

# Unveiling Many Faces of Surrogate Models for Configuration Tuning: A Fitness Landscape Analysis Perspective

Pengzhou Chen, Hongyuan Liang, Tao Chen

**Abstract**—To efficiently tune configuration for better system performance (e.g., latency), many tuners have leveraged a surrogate model to expedite the process instead of solely relying on the profoundly expensive system measurement. As such, it is naturally believed that we need more accurate models. However, the fact of “*accuracy can lie*”—a somewhat surprising finding from prior work—has left us many unanswered questions regarding what role the surrogate model plays in configuration tuning. This paper provides the very first systematic exploration and discussion, together with a resolution proposal, to disclose the many faces of surrogate models for configuration tuning, through the novel perspective of fitness landscape analysis. We present a theory as an alternative to accuracy for assessing the model usefulness in tuning, based on which we conduct an extensive empirical study involving up to 27,000 cases. Drawing on the above, we propose `Model4Tune`, an automated predictive tool that estimates which model-tuner pairs are the best for an unforeseen system without expensive tuner profiling. Our results suggest that `Model4Tune`, as one of the first of its kind, performs significantly better than random guessing in 79% – 82% of the cases. Our results not only shed light on the possible future research directions but also offer a practical resolution that can assist practitioners in evaluating the most useful model for configuration tuning.

**Index Terms**—Search-based software engineering, compiler/database optimization, performance optimization, hyperparameter optimization.

## I. INTRODUCTION

CONFIGURATIONS are pervasive in software systems, including the increasingly popular Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems and Agentic AI systems [25], [81]. Setting those configurations requires careful engineering efforts since they can profoundly influence the performance, such as latency, throughput or accuracy. For example, some poorly tuned configurations can be  $480\times$  worse than the optimal one [39]. As such, configuration tuning—a process that automatically searches the configuration for the best performance via an intelligent heuristic tuner—has attracted increasing attention in recent years [11], [17], [72].

A key challenge in configuration tuning is its expensiveness when measuring the performance achieved by configurations [60]. For example, it takes more than 1,536 hours

to fully sample the configurations from only 11 options for a system [94]. To tackle this, many tuners have relied on the surrogate model: a data-driven model that learns the correlation between configuration and performance from past data. Depending on the way a model contributes to a tuner, existing work follows two design patterns for model-based tuners [11], [12], [49]:

- **Sequential:** a Bayesian optimization-style tuner, where the model is sequentially updated as the tuning progresses [9], [10], [37], [72], [95], [112].
- **Batched:** assuming a fixed, pre-trained model, such that it only helps to predict the performance of a given configuration without being updated when paired with a tuner [8], [38], [48], [58], [116].

The core benefits that the surrogate model provides is intuitive: with a model, the tuner can obtain a quick evaluation of the configurations’ performance, hence saving a huge amount of resources that would otherwise be required to measure the system. For example, it has been shown that predicting a configuration’s performance using the neural network-based model `DaL` [27], [30] only take  $\approx 18$  seconds, which is trivial compared with the maximum of 166 minutes required for measuring only one configuration directly on the database system `MARIADB` [19]. Therefore, while some works concentrate on how to integrate the model with a tuner, many have also exclusively focused on proposing a more accurate model [29], such as `HINNP`erf [20], `SEMPL` [28], and `DHDA` [105], which can be paired with diverse heuristic tuners [12].

Despite the importance, we have not yet obtained a comprehensive understanding on what role the models play in configuration tuning. A long-standing belief over decades is that “*the more accurate the model (e.g., on MAPE [27], [32] and  $\mu RD$  [71], [72]), the more useful for tuning, and vice versa*”. However in early 2025, for the first time, our prior work demonstrated that such a belief can be misleading [12]—the model accuracy has no positive monotonic correlation to the quality of tuning, e.g., a more accurate model does not help or can even harm the tuning results. Yet still, it has neither provided a systematic/comprehensive study on the root causes behind nor the resolution of how the community might move forward, when it is known that the model accuracy can be misleading. An important, but challenging and unanswered question is: how can we infer and assess what models are useful for tuning a system without comprehensively profiling them under the possible tuners?

Corresponding author: Tao Chen (email: t.chen@bham.ac.uk).

Pengzhou Chen and Hongyuan Liang are with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, China, 610056.

Tao Chen is with the School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, UK, B15 2TT.




Fig. 1: Comparing fitness landscape analysis with purely statistical distribution analysis for HADOOP.

To bridge the gap, in this paper, we unveil the many faces of surrogate models for configuration tuning from the perspective of fitness landscape analysis [103]—a well-established paradigm in the optimization community. In a nutshell, studying the fitness landscape provides insights into the problem’s characteristics and how those can influence the behaviors of the optimization algorithms [61], [77]. As shown in Figure 1, compared with the purely statistical distribution analysis used for configurable systems [26], [67], which mainly focuses on the performance/option variation, fitness landscape analysis additionally provides spatial information for:

- the strength of the overall guidance provided to steer the tuning process, i.e., the problem difficulty;
- and the topological neighborhood structure of the paths that can be explored by a tuner, including ruggedness, funnel/basin size, and gradient degree, etc.

As a result, it has been known that the fitness landscape analysis often helps stimulate more advanced and domain-specific algorithm designs [36], [61], [77], [107].

What makes our work unique is that we systematically analyze the landscape emulated by the model, with respect to that of the real system when appropriate, thus allowing us to obtain insights into the model usefulness for tuning that goes beyond the standard accuracy. Specifically, we make several contributions:

- **A New Theory.** We propose *landscape dominance*, a simple yet effective theory by discriminating global and local landscape features under the notion of Pareto dominance [97], to assess the model usefulness for tuning in a coarse-grained manner. Beyond accuracy, for the first time, this provides an alternative way to evaluate and compare the usefulness of models for configuration tuning without expensive tuner profiling.
- **An Empirical Study.** Drawing on the landscape dominance, we conduct an empirical study with 18 configurable systems, 10 surrogate models, 16 tuners, 8 landscape features, and 2 accuracy metrics, resulting in a range between 1,980 and 27,000 cases of investigation. We found that:
  - The proposed landscape dominance can correctly identify the more useful model for tuning in 78% cases overall.

- The accuracy metrics and landscape features are hardly correlated in a positive manner ( $< 30\%$  cases), meaning that they generally provide different aspects of information on the surrogate model for tuning.
- For 93% of the cases, the current models are still far away from correctly emulating the landscape of the real systems, but they might be helpful to relax the issue of local optima for a tuner, even considering a relatively low fidelity.
- No single model is generally the most preferred for tuning, considering all landscape features according to the landscape dominance.
- Memory and queue relevant configuration options can be  $\approx 2\times$  more influential to the landscape emulated by the models than options related to the others (e.g., CPU and utility), but the actual case can vary depending on the system and feature.

- **A Predictive Tool.** The landscape dominance and insights from the empirical study have led us to design *Model4Tune*—a fine-grained, predictive tool that leverages learning-to-rank—for identifying the most useful model-tuner pairs. We show that, when predicting on an unforeseen system, *Model4Tune* achieves remarkably better results than random guessing on up to 82% of the cases with a maximum of 244% improvement.

To promote open science, all data, source code, and supplementary materials can be found at our repository: <https://github.com/ideas-labo/model4tune>.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II overviews the necessary preliminaries. Section III presents the theory—a new alternative to assess the usefulness of models for tuning beyond accuracy—followed by the details of our empirical study in Section IV. Section V presents the findings with an in-depth analysis. Section VI discusses the insights learned from the observations and findings. Section VII presents *Model4Tune*, a predictive tool that assists practitioners in the tuner design by inferring the model usefulness for tuning via a fine-grained manner. Sections VIII and IX present the threats to validity and related work, respectively. Section X concludes the paper.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we discuss the necessary preliminaries that underpin this work.

### A. Configuration Tuning with Surrogate Model

The general goal of configuration tuning is to optimize a performance metric, e.g., latency or throughput, subject to a budget:

$$\arg \min f(c) \text{ or } \arg \max f(c) \quad (1)$$

where  $c = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_n\}$  is a configuration such that  $o_n$  is the  $n$ th configuration option, which can be a binary, integer, or enumerated value.  $f$  denotes measuring the system for evaluating the performance obtained by setting a certain configuration.

A key challenge thereof is that measuring  $f$  is profoundly expensive, limiting the ability to explore the configuration space. As such, model-based tuners, which leverage a surrogate model that mimics the real system, have become increasingly important, since the evaluations of the model can be done in seconds versus hours/days for measuring the system. Generally, there are two types of model-based tuners depending on how the model is used [12]:

- **Sequential model-based tuners** instead iteratively update the model during the tuning as newly measured configurations become available, most commonly following a Bayesian optimization procedure. Among the tuners, the main distinction is the way in which the model is updated and how to leverage the model to select the next configuration to be measured on the real system [9], [10], [37], [72], [95], [112].
- **Batch model-based tuners** pre-train a fixed model using a set of past measurements; such a model is then served as a delegate of the real system. In this way, the surrogate model can be seamlessly paired with any heuristics tuners [8], [38], [48], [58], [116].

### B. Fitness Landscape Analysis

Fitness landscape [61], [77], [103] serves as the foundation for characterizing the spatial structure of search spaces in optimization problems, particularly well-studied in the communities of machine learning [35], [65], evolutionary algorithms [2], [74], and computational optimization [1], [93]. Over the past decades [103], analyzing landscapes has helped researchers to understand the complexity of various optimization problems and their relationships to the behaviors of the algorithms. Since like other Search-based Software Engineering problems [18], [34], [52], configuration tuning is essentially an optimization problem, examining its fitness landscape is naturally promising.

