuration is very inexpensive relative to averaging over the entire distribution. There is also an inherent robustness in running independent optimizations per particle, rather than a single numerical optimization that could get stuck in local minima. Third, ease of development: notice how simple it is in the source code for the developer to implement, experiment with, and introspect model-sampling within Bayesian optimization and acquisition functions. This is but one example of how the user can exploit the source code in probabilistic programmed BO.

This approach to structured BO originates from [11, 12]. Other approaches to structured BO include [36, 37], but without the ability to exploit the program source code in the optimization – note that [25] can access program source code, but overall lacks our flexibility because it is a vanilla BO wrapper for PPL models.

## 4.2 Accelerated drug discovery

The discovery of novel candidate molecules with potential activity against desired targets is of central importance to the early stages of drug discovery. Given the vast space of possible chemical compounds and expensive cost of experimental high-throughput screening, active search methods can accelerate the discovery of novel pharmaceutical molecules. Yet strikingly few works apply Bayesian optimization to this problem [29, 38].




Figure 3: Evolution of the mean value for the top 10% discovered drug targets in the Malaria data set (pertaining to the molecules’ EC50 activity values). Bayesian optimization (BO) methods approach the ideal sampler, while greedy search strategy falls well short.

Here we investigate a data set of 18,294 anti-Malaria candidate molecules, sourced from the *P. falciparum* whole-cell screening derived by combining the GSK TCAMS data set, the Novartis-GNF Malaria Box data set, and the St Jude’s Research Hospital data set, available through the Medicines for Malaria Venture website [39]. The target variable is the EC50 value: the concentration of the drug which gives half maximal response (i.e. the lower the concentration, the stronger the drug). We use the negative log of the EC50 for numerical reasons. We compute 512-bit Morgan circular fingerprints [10] for all molecules – calculated with a bond radius of 2, and derived from the canonical SMILES as implemented in the RDkit package [40] – which serve as input vectors to the Gaussian process models<sup>6</sup>.

For evaluation we look to quantify the potency of candidate compounds found over the search budget. Figure 3 displays the progression of the mean value of the maximum potency for the top ten percent of discovered compounds; each

<sup>6</sup>Note there are alternative approaches to molecular fingerprinting (e.g. [41, 42]) but are beyond the scope of this paper.



experiment was repeated 50 times, with confidence intervals derived using the bootstrap method. We see random and greedy policies fail to approach the ideal set of targets, while the BO approaches succeed. This is expected as the data set presents a challenging search problem: there are multiple competing structure-activity relationships, or local maxima on the target surface. BO is successful by exploring new knowledge while exploiting current data.

This validates our probabilistic programming framework on an important real-world application, but these BO results are not themselves novel [29, 38]. An aim of the probabilistic programming field is ease of development and experimentation with advanced Bayesian machine learning methods. Specifically enabling an iterative process of modeling, inference, and criticisms [43]. Model-checking criticisms can provide valuable insights in practice, namely *posterior predictive checks (PPC)* to analyze the degree to which data generated from the model deviate from data generated from the true distribution. To generate the data we simulate from the posterior predictive distribution  $p(\mathbf{x}_{new}|\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}_{new}|\theta)p(\theta|\mathbf{x})d\theta$  where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the current data,  $\mathbf{x}_{new}$  is data to be predicted, and  $\theta$  are our model parameters. By performing many PPCs to get a holistic understanding of the model fit we were able to ascertain the need for weakly informed priors in this unintuitive molecule-modeling space; in the experiment shown we use the Cauchy distribution rather than Normal (as in the earlier probabilistic program model examples).

### 4.3 Affordances

A main motivation of probabilistic programmed Bayesian optimization is the ability to implement advanced methods trivially. One such method is unscented BO [34], which we introduced previously and now demonstrate their experiment in our framework.




Figure 4: Reproducing the unscented Bayesian optimization (UBO) method for noisy optimization. Top-right shows the “hazardous” objective function [44], bottom-right is the original results from [34], and left is the results with G3PO (see text for details).

