Hyperparameter optimization

CS6787 Lecture 6 — Spring 2026

But First...
Final Project Parameters

CS 6787 — Spring 2026

Overview

- **Implement a machine learning system** to solve a problem

- Use one or more of the **techniques we discussed in class**
  - The mere use of a LLM in the project does not constitute a technique

- To achieve an **improvement over some baseline method**
  - Measuring both statistical performance and hardware performance
  - Or at least evaluate and attempt to achieve such a speedup

- Otherwise, very **open-ended**
  - **Groups of up to three**

Project proposals due in four weeks

- The main body should be about one page in length.
- It should describe the project you intend to do.
- It should contain **at least one citation of a relevant paper that we did not cover in class**.
- It should include some preliminary or exploratory work you've already done, that helps to support the idea that your project is feasible.
  - Don’t need a lot of work, just a nonzero amount of work supporting feasibility.
- In addition to the one-page text proposal, one short **experiment plan** per person

Experiment plan

- The hypothesis
- The proxy
- The protocol
- Expected results

Experiment plan example

We **hypothesize** that consuming caffeine causes PhD students to take longer to graduate. As a **proxy** for caffeine consumption, we will measure the total amount of money spent at Gimme Coffee. Our **protocol** will be to survey all graduating PhD students and ask them how much money in total they spent at Gimme Coffee and in what year they are graduating. We **expect to see** a positive correlation between these two variables.

This is correctly formatted, but **what's wrong with it**?

In-class project feedback activity

- On **Wednesday, March 18**
- Basically, breakout sessions to discuss your project ideas with your peers.
  - You are not committing to work on the specific project you present during the feedback activity. You can always change your ideas as a result of the feedback.
- Prepare a **two-minute verbal pitch** of your ideas.
- And try not to sit with others in your group.
  - To get a wider variety of feedback.

Questions?

Hyperparameter optimization

CS6787 Lecture 6 — Spring 2026

Review — We've discussed many methods

- Stochastic gradient descent
  - **Step size/learning rate, how long to run**
- Mini-batching
  - **Batch size**
- Momentum
  - **Momentum parameter**
- Kernel trick/feature extraction
  - **How many features to extract**

How do we set these parameters?

So Far: Theory

- Theoretical analysis of convex problems gives us a **recipe** for assigning hyperparameters
  - Also gives **guarantees** that the algorithm will converge with some optimal rate

- Often based on strong-convexity/Lipschitz constants **μ**, **L**, etc.
  - Parameters that we can **bound analytically**, regardless of the data

- This is usually enough to get an **asymptotically optimal rate**
  - Certainly in the worst case

The Worst-Case Perspective

- Essentially, the theory I showed you is doing

$$\arg \min_{\text{parameters}} \max_{\text{data}} (\text{objective})$$

- We're **not using the training data** at all to set the parameters
  - Or if we are, we're only using it to compute constants like **μ** and **L**

- Question: **can we use the data to improve our choice of parameters over what the theory gives us?**

Demo

What happened?

- Theory only **minimizes an upper bound** on the objective.
- But actual algorithm can **do much better than the bound**.
  - As we saw in the demo.
- Problem: in the demo, to find the best parameter setting, we had to first solve the problem exactly, then run the algorithm many times.
  - **Computationally intractable** in practice!
- **Can we use a cheaper heuristic to set the parameters?**

Hyperparameter Optimization

Hyperparameter Optimization

- Any system that chooses hyperparameters automatically

- **What's the difference between the model parameters and the hyperparameters?**

Many Settings; Many Strategies

- In some settings, just care about the model accuracy
  - Just want to set things like the learning rate
- In other settings, also want to make the hardware fast
  - Want to choose what hardware to run on, how many cores, etc.
- In all settings, there's **many ways to do hyperparameter optimization**

Simplest Strategy: The Null Hyperparameter Optimizer

- Simplest thing to do is to **just set the parameters based on folklore**.

- **Minibatch size: b =** ?

- **Momentum: β =** ?

- **AdamW second moment parameter =** ?

The Effect of Using Folklore

- **Folklore can lead you astray**!
  - Can actually find **simple cases where the folklore settings are wrong**.
  - This is a good way to start a research paper.

- …but **folklore is folklore for a reason**!
  - It exists where people have found empirically that they get good results.
  - So when you try something new, the **first thing to compare to is folklore**.

- To be honest, the results you get from just using the folklore settings are really not that bad for a lot of practical purposes.

From the simplest strategy to…
The Most Complicated Strategy

- Just **get a human to set your hyperparameters**.
  - Or, if you don't have $ to pay people, do it yourself.

- Fortunately, we happen to have a lot of humans
  - But (expert) human effort doesn't scale.
  - *It "takes a lot of energy to train a human. It takes like 20 years of life, and all the food you eat before that time, before you get smart." — Sam Altman*

Tuning By Hand

- Just fiddle with the parameters until you get the results you want
- Probably **the most common type of hyperparameter optimization**
- Upsides: the results are generally pretty good…
- Downsides: **lots of effort**, and no theoretical guarantees
  - Also problems with reproducibility & cheating

Grid Search

- Define some grid of parameters you want to try
- Try all the parameter values in the grid
  - By **running the whole system** for each setting of parameters
- Then **choose the setting with the best result**
- Essentially a **brute force method**

Downsides of Grid Search

- As the number of parameters increases, the cost of grid search **increases exponentially**!
  - **Why?**
- Still need some way to choose the grid properly
  - Something this can be as hard as the original hyperparameter optimization
- Can't take advantage of any **insight** you have about the system!

Making Grid Search Fast

- **Early stopping**
  - Can run all the grid points for one epoch, then discard the half that performed worse, then run for another epoch, discard half, and continue.