An important notion in fitness landscape is the local optimum: suppose that we seek to minimize a performance metric, a configuration  $c$  is a local optimum if its performance value is no worse than all other configurations in its neighborhood radius within the landscape:

$$f(c) \leq f(c') \quad \forall c' \in \mathcal{N}(c) \quad (2)$$

wherein  $f(c)$  is the performance value (fitness) of configuration  $c$ ;  $\mathcal{N}(c)$  is the neighborhood of configuration  $c$ , which is defined depending on the problems/systems [61], [77], [103]; and  $c'$  denotes any configuration in the neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}(c)$  of  $c$ . In this work, we adopt Hamming distance to measure the neighborhood radius, which is the most common practice for configurable systems [14], [36]. Understanding the local optima is important, as prior studies have demonstrated that the configuration landscape for many configurable systems can contain tough local optima that would easily trap the tuners [10], [11], [72]—a root cause of tuning stagnation. As such, many existing tuner designs have primarily focused on how to jump out from those local optima whenever possible [10], [11].




Fig. 2: A projected configuration-throughput landscape derived from two models, HINNPPerf and LR, for the system HADOOP (dimensionality-reduced by PCA [84]).

The benefits of fitness landscape analysis for configuration tuning is vital: for example, precisely and spatially understanding the complexity of local optima can enable us to design tailored tuners: those that favor tuning exploration would be more suitable for systems with more challenging local optima [11], [48]; in contrast, preferring exploitation can be more appropriate with a strongly-guided and smoother configuration landscape [10].

### C. Motivation: Accuracy can Lie

For configuration tuning, our previous study [12] has indicated that the best/worst accuracy of the surrogate model is generally inconsistent with the best/worst tuning results under sequential model-based tuners—only  $\leq 20\%$  of the cases are matched. In contrast, the batch model-based tuners tend to have slightly better consistency, yet this still merely covers no more than 45% of the cases. The above empirical findings have already evidenced that the accuracy of surrogate models tends to be highly misleading and cannot serve as a reliable reflection of the usefulness of a model for tuning.

Indeed, since a model-based tuner would explore configurations in the model landscape instead of that of the real system, it is important to investigate the spatial information of the model-emulated landscape. However, this is not a straightforward task: even visually similar landscapes may have rather different underlying properties, hence affecting the tuner drastically. For example, in Figure 2, we show the landscapes emulated by HINNPPerf [20] and Linear Regression (LR) [66] for the HADOOP. Visually, both emulated landscapes are almost identical, yet mysteriously, running the same tuner on them leads to rather different tuning results. As such, the visualization of the landscape still cannot accurately portray the usefulness of the model.

The above is what motivates us to study and investigate new ways to assess the model’s usefulness beyond accuracy while mitigating the drawback of directly visualizing the landscape.

## III. THEORY: WHAT ARE USEFUL MODELS BEYOND ACCURACY?

The key of this work is to leverage the *landscape features* for explaining, assessing, and predicting the usefulness of




Fig. 3: Configuration landscapes emulated by the model GP and DT, together with the real landscape for system XG-BOOST. All are processed by PCA.

surrogate models for configuration tuning<sup>1</sup> (we leave detailed elaborations of these features in Section IV-E). Landscape features are core spatial properties of the configuration landscape [61], [77], [103], which helps to quantitatively reason the behaviors of tuners when searching therein. Other than simple visualization, those features quantify the landscape from various spatial aspects, e.g., measuring the ruggedness [90] and the difficulty to be optimized [68], shedding light on understanding the usefulness of models for configuration tuning. Recall the example from Figure 2, our posterior investigation suggests that the overall guidance provided (measured by Fitness Distance Correlation [68]) and the general ruggedness of the local optima (measured by Correlation Length [90]) of the two emulated landscapes differ by at least  $1.63\times$ , which means they are of diverse difficulty levels to a tuner—the root cause of the different results.

Broadly, landscape features can be divided into two categories depending on their granularities of information provided: *global* and *local* features [55], [56], [64]. The former refers to the features that reflect the overall structure of the landscape, e.g., difficulty or guidance; the latter measures the properties related to local optima, e.g., their density and ruggedness.

With accuracy, the general belief is that the closer the predicted performance to the actual performance, the more useful the model for configuration tuning. While this has been demonstrated as misleading [12] and given the promising landscape features, a key question remains is that *how do we know whether a model is more useful than the other for tuning even by leveraging the landscape features?* Indeed, it is natural to believe that a good/useful model should emulate a landscape that is as close to the real landscape as possible, which resembles to the principle behind accuracy. However, we have found that this is not always the case in practice. Consider the example in Figure 3, we see that the landscape emulated by the Decision Tree (DT) in (a) is clearly much more similar to the real one in (c) than the one by Gaussian Process (GP) in (b). Yet, the fact is that a tuner using the GP achieves much better results than using DT in general. This is because, in this case, although GP emulates a landscape that appears to be rather distinct from the real landscape, it still

<sup>1</sup>By the usefulness of a model for configuration tuning, we refer to the extent to which it helps to achieve better tuning results.

has the similar location of the global optimum/overall structure and, more importantly, it is smoother (than the real one and the one emulated by DT), hence less likely causing a tuner to be trapped at local optima; the importance of landscape smoothness has also recently been demonstrated by Yedida and Menzies [109]. As such, we propose a theoretical hypothesis:

#### ◀ Theory of Model Usefulness for Tuning ▶

A **more useful** surrogate model for configuration tuning is the one that emulates a landscape with

- **closer** global feature(s) to that(those) of the real landscape;
- while exhibiting **less severe** local optima property from the local feature(s).

The intention behind the theory is intuitive: if the global features of the model-emulated landscape deviated too much from the real one, then we are tuning for a different, irrelevant problem. Meanwhile, if the emulated landscape is of a similar global structure to the real one, then it would be more beneficial if its local optima issues are easier to tackle.

We call the above definition *landscape dominance*.

In what follows, we will derive our empirical study and propose new ways to assess/predict the usefulness of surrogate models according to the above theoretical understandings.

## IV. EMPIRICAL STUDY METHODOLOGY

We now delineate the methodology of our empirical study.

### A. Research Questions

We investigate the many faces of surrogate models for tuning via several research questions (RQs). The most fundamental goal is to verify our *theory of model usefulness for tuning*:

**RQ1:** *How effective is the proposed theory of landscape dominance using global and local landscape features in assessing model usefulness for configuration tuning?*

Then, to understand why the accuracy of surrogate models can be misleading for configuration tuning, we ask:

**RQ2:** *What is the correlation between accuracy and landscape features of surrogate models?*

Given our theory of the useful model for configuration tuning and that the landscape features can help to explain the behaviors of the tuners when exploring the landscape emulated by a model, understanding the above is essential to study why the accuracy is misleading when being used to reflect the quality of configuration tuning. Next, a natural question to answer is:

**RQ3:** *To what extent does the landscape emulated by a surrogate model differ from the real landscape of configurable systems?*

TABLE I: Details of the subject systems.  $(|\mathcal{B}|/|\mathcal{N}|)$  denotes the number of binary/numeric options.  $\mathcal{S}_{space}$  is the full configuration/search space.  $\mathcal{S}_{train}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{test}$  denote the training and testing size for a surrogate model, respectively.

System	Version	Workload	Domain	Performance	$ \mathcal{B} / \mathcal{N} $	$\mathcal{S}_{space}$	$\mathcal{S}_{train}$	$\mathcal{S}_{test}$	Ref.
APACHE	21.0	ApacheBench 2.3	Web Server	Maximum load (# users)	14/2	$2.35 \times 10^8$	507	12933	[102]
7z	9.20	Compressing a 3 GB directory	File Compressor	Runtime (ms)	11/3	$1.68 \times 10^8$	3600	65040	[102]
DCONVERT	3.0	Transform resources at different scales	Image Scaling	Runtime (s)	17/1	$1.05 \times 10^7$	578	6186	[67]
DEEPARCH	2.2.4	UCR Archive time series dataset	Deep Learning Tool	Runtime (min)	12/0	$4.10 \times 10^3$	2867	1229	[41]
EXASTENCILS	1.2	Three default benchmarks	Code Generator	Runtime (ms)	7/5	$1.61 \times 10^9$	2401	83675	[102]
HADOOP	3.0	HiBench	Data Analytics	Throughput (MB/s)	2/7	$1.27 \times 10^{29}$	250	3744	[6]
MARIADB	10.5	Sysbench	Database	Runtime (ms)	8/3	$5.31 \times 10^{11}$	196	776	[76]
MONGODB	4.4	Yahoo! cloud serving benchmark	Database	Runtime (ms)	14/2	$3.77 \times 10^8$	1008	5832	[76]
POSTGRESQL	22.0	PolePosition 0.6.0	Database	Runtime (ms)	6/3	$1.42 \times 10^9$	108	18900	[102]
REDIS	6.0	Sysbench	Database	Requests per second	1/8	$5.78 \times 10^{16}$	1633	2767	[6]
SPARK	3.0	HiBench	Data Analytics	Throughput (MB/s)	5/8	$2.55 \times 10^{12}$	252	2448	[6]
STORM	0.9.5	Randomly generated benchmark	Data Analytics	Latency (s)	0/12	$2.83 \times 10^{23}$	543	1004	[47]
HSMGP	1.0	Perform one V-cycle	Stencil-Grid Solver	Latency (ms)	11/3	$2.97 \times 10^8$	2419	1037	[32]
XGBOOST	12.0	Two standard datasets	Machine Learning Tool	Runtime (min)	11/0	$2.04 \times 10^3$	121	1927	[41]
HIPACC	0.8	A set of partial differential equations	Image Processing	Latency (ms)	31/2	$3.30 \times 10^{12}$	9439	4046	[32]
SQLITE	3.0	Benchmark provided by vendor	Database	Runtime (s)	39/0	$5.50 \times 10^{11}$	3187	1366	[32]
JAVAGC	7.0	DaCapo benchmark suite	Java Runtime	Runtime (ms)	12/23	$2.67 \times 10^{41}$	3718	163257	[32]
POLLY	3.9	The gemm program from polybench	Code Optimizer	Runtime (s)	39/0	$5.50 \times 10^{11}$	1521	58479	[20]

This enables us to explore the current fidelity of the surrogate models in terms of the landscape features.