To reproduce the effect of input noise, the authors generate Monte Carlo samples according the input noise distribution at each iteration, yielding the expected outcome and the instability. In probabilistic programming, not only is this additional sampling step unnecessary (as we already have the posterior over particles), but our posterior over particles is a more accurate representation of the true posterior because we run the acquisition function (EI in this case) on the space of particles, sidestepping the need for the unscented transform’s approximate sampling phase.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

Powerful acquisition function strategies are often computationally intensive and algorithmically complicated [45]. Yet when cast in the space of probabilistic programs, advanced Bayesian optimization techniques can be rather trivial. We demonstrated this by reproducing state-of-art techniques designed for reasoning with uncertainties, in simple probabilistic programs. We also showed a succinct approach to the inner-optimization problem of BO by utilizing programmed model structure. Even more we motivated the use of the framework on a real world drug discovery problem.



One direction of future work is to experiment with a more powerful acquisition function “predictive entropy search” [23], where we hope to show the information-theoretic value afforded by probabilistic programming. We also plan to implement in G3P0 the interacting particle MCMC approach of [46], where path degeneracy is further addressed mixing independent SMC and conditional SMC sweeps that run in parallel.

In general a main effort will be to integrate the presented Bayesian optimization and Gaussian process concepts into the Stan probabilistic programming system [47]. This will better enable development and use in the community of Bayesian practitioners.

## References

- [1] Diana M. Negoescu, Peter I. Frazier, and Warren B. Powell. The knowledge-gradient algorithm for sequencing experiments in drug discovery. *ORSA journal on computing*, 23(3):346–363, 6 2011.
- [2] Roberto Calandra, André Seyfarth, Jan Peters, and Marc Peter Deisenroth. Bayesian optimization for learning gaits under uncertainty - an experimental comparison on a dynamic bipedal walker. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 76(1-2):5–23, 2016.
- [3] R. Marchant and F. Ramos. Bayesian optimisation for informative continuous path planning. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6136–6143, May 2014.
- [4] Ron Kohavi, Roger Longbotham, Dan Sommerfield, and Randal M. Henne. Controlled experiments on the web: survey and practical guide. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 18(1):140–181, Feb 2009.
- [5] R. Garnett, M. A. Osborne, and S. J. Roberts. Bayesian optimization for sensor set selection. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks*, IPSN ’10, pages 209–219, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [6] Noah D. Goodman, Vikash K. Mansinghka, Daniel M. Roy, Keith Bonawitz, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. Church: a language for generative models. *CoRR*, abs/1206.3255, 2012.
- [7] Vikash K. Mansinghka, Daniel Selsam, and Yura N. Perov. Venture: a higher-order probabilistic programming platform with programmable inference. *CoRR*, abs/1404.0099, 2014.
- [8] F. Wood, J. W. van de Meent, and V. Mansinghka. A new approach to probabilistic programming inference. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1024–1032, 2014.
- [9] Noah D. Goodman and Andreas Stuhlmüller. The Design and Implementation of Probabilistic Programming Languages. <http://dippl.org>. Accessed: 2014-08-27.
- [10] David Rogers and Mathew Hahn. Extended-connectivity fingerprints. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 50(5):742–754, 2010. PMID: 20426451.
- [11] Valentin Dalibard, Michael Schaarschmidt, and Eiko Yoneki. Boat: Building auto-tuners with structured bayesian optimization. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, WWW ’17, pages 479–488, Republic and Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, 2017. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- [12] Valentin Dalibard. A framework to build bespoke auto-tuners with structured bayesian optimisation. 2017.
- [13] Alexander Lavin and Vikash K. Mansinghka. Probabilistic programming for data-efficient robotics. In *The International Conference on Probabilistic Programming (PROBPROG)*. 2018.
- [14] Brooks Paige and Frank D. Wood. A compilation target for probabilistic programming languages. In *ICML*, 2014.
- [15] Andrew D. Gordon, Thomas A. Henzinger, Aditya V. Nori, and Sriram K. Rajamani. Probabilistic programming. In *Proceedings of the on Future of Software Engineering*, FOSE 2014, pages 167–181, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.
- [16] Christophe Andrieu, Arnaud Doucet, and Roman Holenstein. Particle markov chain monte carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3):269–342, 2010.
- [17] J.-W. van de Meent, B. Paige, H. Yang, and F. Wood. An Introduction to Probabilistic Programming. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2018.
- [18] Carl Edward Rasmussen and Christopher K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press, 2005.
- [19] Frank Hutter, Holger H. Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, LION’05, pages 507–523, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer-Verlag.