- Can **take advantage of parallelism**
  - Run all the different parameter settings independently on different servers in a cluster.
  - An **embarrassingly parallel task**.
  - Downside: **doesn’t reduce the energy cost**.

One Variant: Random Search

- This is just grid search, but with randomly chosen points instead of points on a grid.

- **This solves the curse of dimensionality**
  - Don’t need to increase the number of grid points exponentially as the number of dimensions increases.

- Problem: with random search, **not necessarily going to get anywhere near the optimal parameters** in a finite sample.

One Variant: “Best Ball”

- Works with epochs.
- At each epoch, do a small grid search **around the current hyperparameter settings**
- Then evaluate the objective and choose the **“best ball”**
  - The choice of parameters that gave the best objective for that epoch
- And repeat until a solution of desired quality is achieved.

An Alternative: Bayesian Optimization

- Statistical approach for **minimizing noisy black-box functions**.

- Idea: **learn a statistical model** of the function from hyperparameter values to the loss function
  - Then choose parameters to minimize the loss under this model

- Main benefit: choose the hyperparameters to test not at random, but in a way that gives the **most information about the model**
  - This lets it learn faster than grid search

Effect of Bayesian Optimization

- Downside: it's a pretty **heavyweight method**
  - The updates are not as simple-to-implement as grid search
- Upside: empirically it has been demonstrated to **get better results in fewer experiments**
  - Compared with grid search and random search
- Pretty widely used method
  - Lots of research opportunities here.

A related method: DFO

- **Derivative-free optimization**
- Also called **zeroth-order optimization**
- These methods optimize a function using only evaluations, no derivatives
- Ideal for use with hyperparameter optimization
  - Also ideal for **reinforcement learning**

The opposite of DFO
Gradient-based optimization

- These strategies say: **“I’m doing SGD to learn, I may as well use it to optimize my hyperparameters.”**

- When we can efficiently differentiate with respect to the hyperparameters, this strategy actually works pretty well.

- But generally, we **can’t do it**.

Methods that Look at the Data

- Many methods look at curvature/variance info to decide how to set hyperparameters, and update their settings throughout the algorithm

- Example: **ADAGRAD**

- Example: **Adam**
  - Which you will be reading on Wednesday

Evaluating the Hyperparameter Optimization

How to evaluate the hyperparameters?

- Unlike the model parameters, we're **not given a loss function**
- **Can't we just use the training loss?**
- **Not always**: we don't want to **overfit the hyperparameters**
  - Especially not when they are things that affect the model

Cross-Validation

- Partition part of the available data to create an **validation dataset** that we don't use for training.
- Then **use that set to evaluate the hyperparameters**.
- Typically, **multiple rounds of cross-validation** are performed using different partitions
  - Can get a very good sense of how good the hyperparameters are
  - But at a **significant computational cost**!

Evaluating the System Cost

- In practice we **don't just care about the statistics**
  - Not just about the accuracy after a fixed number of iterations
- We care about wall-clock **time**, and we care about **energy**
  - How much did solving this problem **actually cost**?
- The parameters we chose can affect these systems properties
  - As we saw with our SVRG demo!
- Need to **include systems cost as part of the metric**!

Hardware efficiency

- **How long does an iteration take, on average?**

- Hardware efficiency measures the systems cost of doing a single update.

- Key point: many hyperparameters do not affect hardware efficiency
  - **Which ones?**

- **Which hyperparameters do affect hardware efficiency?**

Statistical Efficiency

- **How many iterations do we need to get to a specified level of accuracy?**

- Statistical efficiency measures how many updates we need to get an answer of the quality that we want.

- **Which hyperparameters affect statistical efficiency?**
  - **And which ones don't?**

Total performance

- Total cost of running the algorithm is:

HARDWARE EFFICIENCY x STATISTICAL EFFICIENCY

- We can estimate these quantities separately, then use their product to evaluate our hyperparameters.

- For example, we can use theory to evaluate statistical efficiency and a hardware model to evaluate hardware efficiency.

Benefits of Looking at Both

- Looking at **both statistical and hardware efficiency together** has some important benefits!

- Many times the **optimal parameter settings are different** than if you set the parameters to optimize hardware efficiency or statistical efficiency individually.

- There's a lot of **open research opportunities** here!

Hyperparameter Optimization is Expensive

Consumption	**CO_2e (lbs)**
Air travel, 1 passenger, NY↔SF	1984
Human life, avg, 1 year	11,023
American life, avg, 1 year	36,156
Car, avg incl. fuel, 1 lifetime	126,000
Training one model (GPU)	
NLP pipeline (parsing, SRL)	39
w/ tuning & experimentation	78,468
Transformer (big)	192
w/ neural architecture search	626,155

Table 1: Estimated CO_2 emissions from training common NLP models, compared to familiar consumption.[1]

The world cerca 2019

Scaling Laws

- Use an empirical model of how performance will depend on hyperparameters to guide choices

- Restricted to architectures and hyperparameters for which reliable models exist…
  - …and to the regions in which those models are accurate

- We'll see this approach in **next Wednesday's papers**.

Scaling Laws Example: Llama 3



Figure 2 Scaling law IsoFLOPs curves between 6×10^{18} and 10^{22} FLOPs. The loss is the negative log-likelihood on a held-out validation set. We approximate measurements at each compute scale using a second degree polynomial.



Figure 3 Number of training tokens in identified compute-optimal models as a function of pre-training compute budget. We include the fitted scaling-law prediction as well. The compute-optimal models correspond to the parabola minimums in Figure 2.

Questions?

- Upcoming things
  - Paper review 3a or 3b **due on Wednesday**
  - Paper Presentation #4 **on Wednesday**