While **RQ1-RQ3** provide a general overview of the landscape of the surrogate model for configuration tuning, they merely treat the system as a black box. As such, in **RQ4**, we ask:

**RQ4:** How does each individual option influence the emulated landscape of the surrogate model?

With domain knowledge and understanding of the configuration options, we seek to provide insights on how the specific options, and their categories, of the systems can change the landscape being built by a model, if each of them is omitted in the modeling process.

## B. Configurable Systems

1) *System Selection:* As shown in Table I, we select the software systems and their workloads used by the most notable works from the key venues in software modeling system engineering. After extensively surveying the systems, we conduct a screening of them following two criteria:

- We excluded systems with fewer than five options, as in those cases the quality difference among surrogate models appears to be insignificant.
- For the same systems where different sets of relevant configuration options have been used, we select the one with the highest number of options. For example, STORM is a configurable system that has been studied in many prior studies, and we use the instance with 12 options to tune, which is the most complicated case.

We have also omitted systems with a too small configuration space (i.e.,  $< 10^7$ ) while designed for the same domain as a larger system. For example, HSQLDB and POSTGRESQL are both database systems, but the former only has a space of  $2.62 \times 10^5$  while the latter has  $1.42 \times 10^9$  (but both would be selected if they have a search space  $> 10^7$ ). Additionally, certain systems (e.g., SAC, TOMCAT) are removed because their calculation of certain landscape features (e.g., CL) become too sparse to identify neighbors, rendering calculations impossible.

Table I shows the final set of 18 configurable systems considered in this study. It is clear that those systems come from various domains with diverse performance attributes that are of concern, ranging from 9 options (POSTGRESQL) to 39 options (POLLY). The configuration space also covers a wide range: from  $2.04 \times 10^3$  to  $2.67 \times 10^{41}$ . It is worth noting that, even for those with a relatively small search space, the measurement of a single configuration can still be time-consuming. For instance, it can take up to hours to measure one configuration on MARIADB [19], and a single run of measurement for DEEPARCH might even be half a day [41].

Note that the configuration performance data is collected by using standard benchmarks [6], [32], [41], [47], [67], [72], [76], [102]. For instance, when tuning SQLITE, SYSBENCH—a standard performance benchmark—is used to generate the workloads and for measuring the performance. To avoid measurement noise, the performance of each configuration is the average or median of 3 to 23 measurement repeats, as stated in the prior work.

2) *Option Selection:* To ensure the validity and comparability of our research outcomes, we adopt a rigorous approach that adheres strictly to the established norms within the research community. Instead of devising our own selection criteria, we have meticulously matched the configuration options, corresponding values, workloads/benchmarks, and target performance metrics with those employed in previous studies of the same systems [6], [32], [41], [47], [67], [72], [76], [102].

## C. Surrogate Models

In this study, we examine surrogate models commonly used by research on software configuration [13], [26], [40], [62], including both the general machine learning models (e.g., GP) and those that are proposed for configuration performance learning (e.g., DaL [27]). In particular, the models are of diverse categories, e.g., Gaussian distribution, tree-based, and deep learning based. The results have been shown in Table II.

It is worth noting that we have to omit certain models due to their slow runtime on training and/or prediction. For example, Perf-AL [85], a deep learning model specifically designed for learning configuration performance, relies on an adversarial

TABLE II: Specification of the surrogate models considered. ML and DL denotes classic Machine Learning and Deep Learning, respectively.

Model	Abbr.	Type	Domain	Characteristics	Ref.	Used by
Support Vector Regression	SVR	ML	General	Good for high dimensionality but can be sensitive to its parameters	[88]	[27]
Linear Regression	LR	ML	General	Fast execution but only suitable for independent linear relationships	[66]	[27]
Gaussian Process	GP	ML	General	Providing uncertainty estimates but only suitable for low dimension	[79]	[43]
Decision Tree	DT	ML	General	Easy to interpret but can be overfitting and instable	[89]	[72]
Random Forests	RF	ML	General	High accuracy and stable but can be complex and difficult to explain	[54]	[9]
DECART	DCT	ML	Configurable systems	Handling non-linear relationships with tuned parameters but can overfit	[31]	[32]
SPLConqueror	SPL	ML	Configurable systems	Handling option interactions but mainly work linearly	[86]	[20]
DaL	DaL	ML/DL	Configurable systems	Efficiently addressing sample sparsity but can be expensive to train	[27]	[27]
DeepPerf	DeP	DL	Configurable systems	Accurate for sparse options but sensitive to hyperparameters	[32]	[20]
HINPerf	HIP	DL	Configurable systems	High accuracy through hierarchical modeling but hard to tune	[20]	[27]

TABLE III: The landscape features considered.  $\uparrow$  and  $\downarrow$  denote the interpretations for bigger and smaller value, respectively (assuming that the performance metric is to be minimized).

Metric	Abbr.	Domain	Characteristics	$\uparrow$ Bigger Value	$\downarrow$ Smaller Value
Fitness Distance Correlation [68]	FDC	Global	Correlation between configurations' distances and the distance to the optimal configuration.	more straightforward guidance	more misleading guidance
From Best Distance [36]	FBD	Global	Distance between the configuration and the global optimum.	more dense optimum	more sparse optimum
Skewness [75]	Ske	Global	Describes the skewness of the landscape.	worse performance is common	better performance is common
Kurtosis [21]	Kur	Global	Describes the sharpness or flatness of the landscape's peak.	more peaked performance	flatter performance
Proportion of Local Optima [55]	PLO	Local	Proportion of local optima in the configuration space.	more local optima	less local optima
Correlation Length [90]	CL	Local	The rate at which landscape correlation decays with distance.	more smoother landscape	more rugged landscape
Maximum Information Entropy [69]	MIE	Local	Logarithmic operation based on information content.	more complex local optima	simpler local optima
Nearest Better Cluster [45]	NBC	Local	Relationship between nearest neighbor and nearest better neighbor.	larger local optima cluster	smaller local optima cluster

neural network with hyperparameter tuning that requires an extremely long training time.

#### D. Accuracy Metrics of Surrogate Models

To comprehensively assess accuracy, we include two of the most widely used metrics that are derived from a completely different nature: residual and ranked.

**MAPE** [27], [32], [110], [116], a.k.a. MRE or MMRE, is a popular residual metric for measuring accuracy, which is calculated as:

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{y_i - \hat{y}_i}{y_i} \right| \cdot 100\% \quad (3)$$

where  $n$  is the number of testing samples;  $\hat{y}_i$  and  $y_i$  correspond to the model-predicted and true performance value of a configuration, respectively. Since MAPE measures the error, the smaller the MAPE, the better the accuracy.

It is not hard to understand that MAPE is independent of the performance scale, therefore enabling cross-comparisons of models built for different systems and performance attributes. In contrast to other common metrics such as root mean square error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE), MAPE has its unique advantage: it is more scale-robust compared with MAE, while it is more resilient to outliers and is more interpretable than RMSE.

Unlike MAPE,  $\mu\text{RD}$  is a rank-based metric [72] that provides the coarse-grained quantification of the accuracy. The motivation is that tuning configuration might care less about the extent of performance deviation between the configurations, but only whether they are better or worse.

In a nutshell,  $\mu\text{RD}$  computes the number of pairs in the test data where the performance model ranks them incorrectly and measures the average rank difference. It can be calculated using equation (4) :

$$\mu\text{RD} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{rank}(y_i) - \text{rank}(\hat{y}_i)| \quad (4)$$

in which  $\text{rank}$  denotes the function that produces the rank value of a performance value among the others in the testing data;  $n$  signifies the number of testing samples.  $y_i$  corresponds to the true performance value of the configuration, and  $\hat{y}_i$  stands for the predicted performance value for the same configuration.

#### E. Landscape Features

Indeed, from the literature, there exist hundreds of landscape features [55], [56], [64]. However, not all of them are suitable for our case following the criteria below:

- **Using representative from distinct categories.** For example, both Maximum Information Entropy (MIE) and ratio of partial information measure the amount of information contained by the fitness distribution, but the former takes a more holistic view in the entropy computation, and hence it is chosen as a representative. Similarly, many features assess the difficulty of the configuration landscape, e.g., Fitness Distance Correlation (FDC), fitness mean, and distance mean, from which we use FDC since it is more widely applied for fitness landscape analysis [36].
- **Omitting multi-objective features.** Since we are focusing on tuning a single performance objective, landscape features that are designed for multi-objective optimization are omitted [55].