- [20] Radford M. Neal. *Bayesian Learning for Neural Networks*. PhD thesis, Toronto, Ont., Canada, Canada, 1995. AAINN02676.
- [21] Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P Adams. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. In F. Pereira, C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25*, pages 2951–2959. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012.
- [22] Niranjan Srinivas, Andreas Krause, Sham M. Kakade, and Matthias W. Seeger. Gaussian process bandits without regret: An experimental design approach. *CoRR*, abs/0912.3995, 2009.
- [23] José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Matthew W. Hoffman, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Predictive entropy search for efficient global optimization of black-box functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2014, December 8-13 2014, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 918–926, 2014.
- [24] B. Shahriari, K. Swersky, Z. Wang, R. P. Adams, and N. de Freitas. Taking the human out of the loop: A review of bayesian optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, Jan 2016.
- [25] Tom Rainforth, Tuan Anh Le, Jan-Willem van de Meent, Michael A Osborne, and Frank Wood. Bayesian optimization for probabilistic programs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29*, pages 280–288. 2016.
- [26] Benjamin Letham, Brian Karrer, Guilherme Ottoni, and Eytan Bakshy. Constrained bayesian optimization with noisy experiments. *Bayesian Anal.*, 2018. Advance publication.
- [27] J. T. Wilson, F. Hutter, and M. P. Deisenroth. Maximizing acquisition functions for Bayesian optimization. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2018.
- [28] William R Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3-4):285–294, 1933.
- [29] 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 *ICML*, 2017.
- [30] Peter I. Frazier. A tutorial on bayesian optimization. *CoRR*, abs/1807.02811, 2018.
- [31] Peter I. Frazier, Warren B. Powell, and Savas Dayanik. The knowledge-gradient policy for correlated normal beliefs. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 21:599–613, 2009.
- [32] Warren R. Scott, Peter I. Frazier, and Warren B. Powell. The correlated knowledge gradient for simulation optimization of continuous parameters using gaussian process regression. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21:996–1026, 2011.
- [33] Philipp Hennig and Christian J. Schuler. Entropy search for information-efficient global optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:1809–1837, 2012.
- [34] J. Nogueira, R. Martinez-Cantin, A. Bernardino, and L. Jamone. Unscented bayesian optimization for safe robot grasping. In *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 1967–1972, Oct 2016.
- [35] S. J. Julier and J. K. Uhlmann. Unscented filtering and nonlinear estimation. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 92(3):401–422, March 2004.
- [36] Rodolphe Jenatton, Cedric Archambeau, Javier González, and Matthias Seeger. Bayesian optimization with tree-structured dependencies. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1655–1664, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia, 06–11 Aug 2017. PMLR.
- [37] Jacob Gardner, Chuan Guo, Kilian Weinberger, Roman Garnett, and Roger Grosse. Discovering and Exploiting Additive Structure for Bayesian Optimization. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1311–1319, Fort Lauderdale, FL, USA, 20–22 Apr 2017. PMLR.
- [38] E. O. Pyzer-Knapp. Bayesian optimization for accelerated drug discovery. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, pages 1–1, 2018.
- [39] Thomas Spangenberg, Jeremy N. Burrows, Paul Kowalczyk, Simon McDonald, Timothy N. C. Wells, and Paul Willis. The open access malaria box: A drug discovery catalyst for neglected diseases. In *PloS one*, 2013.
- [40] Greg Landrum. Rdkit: Open-source cheminformatics software. 2016.
- [41] David K. Duvenaud, Dougal Maclaurin, Jorge Aguilera-Iparraguirre, Rafael Gómez-Bombarelli, Timothy Hirzel, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Ryan P. Adams. Convolutional networks on graphs for learning molecular fingerprints. In *NIPS*, 2015.
- [42] Marwin H. S. Segler, Mike Preuss, and Mark P. Waller. Learning to plan chemical syntheses. *CoRR*, abs/1708.04202, 2017.