The above apply to both the global and local landscape features. A brief summary of all landscape features considered can be found in Table III.

1) *Global Features: Fitness Distance Correlation (FDC)* [68] measures the correlation between a configuration's performance value and its distance to the global optimum, with a value range of  $[-1, 1]$ .

$$FDC = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (f_i - \bar{f})(d_i - \bar{d})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (f_i - \bar{f})^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - \bar{d})^2}} \quad (5)$$

where  $f_i$  is the performance value,  $d_i$  is the distance to the best solution,  $\bar{f}$  and  $\bar{d}$  are their respective means. Assuming the performance is to be minimized, when the FDC value is close to 1, the performance value becomes better since the distance reduces, indicating an easier tuning problem as the guidance provided by closeness of configurations is stronger. In contrast, if the FDC is close to  $-1$ , the performance value becomes worse despite reduced distance, suggesting that the guidance is more misleading and hence more challenging for tuning. A FDC of 0 implies no information can be found. As a global metric, FDC effectively reflects the general search difficulty of the problem.

**Fitness Best Distance (FBD)** [36] quantifies the Hamming distance between the best configuration in the current configuration set—which is often sampled via random walk—and the known global optimum, with a value range of  $[0, n]$ , where  $n$  is the dimension of options.

$$FBD = \min_{x^* \in S^*} \min_{x \in X_{best}} d(x, x^*) \quad (6)$$

where  $S^*$  is the set of global optima,  $X_{best}$  is the set of best configuration found, and  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the Hamming distance. FBD directly indicates the proximity of the current best configuration to the global optimum: the smaller value means that the global optimum is not far from a best configuration found, hence easier for a tuner.

**Skewness (Ske)** [75] and **Kurtosis (Kur)** [21] are statistical measures that describe the shape of a fitness/performance distribution in the tuning problem from distinct perspectives. Specifically, *Ske* quantifies the asymmetry: for minimizing performance, a positive skewness indicates a longer right tail and a negative skewness indicates a longer left tail, providing insights into the distribution's non-uniformity for the performance. As such, a smaller *Ske* value is better, since it is less common to have worse performance values. *Kur* measures the peakedness or flatness of a landscape's performance, where a value greater than 3 indicates a more peaked distribution and a value less than 3 suggests a flatter one, revealing the concentration of solutions and the complexity of the configuration space. Thus, a smaller *Kur* implies a relatively easier tuning problem. Formally, they are calculated as:

$$Ske = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mu)^3]}{\sigma^3} \quad (7)$$

$$Kur = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mu)^4]}{\sigma^4} \quad (8)$$

where  $Y$  is the fitness/performance distribution;  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  are the mean and standard deviation of  $Y$ , respectively.

2) *Local Features: Proportion of Local Optima (PLO)* [55] measures the ratio of local optima to the total number of configurations in the configuration space, with a value range of  $[0, 1]$  (assume minimization).

$$PLO = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} \mathbb{I}[f(x) \leq f(y) \text{ for all } y \in N(x)] \quad (9)$$

where  $N(x)$  is the neighborhood of  $x$ , and  $\mathbb{I}[\cdot]$  is the indicator function, calculated as the number of local optima divided by the total number of configurations. PLO reflects the multimodal nature of the configuration space, where it is possible to have multiple global optima. A high PLO value indicates a large number of local optima, potentially increasing the risk of a tuner being trapped in local optima.

**Correlation Length (CL)** [90] is a key metric that quantifies the ruggedness of the configuration landscape.

$$CL = -\frac{1}{\log |r_1|} \quad (10)$$

$$r_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i - \bar{y})(y_{i+1} - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (11)$$

wherein  $r_1$  is the autocorrelation. Practically, CL is computed by sampling the configuration space through a random walk to generate a sequence, calculating the autocorrelation coefficients of the sequence, and applying a logarithmic transformation to obtain the final correlation length. A bigger absolute CL indicates a smoother landscape, while a smaller absolute CL suggests a more rugged landscape, which implies severe local optima traps. CL is valuable for guiding the selection of local search step sizes, evaluating the effectiveness of neighborhood structures, and predicting the efficiency of local search strategies.

**Maximum Information Entropy (MIE)** [69] reflects the information complexity of the configuration space.

$$MIE = \max_{\epsilon} H(\epsilon) \quad (12)$$

$$H(\epsilon) = -\sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\epsilon) \log_6 p_{ij}(\epsilon) \quad (13)$$

and  $p_{ij}(\epsilon)$  represents the transition probabilities in the  $\epsilon$ -based information content analysis. Drawing on the information entropy theory, it accounts for local variations in the configuration space, serving as an indication of the information quality of local optima. A higher MIE indicates the landscape contains local optima of more complex structure. This metric is instrumental in assessing problem complexity, evaluating the difficulty of algorithm convergence, and guiding the selection of appropriate search strategies.

**Nearest Better Clustering (NBC)** [45] analyzes the local clustering characteristics of the configuration space.

$$NBC = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} \frac{d_{nb}(x)}{d_{nn}(x)} \quad (14)$$

in which  $d_{nb}(x)$  is the distance to the nearest better configuration and  $d_{nn}(x)$  is the distance to the nearest neighbor. NBC is calculated by identifying the nearest neighbor with a better fitness/performance value for each configuration, computing the mean of the distance ratios. NBC reflects the degree of

clustering in the configuration space, describes the distribution of local optimal configurations, and reveals the local structure of the landscape. If NBC is higher, it indicates that it is easy to find a better configuration in a localized region, as the size of the local optima cluster is smaller.

### F. Metric for Tuning Quality

In this work, we are concerned with the most popular aspect of the tuning quality, namely the performance, which is system-dependent. Naturally, we use the measured performance of the best measured configuration. Notably, according to Table I, some of those performance metrics are to be minimized (e.g., the latency for MARIADB) while others are to be maximized (e.g., the throughput for HADOOP). Yet, for the simplicity of exposition and interpretation, in this work, we convert all maximizing performance to be minimized via additive inversion.

### G. Statistical Validation

To mitigate stochastic bias, we use several statistical methods.

1) *Wilcoxon Signed Rank/Rank Sum Test*: To verify pairwise comparisons, we use Wilcoxon test—a non-parametric test that has been recommended for software engineering research [5]. We apply both of its paired and non-paired versions, i.e., Wilcoxon signed-rank and Wilcoxon rank-sum test, depending on the RQs and needs. We set a confidence level of  $\alpha = 95\%$ , meaning that if the comparison results in  $p < 0.05$  then the difference is statistically significant.

2) *Scott-Knott Effect Size Difference (ESD) Test*: When comparing multiple models, we leverage the non-parametric version of the Scott-Knott Effect Size Difference (ESD) test<sup>2</sup> [91]. In a nutshell, Scott-Knott ESD test sorts the list of treatments (e.g., models) by their median values of the metric. Next, it splits the list into two sub-lists with the largest expected difference [104]. For example, suppose that we compare  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ , a possible split could be  $\{A, B\}$ ,  $\{C\}$ , with the rank ( $r$ ) of 1 and 2, respectively. This means that, in the statistical sense,  $A$  and  $B$  perform similarly, but they are significantly better than  $C$ .

In contrast to other non-parametric statistical tests on multiple comparisons (e.g., Kruskal-Wallis test [63]), Scott-Knott ESD test offers the following unique advantages:

- It does not require posterior correction, as the comparisons are essentially conducted in a pairwise manner.
- It not only shows whether some treatments are statistically different or not, but also indicates which one is better than another, i.e., by means of ranking, while avoiding overlapping groups.
- It overcomes the confounding factor of overlapping groups that are produced by other post hoc tests.

3) *Spearman’s Rank Correlation*: To quantify the relationship between two metrics, we leverage Spearman’s rank correlation ( $\rho$ ) [70], which is a widely used indicator in software engineering [13], [101]. Specifically, Spearman’s rank

<sup>2</sup>We use the non-parametric version of the Scott-Knott ESD test.




Fig. 4: Methodology of the empirical study.

correlation measures the nonlinear monotonic relation between two random variables, and we have  $-1 \leq \rho \leq 1$ .  $|\rho|$  represents the strength of monotonic correlation, and  $\rho = 0$  means that the two metrics do not correlate with each other in any way;  $-1 \leq \rho < 0$  and  $0 < \rho \leq 1$  denote that the monotonic correlation is negative and positive, respectively.

As widely used in software engineering [80], [101], the Spearman’s rank correlation can be interpreted as:

- **negligible**:  $0 \leq |\rho| \leq 0.09$
- **weak**:  $0.09 < |\rho| \leq 0.39$
- **moderate**:  $0.39 < |\rho| \leq 0.69$
- **strong**:  $0.69 < |\rho| \leq 1$

The statistical significance of the  $\rho$  value is verified by z-score under a confidence level of 95%, i.e., the correlation is significant only when  $p < 0.05$ .

Commonly, only moderate level or higher ( $|\rho| > 0.39$ ) with  $p < 0.05$  are significant enough to create practical implication [12], [101].

### H. Settings for Model Training and Testing

To train the surrogate models, for each system, we randomly sample a small set of measured configuration-performance pairs from the available one, following exactly what has been done in prior work [27], [86]: for binary systems, the sample size would be  $5n$  where  $n$  is the number of configuration options; for mixed/non-binary systems, we use SPLConqueror [86] to estimate the size. All the remaining samples in the systems’ datasets serve as the testing data, which would be used to compute both the landscape features and accuracy metrics<sup>3</sup>. The results are shown in Table I.

### I. Procedure of Empirical Study

The methodology of the empirical study has been depicted in Figure 4. In total, our study covers 18 configurable systems, 10 surrogate models, 16 tuners, 8 landscape features, and 2

<sup>3</sup>The training data is randomly chosen in each repeated run.

accuracy metrics, ranging between 1,980 and 27,000 cases for the corresponding RQs. To mitigate the stochastic noise, we repeat each experiment 30 times with varying seeds while verifying their statistical significance. Note that answering **RQ1** and **RQ4** additionally requires conducting iterated tuning under diverse model-tuner pairs (see Section V-A) and manually inspecting the characteristics of configuration options (see Section V-D), respectively.

All experiments were run in parallel on two high-performance servers each with Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS, two Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 50 cores CPU@2.30GHz (with two Nvidia A100 80GB GPU support for training the deep learning-based models), and 500GB memory over the period of 14 months,  $24 \times 7$ —roughly 10,080 GPU/CPU hours. Furthermore, manually categorizing the characteristics of systems’ options has also taken  $\approx 6.4$  person months.

## V. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this section, we summarize and discuss the results obtained.

### A. RQ1: Verifying New Theory of Model Usefulness

1) *Method*: To verify our theoretical hypothesis in **RQ1**, we propose a simple method to instantiate landscape dominance based on *Pareto dominance* [97]—a common concept in multi-objective optimization—for investigating whether the global and local landscape features are helpful.

Traditionally, the Pareto dominance relationship is defined as a binary relationship between two solutions  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  with respect to a set of objectives  $\mathbf{F}$  (assuming minimization), from which  $\mathcal{A}$  dominates  $\mathcal{B}$  is denoted as:

$$\mathcal{A} \succ \mathcal{B} \iff (f_{i,\mathcal{A}} \leq f_{i,\mathcal{B}}, \forall f_i \in \mathbf{F}) \wedge (f_{j,\mathcal{A}} < f_{j,\mathcal{B}}, \exists f_j \in \mathbf{F}) \quad (15)$$

whereby  $f_{i,\mathcal{A}}$  and  $f_{i,\mathcal{B}}$  are the values of the  $i$ th objective for solution  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , respectively.

However, since it is unclear about the relative importance within/between the global and local features, while it is difficult for us to precisely define their preferences, it is natural to see every global and local feature as an independent objective. Yet, this would lead to too many non-dominated and incomparable models, since we have a total of eight features [50]. To mitigate this, we consider two objectives at a time, one from global features and the other from the local features; we examine all the possible combinations.

Specifically, according to our definition of the *landscape dominance* for “useful” model from Section III, we define and instantiate two objectives (the models are trained and tested using the sample size in Table I for calculating the landscape features):

- **Absolute deviation of a global feature  $\Delta g$** : We measure the distance between the feature of the model emulated landscape ( $g_{model}$ ) and that of the real landscape ( $g_{system}$ ):  $\Delta g = |g_{system} - g_{model}|$ . Note that  $g_{model}$  and  $g_{system}$  are computed using the same points in the testing dataset.

TABLE IV: Specification of the tuners considered from [12].

Tuner	Type	Domain	Tuner	Type	Domain
BOCA [9]	Sequential	Compilers	ConEx [48]	Batch	Distributed systems
ATconf [22]	Sequential	Big data systems	BestConfig [116]	Batch	Database systems
FLASH [72]	Sequential	Configurable systems	Trace [58]	Batch	Parameter optimization
OtterTune [95]	Sequential	Database systems	GGA [4]	Batch	Parameter optimization
ResTune [112]	Sequential	Database systems	ParamILS [38]	Batch	Parameter optimization
ROBOTune [46]	Sequential	Distributed systems	Random	Batch	General
SMAC [37]	Sequential	Parameter optimization	GA [49]	Batch	General
Tuneful [24]	Sequential	Data analytics	SWAY [8]	Batch	Parameter optimization

TABLE V: The budgets used for each system from [12].

System	Budget	System	Budget	System	Budget
APACHE	271	7z	382	DCONVERT	335
DEEPARCH	207	EXASTENCILS	416	HADOOP	297
MARIADB	226	MONGODB	278	POSTGRESQL	298
REDIS	298	SPARK	326	STORM	263
HSMGP	218	XGBOOST	278	HIPACC	371
SQLITE	206	JAVAGC	289	POLLY	285

- **A local feature  $l$** : We directly measure the landscape features ( $l$ ) of the landscape built by the models. For the ease of exposition, we additively convert all features such that a smaller value represents easier local optima case.

We expect both  $\Delta g$  and  $l$  to be smaller. Given two surrogate models  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , the proposed landscape dominance can be formalized by revising and specializing the Pareto dominance with the above two objectives as:

$$\mathcal{A} \succ \mathcal{B} \iff (\Delta g_{i,\mathcal{A}} \leq \Delta g_{i,\mathcal{B}} \wedge l_{i,\mathcal{A}} < l_{i,\mathcal{B}}) \vee (\Delta g_{i,\mathcal{A}} < \Delta g_{i,\mathcal{B}} \wedge l_{i,\mathcal{A}} \leq l_{i,\mathcal{B}}) \quad (16)$$

whereby  $\Delta g_{i,\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\Delta g_{i,\mathcal{B}}$  are the value of the  $i$ th chosen global feature deviation for model  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , respectively; the same applies to  $l_{i,\mathcal{A}}$  and  $l_{i,\mathcal{B}}$  which are for the  $i$ th selected local feature. Here,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the *dominating* model when  $\mathcal{B}$  is the *dominated* one, hence  $\mathcal{A}$  is better and more useful.

Next, we pair the models with 16 state-of-the-art tuners, which have been used in prior work [12], and run them on all the systems. We follow the same method to identify the budgets that ensure all tuners can reasonably converge. For the hot-start sample size of sequential model-based tuners, we use the same setting of 20 measurements as used by Chen et al. [12]. The training size from Table I is used for the batch model-based tuners. The results<sup>4</sup> can be found in Tables IV and V.

Drawing on the above, for each system, we perform the following:

- (i) Pick a tuner (from the total of 16 tuners).
- (ii) Pick a combination of global and local landscape features (total of  $4 \times 4 = 16$  combinations).
- (iii) Compute the  $\Delta g$  and  $l$  for each of the 10 models considered.
- (iv) Put any pair of models ( $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ ), such that it satisfies  $\mathcal{A} \succ \mathcal{B}$  on  $\Delta g$  and  $l$ , into the dominating (DG) group and dominated (DD) group, respectively.

<sup>4</sup>Note that for sequential model-based tuners, the budget denotes the hot-start sample size and the system measurements; for batch model-based tuners, the budget only means the number of model evaluations, as the model is pre-trained using the training samples (again, those are system measurements too) from Table I. Such a different setting is due to how the model is used thereof, and it does not affect the conclusions since we never compare a sequential model-based tuner and another batch counterpart directly.

TABLE VI: Exemplified model pairs in the dominating (DG) and dominated (DD) groups on a given system via landscape dominance.

Tuner	Objectives		Pairs of Models	
	$\Delta g$	$l$	DG group	DD group
GA	FDC	CL	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
GA	FDC	CL	$\mathcal{B}$	$\mathcal{C}$
...	...	...	...	...
GA	Kur	PLO	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{B}$
...	...	...	...	...
SMAC	FDC	CL	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
...	...	...	...	...

(v) Repeat from (ii) until all combinations have been examined.

(vi) Repeat from (i) until all tuners have been investigated.

Therefore, for a system, in total we need to extract the pairs with dominance relations for  $16 \times 16 = 256$  tuner and global/local feature combination, under each of which there might be 0 or more dominating/dominated pairs.

An example of a given system has been shown in Table VI. Clearly, the models come in pairs from a tuner under a particular combination of global and local landscape features, hence the size of both the dominating and dominated groups would always be equal. Note that it is possible for the two groups to have overlapping models even under the same tuner and global/local feature combination, e.g., model  $\mathcal{B}$  is in both the dominating and dominated group for GA when using FDC as the  $\Delta g$  and CL as the  $l$ , since  $\mathcal{B}$  is both dominating  $\mathcal{C}$  while being dominated by  $\mathcal{A}$ . As such, we have two pairs:  $\mathcal{A} \succ \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B} \succ \mathcal{C}$ . This makes sense, as according to our theory,  $\mathcal{B}$  is indeed both more and less useful than one other model.

We report on the mean tuning performance (e.g., latency) deviation of all the  $n$  pairs between the dominating and dominated group (we additively invert maximizing performance into minimizing for simple exposition):

$$\Delta p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (p_{i,DG} - p_{i,DD}) \quad (17)$$

where  $p_{i,DG}$  is the system’s tuned performance when using the  $i$ th model-tuner pair that belongs to the dominating group;  $p_{i,DD}$  is that under the corresponding model-tuner from the dominated group. Therefore, a negative  $\Delta p$  generally confirms our theory; otherwise, it is violated. We apply the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to verify the statistical significance of such deviations between the dominating and dominated groups, since we have paired data. The percentages of pairs for which a model in the dominating group wins/loses (i.e., it has better/worse performance) are also reported.

2) *Results*: As can be seen in Table VII, for 14 out of 18 systems (78%), on average, confirm that the dominating models can enable much better tuning performance than their dominated counterpart in the pair, all of which show statistical significance. The results are even more obvious on the percentage of pairs in which the model belongs to the dominating group wins: up to 87.5% for a system. All the above demonstrate the validity and reliability of our theory on

TABLE VII: Comparing the performance of dominating (DG) and dominated (DD) groups.  $\dagger$  denotes that the difference exhibits  $p < 0.001$ . Green rows and red rows denote the cases that confirm and violate our theory of model usefulness with statistical significance, respectively.