- [43] Dustin Tran, Matthew D. Hoffman, Rif A. Saurous, Eugene Brevdo, Kevin Murphy, and David M. Blei. Deep probabilistic programming. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [44] J. Assel Z. Wang and N. Freitas. Rkhs 1d function for bayesian optimization tasks, 2014.
- [45] Tom Rainforth. *Automating Inference, Learning, and Design using Probabilistic Programming*. PhD thesis, 2017.
- [46] Tom Rainforth, Christian A. Naesseth, Fredrik Lindsten, Brooks Paige, Jan-Willem van de Meent, Arnaud Doucet, and Frank D. Wood. Interacting particle markov chain monte carlo. In *ICML*, 2016.
- [47] Bob Carpenter, Andrew Gelman, Matthew Hoffman, Daniel Lee, Ben Goodrich, Michael Betancourt, Marcus Brubaker, Jiqiang Guo, Peter Li, and Allen Riddell. Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles*, 76(1):1–32, 2017.
- [48] Kevin P Murphy. *Machine learning: a probabilistic perspective*. Cambridge, MA, 2012.
- [49] Olivier Chapelle and Lihong Li. An empirical evaluation of thompson sampling. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. S. Zemel, P. L. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 2249–2257. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- [50] Marco F. Cusumano-Towner, Benjamin Bichsel, Timon Gehr, Martin Vechev, and Vikash K. Mansinghka. Incremental inference for probabilistic programs. In *To appear in Proceedings of ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI)*. 2018.
- [51] Hong Ge, Kai Xu, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Turing: a language for flexible probabilistic inference. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1682–1690, 2018.

## Appendix

### A Gaussian Process Probabilistic Programming & Optimization

The probabilistic domain-specific language (DSL) described in this work prominently features (i) programmable inference, (ii) modular and structured optimization, and (iii) explicit uncertainty quantification. The framework emphasizes Gaussian process (GP) models and Bayesian optimization (BO) methods, thus we refer to the prototype as “G3PO: Gaussian process probabilistic programming and optimization”.

#### A.1 Probabilistic Language Primitives

The prototype G3PO is implemented as an embedded language within C++ via preprocessor macros. C++ is chosen as the host language mainly for computational efficiency over alternatives such as Python, and to utilize the built-in metaprogramming techniques, namely template metaprogramming<sup>7</sup> and CRTP<sup>8</sup>. The DSL implementation is heavily influenced by [11, 12, 14]. We extend the C++ host language with macros to define the standard `observe` and `sample` stochastic primitives, which enable the passing of program flow between models and inference engines. A simple contrived example:

```

1 // Sample the params for linear regression model:
2 LinearModel() {
3     a = sample(Normal(0.0, 5.0));
4     b = sample(Normal(0.0, 5.0));
5     noise = 2.0;
6 }
7 auto lm = LinearModel();
8
9 // Condition on data:
10 observe(lm, x_data, y_data);

```

<sup>7</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expression\\_templates](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expression_templates)

<sup>8</sup>The curiously recursive template pattern (CRTP) is a technique to implement compile-time polymorphism; using a pure virtual method you are solving the inheritance at runtime instead of compile time, whereas CRTP solves this at compile time so the execution will be faster.

In practice we implement models with `ModelPrograms`, where the user declares priors over variables and defines the `ModelProgram::forward` method. In `ModelProgram::forward` we define the program flow, usually a mix of deterministic operations and stochastic primitives; the function `observe` conditions variables on data, `predict` makes predictions in light of this data, and `sample` draws samples from the model.

Importantly, a `ModelProgram` is able to handle both parametric and nonparametric models: The parametric component learns a fixed number of parameters and allows the user to specify domain knowledge, while a nonparametric model, e.g. Gaussian process, learn an unbounded number of parameters that grows with the training data [48]. The use of *semi-parametric* models is an advantage proposed by [11], and also possible in the Stan PPS [47]. Sampling from the parametric components is simple: select one of the particles with probability weighted by its likelihood. For a nonparametric model we must sample one of its response surfaces, for which we use an efficient approach similar to Thompson sampling; the approach works well in practice and is theoretically grounded [49].

## A.2 Probabilistic Programming Inference

In G3PO the `InferenceEngines` are handled by the backend DAG execution trace structure. The trace runs inference by initializing a defined number of particle programs, and executing them via the user-defined `ModelProgram::forward` method.

In G3PO programmable inference is exposed to the user via `InferenceEngine` modules, which defines part of the computation graph to be executed by the desired inference algorithm. Broadly speaking this approach is referred to as “inference metaprogramming” [50], where the user manually defines inference and/or optimization subproblems to be fed to the system backend. This enables the user to construct model programs of both static and dynamic components, and easily experiment with modular inference strategies. For example, one could run a particle Gibbs inference engine to sample from the model while running gradient updates or perhaps HMC inference over the differentiable parameters. Composable inference strategies are similarly available in Edward [43], Venture [7], and Turing.jl [51].

In our examples we highlight SMC and HMC inference algorithms. Future work is to implement the interacting particle MCMC approach, where path degeneracy is further addressed mixing independent SMC and conditional SMC sweeps that run in parallel [46].