System	$\Delta p$	DG Lose (%)	DG Win (%)
APACHE	-0.0191 $\dagger$	39.1	60.9
7z	-173.1200 $\dagger$	22.7	77.3
DCONVERT	-0.0016 $\dagger$	45.3	54.7
DEEPARCH	-0.0079 $\dagger$	18.0	82.0
EXASTENCILS	-192.1372 $\dagger$	17.2	82.8
HADOOP	-0.5338 $\dagger$	42.2	57.8
MARIADB	-0.0779 $\dagger$	39.1	60.9
MONGODB	-417.9015 $\dagger$	25.8	74.2
POSTGRESQL	2.3402 $\dagger$	59.4	40.6
REDIS	0.0441	50.0	50.0
SPARK	-3.1976 $\dagger$	35.2	64.8
STORM	-0.0000 $\dagger$	24.2	63.3
HSMGP	0.8928 $\dagger$	80.5	19.5
XGBOOST	-0.9543 $\dagger$	25.0	75.0
HIPACC	0.0153 $\dagger$	62.5	37.5
SQLITE	-0.0173 $\dagger$	34.4	65.6
JAVAGC	-3.0529 $\dagger$	12.5	87.5
POLLY	-0.0836 $\dagger$	14.8	85.2

the relative model usefulness for tuning based on landscape features. As such, we confirm that through a pair of randomly chosen global and local features:

#### Finding 1

*In the majority of the cases (78%), a model-emulated landscape with smaller deviation of the overall structure to the real landscape and less severe local optima can generally reflect a more useful model for tuning.*

#### B. RQ2: Correlating Accuracy and Landscape Features for Model Usefulness

1) *Method*: To answer **RQ2**, we train all 10 models over the 18 systems with 30 repeats, after which we measure their accuracy (MAPE and  $\mu$ RD) and the landscape features using the samples in Table I. Following our theory of model usefulness and **RQ1**, we use the  $\Delta g$  and  $l$  to represent the landscape features. A smaller  $\Delta g$ ,  $l$ , MAPE, and  $\mu$ RD is preferred<sup>5</sup>.

We then analyze the monotonic relationships between accuracy metrics and  $\Delta g/l$  of the models using Spearman correlation. Therefore, considering the 10 models and 30 repeated runs, for each accuracy-landscape feature pair under a system, we have  $10 \times 30 = 300$  points in the correlation analysis. When they have a strong positive correlation, we say that the information expressed by the landscape features for model usefulness is largely consistent with that of the accuracy, i.e., a better accuracy can also reflect a more preferred landscape feature.

<sup>5</sup>All landscape features and accuracy metrics are computed using the same points in the testing dataset.

TABLE VIII: Spearman correlations between landscape features and accuracy metrics. † and \* denote  $p < 0.001$  and  $0.001 \leq p < 0.05$ , respectively. Green bars and red bars indicate positive and negative correlation, respectively. Their darkness of color reflect the strength of correlations.

System	FDC-MAPE	FDC-μRD	FBD-MAPE	FBD-μRD	Ske-MAPE	Ske-μRD	Kur-MAPE	Kur-μRD	PLO-MAPE	PLO-μRD	CL-MAPE	CL-μRD	MIE-MAPE	MIE-μRD	NBC-MAPE	NBC-μRD
APACHE	-0.17*	-0.15*	0.05	0.08	0.57†	0.73†	0.61†	0.72†	0.08	0.34†	0.20†	0.28†	-0.21†	-0.07	-0.01	-0.32†
7Z	0.24†	0.20†	0.74†	0.74†	0.83†	0.89†	0.86†	0.92†	-0.45†	-0.40†	0.39†	0.34†	-0.01	0.05	0.47†	0.41†
D CONVERT	-0.02	-0.21†	-0.13*	0.01	0.52†	0.77†	0.47†	0.79†	0.08	-0.08	-0.06	0.05	0.30†	0.55†	-0.10	0.09
DEEPARCH	0.08	-0.19†	0.37†	0.11*	0.70†	0.41†	0.71†	0.38†	-0.32†	0.31†	-0.21†	0.24†	0.36†	0.42†	0.31†	-0.35†
EXASTENCILS	0.57†	0.66†	0.55†	0.59†	0.61†	0.77†	0.64†	0.81†	-0.06	0.01	0.30†	0.15*	0.07	0.22†	0.05	0.05
HADOOP	-0.03	-0.03	-0.16*	0.11*	-0.10	0.06	-0.24†	0.02	0.27†	0.05	-0.24†	0.21†	0.04	0.21†	-0.39†	0.05
MARIADB	-0.05	0.03	-0.08	-0.21†	0.56†	0.76†	0.36†	0.63†	-0.41†	-0.35†	-0.32†	-0.34†	-0.04	0.18†	-0.07	0.07
MONGODB	0.27†	0.38†	0.10	0.27†	0.47†	0.56†	0.38†	0.44†	0.47†	0.41†	0.13*	0.14*	0.04	0.06	-0.32†	-0.24†
POSTGRESQL	0.08	0.11*	0.03	0.01	0.13*	0.19†	0.07	0.26†	-0.18*	0.26†	0.03	0.24†	-0.15*	-0.46†	0.19†	-0.19†
REDIS	-0.04	0.24†	-0.13*	-0.04	-0.01	-0.08	-0.18†	0.27†	0.45†	-0.35†	-0.22†	0.14*	-0.06	0.08	-0.58†	-0.49†
SPARK	-0.05	-0.03	0.16*	0.20†	0.54†	0.71†	0.61†	0.83†	-0.28†	-0.36†	0.06	0.17*	0.08	0.03	0.17*	0.12*
STORM	-0.05	0.02	0.18*	0.10	0.57†	0.78†	0.52†	0.77†	-0.62†	-0.66†	-0.22†	-0.42†	0.04	0.29†	0.39†	0.38†
HSMGP	-0.02	0.18*	-0.02	-0.17*	0.47†	0.42†	0.47†	0.42†	-0.03	0.28†	-0.01	-0.03	0.25†	0.68†	0.14*	-0.03
XGBOOST	0.12*	0.01	0.03	-0.22†	0.56†	0.63†	0.53†	0.60†	-0.41†	0.06	-0.02	-0.15*	0.50†	0.51†	0.42†	-0.04
HIPACC	-0.18†	-0.24†	0.60†	0.62†	0.65†	0.73†	0.62†	0.70†	-0.49†	-0.48†	-0.11	-0.06	0.56†	0.62†	0.57†	0.58†
SQLITE	0.07	0.17*	0.22†	0.15*	-0.06	-0.27†	0.28†	0.36†	0.24†	0.54†	0.09	0.17*	0.38†	0.47†	-0.14*	-0.45†
JAVAGC	0.45†	0.42†	-0.29*	0.29*	0.67†	0.27*	0.30*	0.34*	-0.35*	0.03	0.44†	0.72†	0.37*	-0.18	0.38*	0.01
POLLY	0.53†	0.70†	0.40†	0.37†	0.44†	0.73†	0.50†	0.77†	-0.15*	-0.22†	0.19†	0.06	0.25†	0.32†	0.16*	0.23†




Fig. 5: Per accuracy-landscape feature pair correlation.

In addition to the results for every accuracy-landscape feature pair under each system, we also summarize the results from two aspects:

- **Per accuracy-landscape feature pair basis:** This means that, for each accuracy-landscape feature pair, we have 18 cases since there are 18 systems.
- **Per system basis:** For each system, we have 2 accuracy metrics  $\times$  8 landscape features = 16 cases.

Note that we only consider correlation higher than the moderate level while  $p < 0.05$  as a significant correlation; all other cases (weak and negligible, or with  $p > 0.05$ ) have limited practical implications. A significant positive correlation means that the landscape features are more preferred when the accuracy becomes better, and hence the accuracy metrics can serve as their “delegate”. Otherwise, either negative or insignificant correlations suggest that the landscape features indeed provide additional information that cannot be covered by the accuracy metrics.

2) *Results:* As shown in Table VIII, a clear pattern we can observe is that, although in certain cases the landscape features have strongly and positively correlated with the accuracy metrics, they mostly have insignificant or negative correlation: only 29% cases show moderate or higher positive correlations. Indeed, some systems exhibit more positive correlations than the others, e.g., EXASTENCILS shows positive correlations to the accuracy mainly for the global features while those on the local features are rather weak/negligible and with  $p > 0.05$  in general, despite being positive; in contrast, BATIK has all




Fig. 6: Per system correlation.

the cases being negative or insignificant correlations. This is attributed to the real landscape formed by different systems: some systems are more difficult to tune than others due to the limited structural guidance and/or the presence of complex local optima.

We can see clearer results when investigating the per accuracy-landscape feature across the system, as shown in Figure 5: the majority of the landscape features reveal insignificant correlations (on average, only 5.3 out of 18 systems show at least moderately positive correlation). The only exceptions are for Ske and Kur such that the positive correlations are more common (with up to 14/18 systems), which is also the main contributor to the significant positive correlation in Table VIII. This makes sense, since they are global features that reflect on the distribution of the performance (fitness) values, which is directly relevant to the way the accuracy metrics are calculated. However, we note that even for Ske and Kur, the correlations are rarely strong.

To better understand whether the correlations differ on the systems, in Figure 6, we note that there indeed exist discrepancies; for example, three systems, i.e., 7Z, EXASTENCILS, and HIPACC, have 50% or more accuracy-landscape pairs with at least moderately positive correlation. However, overall, there are only 4.7 out of 16 pairs that have a positive correlation of at least the moderate level, demonstrating the generally insignificant correlation per system. Therefore, we say that:

TABLE IX: Relative deviation between the landscape emulated by a surrogate model and that of the real systems. “+ $\Delta$ ” and “- $\Delta$ ” denote the average relative deviation when it is  $\geq 0$  and  $\leq 0$ , respectively, within the 300 data points; N/A means no applicable cases under the condition. “SS%” means the percentage of models such that the relative deviation has statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) across the 10 models. **Red cells** highlight the cases where  $SS% > 50$ .  $\rightarrow 0$ ,  $\uparrow$ , and  $\downarrow$  represents a value that is close to 0, bigger, and smaller, respectively. The “better” means a surrogate model resembles the real landscape in a more preferred way on the landscape feature, as derived from our theory of landscape dominance on model usefulness.

System	FDC ( $\rightarrow 0$ is better)			FBD ( $\rightarrow 0$ is better)			Ske ( $\rightarrow 0$ is better)			Kur ( $\rightarrow 0$ is better)			PLO ( $\downarrow$ is better)			CL ( $\uparrow$ is better)			MIE ( $\downarrow$ is better)			NBC ( $\downarrow$ is better)		
	+ $\Delta$	- $\Delta$	SS%	+ $\Delta$	- $\Delta$	SS%	+ $\Delta$	- $\Delta$	SS%	+ $\Delta$	- $\Delta$	SS%	+ $\Delta$	- $\Delta$	SS%									
APACHE	0.205	N/A	90.0	4.533	N/A	100.0	0.003	-0.001	70.0	0.144	-0.003	80.0	0.051	-0.055	90.0	1.615	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.028	80.0	0.010	-0.030	60.0
7Z	0.133	N/A	100.0	3.987	N/A	100.0	0.068	-2.499	60.0	48.902	-8.920	80.0	0.008	-0.006	100.0	0.787	-0.658	80.0	0.028	-0.022	80.0	0.032	-0.241	100.0
DCONVERT	0.116	-0.050	80.0	3.340	N/A	100.0	0.012	-0.988	90.0	0.042	-1.091	70.0	0.033	-0.049	100.0	0.492	-0.020	90.0	0.025	-0.024	90.0	0.029	-0.188	100.0
DEEPARCH	0.079	-0.045	70.0	2.894	N/A	100.0	0.013	-0.445	30.0	0.060	-0.472	70.0	0.152	N/A	100.0	0.355	-0.317	50.0	0.010	-0.010	90.0	N/A	-0.054	100.0
EXASTENCILS	0.103	N/A	90.0	4.384	N/A	100.0	0.010	-1.054	70.0	271.778	-0.753	90.0	0.009	-0.000	100.0	1.041	-1.266	80.0	0.015	-0.026	100.0	0.020	-0.360	100.0
HADOOP	0.208	N/A	100.0	6.970	N/A	100.0	0.227	-0.282	80.0	1.009	N/A	90.0	0.000	N/A	100.0	1.135	-0.104	40.0	N/A	-0.021	100.0	0.017	-0.082	90.0
MARIADB	0.071	-0.022	30.0	3.440	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.199	80.0	1.173	-0.185	70.0	0.063	-0.027	90.0	1.547	-0.278	100.0	0.023	-0.012	70.0	0.021	-0.003	100.0
MONGODB	0.031	-0.076	80.0	3.253	N/A	100.0	0.040	-0.173	60.0	60.338	-0.016	100.0	0.065	-0.022	90.0	0.500	-1.664	100.0	N/A	-0.052	100.0	0.011	-0.152	70.0
POSTGRESQL	0.063	-0.084	30.0	3.740	N/A	100.0	1.773	-0.426	100.0	4.253	-0.133	90.0	0.035	-0.028	100.0	0.496	-1.525	100.0	0.037	-0.032	100.0	0.004	-0.057	70.0
REDIS	0.127	-0.006	60.0	7.296	N/A	100.0	0.145	-0.145	50.0	19.413	-1.039	100.0	0.002	N/A	100.0	0.863	-0.065	70.0	0.019	-0.012	90.0	0.010	-0.031	100.0
SPARK	0.315	-0.016	60.0	8.920	N/A	100.0	0.357	-0.018	60.0	1.549	-0.047	90.0	0.003	-0.001	90.0	0.966	N/A	90.0	0.011	-0.002	70.0	0.027	-0.136	100.0
STORM	0.052	-0.005	20.0	2.700	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.485	80.0	0.003	-0.893	60.0	0.044	-0.004	90.0	1.135	-0.157	60.0	0.087	-0.008	80.0	N/A	-0.000	100.0
HSMGP	0.018	-0.047	80.0	2.632	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.270	30.0	N/A	-1.285	30.0	0.187	N/A	100.0	0.181	N/A	60.0	0.182	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.251	100.0
XGBOOST	0.855	N/A	100.0	3.953	N/A	100.0	0.018	-0.590	60.0	N/A	-0.651	70.0	0.045	-0.008	100.0	0.882	-0.141	90.0	0.029	-0.015	70.0	0.004	-0.029	100.0
HIPACC	0.082	-0.028	90.0	3.459	N/A	100.0	0.509	-0.428	90.0	17.966	-1.152	100.0	0.284	N/A	100.0	N/A	-0.936	100.0	0.053	-0.007	100.0	N/A	-0.103	100.0
SQLITE	0.116	-0.116	70.0	11.613	N/A	100.0	0.240	-2.951	90.0	27.620	N/A	90.0	0.293	N/A	100.0	0.321	-0.420	50.0	0.003	-0.009	80.0	0.053	-0.002	90.0
JAVAGC	0.169	N/A	70.0	19.631	N/A	80.0	N/A	-3.938	70.0	N/A	-88.941	70.0	0.282	-0.035	80.0	0.988	-0.366	60.0	0.031	-0.051	80.0	0.020	-0.418	80.0
POLLY	0.039	-0.017	90.0	5.540	N/A	100.0	2.193	-0.008	90.0	0.022	-3.595	70.0	0.249	-0.033	100.0	0.566	-0.026	90.0	0.005	-0.023	60.0	0.014	-0.078	100.0
Overall (Median)	0.109	-0.036	80.0	3.970	N/A	100.0	0.107	-0.427	70.0	1.549	-0.823	80.0	0.048	-0.024	100.0	0.863	-0.317	85.0	0.025	-0.021	85.0	0.019	-0.080	100.0

TABLE X: The model that emulates a landscape with the smallest  $\Delta g$  for global feature or  $l$  for local features on a system. A **Green cell** denotes a classic machine learning model or otherwise it is a deep learning model.

System	FDC	FBD	Ske	Kur	PLO	CL	MIE	NBC
APACHE	DT	DCT	HIP	LR	HIP	DaL	SVR	DCT
7Z	DCT	DCT	RF	SPL	RF	DCT	GP	DCT
DCONVERT	SVR	DCT	DeP	SPL	DaL	DCT	DaL	DCT
DEEPARCH	DT	DCT	RF	DeP	RF	SPL	RF	DCT
EXASTENCILS	DT	DCT	RF	SVR	RF	DCT	DCT	DCT
HADOOP	RF	DCT	DT	GP	DT	DCT	DaL	DCT
MARIADB	SPL	DCT	DeP	SPL	DeP	LR	DeP	DT
MONGODB	DCT	DCT	DCT	SPL	LR	DCT	GP	DCT
POSTGRESQL	HIP	DCT	SVR	GP	SVR	SPL	RF	DT
REDIS	RF	DaL	DT	LR	SPL	DT	GP	DCT
SPARK	SVR	DCT	DCT	GP	DCT	DCT	DCT	DCT
STORM	DeP	DCT	DT	LR	DT	SVR	DeP	DCT
HSMGP	SVR	DaL	DaL	GP	DaL	DCT	SVR	DCT
XGBOOST	HIP	DCT	DaL	GP	DeP	DCT	DCT	DCT
HIPACC	GP	DCT	DaL	SPL	DT	LR	HIP	DCT
SQLITE	SVR	RF	HIP	SVR	DT	GP	HIP	DCT
JAVAGC	DCT	GP	DCT	RF	DCT	DCT	DCT	DCT
POLLY	RF	DCT	DT	SPL	DT	DCT	DCT	DCT

## Finding 2

*The correlations between accuracy and landscape feature for surrogate model are not positively significant in general (for over 70% cases), especially for local features.*

### C. RQ3: Fidelity of the Model Emulated Landscape

1) *Method*: For **RQ3**, we focus on the deviation between model-emulated landscape features ( $v_{model}$ ) and those of the real system ( $v_{system}$ ). We report on the relative deviation as  $v_{model} - v_{system}$ , covering 300 data points (identical to that in **RQ2**), which is also verified by Wilcoxon rank-sum test for confirming a statistically significant difference. Note that  $v_{model}$  and  $v_{system}$  are computed using the same points in the testing dataset from Table I. To understand the direction of

deviation, we do not invert the values of the landscape features. As such, depending on the landscape feature, a positive or negative value of the relative deviation has different meanings.

2) *Results*: As shown in Table IX, a general observation is that the landscapes emulated by the models mostly exhibit a significant difference compared with the real one: there are 134 out of 144 cases in which more than 50% models have  $p < 0.05$  difference (100% for many cases). According to our theory of landscape dominance in Section III, such a deviation is not ideal for global features but could be preferred for the local ones. For the global features, we see that the models tend to build a landscape with higher global landscape values than having smaller ones, except for *Ske*. This means that the model-emulated landscapes are generally more optimistic: they tend to create stronger guidance with a more dense and isolated optimal performance, but assuming that better performance is common, which could cause misleading issues in the tuning. For the local features, models tend to make the tuning more difficult on *PLO* and *MIE* ( $|- \Delta| < | + \Delta|$ ), but they tend to be beneficial on *CL* ( $|- \Delta| < | + \Delta|$ ) and *NBC* ( $|- \Delta| > | + \Delta|$ ). This suggests that while models often emulate a landscape deviated from the real ones on the local features, they might be preferred for tuning since the issues of local optima can be relaxed, making the task easier for a tuner.

For particular systems, we see that the model emulated landscape shares similar characteristics with certain ones, but for others, their results are highly deviated, even for those systems of the same type, e.g., *SQLITE* and *MONGODB*. This makes sense, since the systems are highly complex—any of their alternative internal designs might dramatically alter the performance behaviors, hence the landscapes to be modeled.

Table X shows the model over a particular landscape feature and system with the smallest  $\Delta g$  or  $l$ . We see that, even when referring to a single landscape feature, it is difficult to conclude which model is generally the most preferred, as this differs depending on the systems. However, surprisingly, the classic machine learning models are generally more suitable

for tuning in terms of the single landscape metrics over the deep learning ones (119 cases versus 25 cases), despite a vast amount of studies have shown that deep learning-based models provide “better” accuracy [20], [27], [32]. This finding again aligns with the prior work [12], i.e., the accuracy can lie.

Overall, we conclude that:

#### Finding 3

*The existing surrogate models are still far from being able to correctly emulate the real system landscapes in 93% cases, but they might be helpful to relax the issues of local optima for a tuner.*

#### Finding 4

*No single model has the generally smallest  $\Delta g$  or  $l$  for all cases, but machine learning models often tend to be more fit than the deep learning counterpart in terms of the preferred landscape properties—119 cases versus 25 cases.*

#### D. RQ4: Implications of Individual Option to the Model Emulated Landscape

1) *Method:* Here, we are interested in understanding how domain knowledge of the systems can influence the features of the emulated landscape. Therefore, in **RQ4**, we perform the following for each system and model:

- 1) Remove a configuration option  $O$  from the dataset.
- 2) For configurations that only differ on  $O$ , we keep one of the most frequently occurring performance values as a sample while discarding the others.
- 3) Train the model with training size from Table I.
- 4) Compute the landscape feature of the landscape built by the model without  $O$  and that of a model trained on all options using the testing size from Table I.
- 5) Move to the next option until every option has been ruled out once.

To systematically analyze the impact of a configuration option on each landscape feature, we use a clustering-based approach for a system and a given landscape feature:

- 1) **Build a model-feature matrix:** We train each model on the system with one of the options removed in turn:

$$\begin{matrix} & \mathbf{v}_1 & \mathbf{v}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{v}_k & \mathbf{v}_{\text{all}} \\ \mathcal{M}_1 & \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,1} & v_{1,2} & \cdots & v_{1,k} & v_{1,\text{all}} \\ v_{2,1} & v_{2,2} & \cdots & v_{2,k} & v_{2,\text{all}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ v_{n,1} & v_{n,2} & \cdots & v_{n,k} & v_{n,\text{all}} \end{bmatrix} & \end{matrix} \quad (18)$$

whereby  $\mathcal{M}_n$  is the  $n$ th model.  $v_{n,k}$  is the landscape feature value for the  $n$ th model when the  $k$ th option is removed;  $\mathbf{v}_k$  is the vector of landscape feature values from all models trained without using the  $k$ th option. Similarly,  $v_{n,\text{all}}$  is the landscape feature value for the  $n$ th model trained using all options;  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{all}}$  is a vector of the landscape feature values for all models with all options.




Fig. 7: Illustration of the clustering results to distinguish influential and non-influential options for a landscape feature.

TABLE XI: Option categories and descriptions.

Type	Category	Descriptions	Symbol
Core	Functional	Governing the system’s core logic, directly impacting execution behavior.	F1
Utility	Functional	Providing utilization functionalities applicable across multiple modules.	F2
CPU	Resource	Controlling CPU usage, parallel processing, or core multi-threading.	R1
Storage	Resource	Managing persistent data storage.	R2
Memory	Resource	Handling cache, memory pools, and buffer.	R3
Queue	Resource	Regulating scheduling, timeouts, and delays.	R4


- 2) **Cluster option vector:** We apply  $k$ -Mean to cluster the option vector  $\mathbf{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_{\text{all}}\}$ , where each element is represented by the landscape feature values of all models. We are interested in dividing a  $\mathbf{v}_k$  based on whether it is sufficiently distant from  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{all}}$ . As such, we set  $k = 2$ , i.e., only two clusters.
- 3) **Identify influential options:** For a  $\mathbf{v}_k$  that is assigned into the same cluster as  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{all}}$ , we consider that the corresponding  $k$ th option, if removed, is influential to the model under the given landscape feature and system; otherwise, the said option can be safely removed without significantly affecting the landscape feature. For example, in Figure 7,  $\mathbf{v}_2$  and  $\mathbf{v}_6$  are placed in the same cluster as  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{all}}$ , hence we say the second and the sixth options are both generally influential to the corresponding landscape feature while the others are not.

The above helps us to quickly identify the influential options on the landscape features while being robust to the confounding factor of overlapping groups [92] when using a multi-comparison statistical testing without degrading the statistical power.


To aid the interpretation of the results, we categorize the types of options as shown in Table XI by manually inspecting the related configuration code and documentation of the systems, following a similar approach used by Liang et al. [53]. Broadly, the functional options include those that control the core features and utility of the system: for example, in MARIADB, “binaryLog” is a utility option that controls certain granularity of the logging functionality. In contrast, the resource type involves options that tend to significantly influence the software/hardware provisioning, i.e., CPU, memory, storage and queue, e.g., the “mapreduce\_reduce\_merge\_inmem\_threshold”

TABLE XII: The number of influential and non-influential options with respect to option types and landscape features (totaling all systems).  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  count the non-influential and influential options, respectively.

Feature	F1		F2		R1		R2		R3		R4	
	$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathcal{I}$										
FDC	107	46	5	4	35	6	11	0	28	16	1	2
FBD	112	41	7	2	31	10	5	6	23	21	3	0
Ske	131	22	7	2	34	7	9	2	27	17	2	1
Kur	121	32	7	2	33	8	8	3	26	18	2	1
PLO	119	34	6	3	31	10	10	1	29	15	0	3
CL	110	43	7	2	30	11	9	2	22	22	1	2
MIE	107	46	7	2	32	9	7	4	27	17	2	1
NBC	118	35	7	2	36	5	10	1	26	18	3	0
<b>Average #</b>	116	37	7	2	33	8	9	2	26	18	2	1
<b>Average %</b>	76%	24%	74%	26%	80%	20%	78%	22%	59%	41%	58%	42%



(a) FDC on 7Z



(b) CL on PORSTGRESQL

Fig. 8: Extent of option influence to the models' landscape features in terms of the deviation between  $v_{n,k}$  to  $v_{n,all}$  for two exemplified cases: FDC on 7Z and CL on POSTGRESQL.

in HADOOP determines the memory allocation of the merge operations; the “maxClients” in APACHE controls the maximum number of client connections before the requests need to be queued.

2) *Results*: From Table XII, we note that most of the performance-sensitive options are related to core functionalities, followed by CPU and memory-related options. However, within each of the categories, around one fourth of the functional options are influential to the model emulated landscapes, which is similar to those of R1 and R2 (20% - 26%). This is because neither functional aspects nor CPU/storage-related aspects can dramatically influence the performance, and hence the impact on the landscape is limited. In contrast, for R3 and R4, which denote memory and queue, almost half of the options can pose significant shifts to the model landscape if removed. This makes sense, since both categories denote

options that control the “space” of the system; therefore, if information of such a space is omitted, the configuration landscape learned can be severely affected.

From the examples illustrated in Figure 8, we see that some options are highly influential to the landscape feature for some models but not always, e.g., “BlockSize” in Figure 8a. These are the same observations across different systems and models. Also, depending on the feature and system, options belonging to R3 might not always lead to the biggest influence, e.g., “workMem” versus “fsync” in Figure 8b, despite the fact that generally R3 options are more influential.

We therefore conclude that:

#### Finding 5

*Options that control either memory or queue are generally easier to be influential ( $\approx 2\times$ ) for the model emulated landscape compared with the others, but the extent of influence can be case-dependent.*

## VI. INSIGHTS FROM THE FINDINGS

The findings from our empirical study are not only confirmatory but also exploratory, both of which could influence future research directions of the field. Specifically, the most impactful insight is perhaps the confirmation that:

#### ◀ Finding 1 → Insight 1 ▶

Combining the deviation to the true overall structure (global feature) and severity of local optima (local feature) from the fitness landscape can serve as a good proxy to estimate and evaluate the model usefulness for tuning.

We have also revealed an extended explanation to the observations of “accuracy can lie” in prior work [12], that is:

#### ◀ Finding 2 → Insight 2 ▶

The accuracy metrics and landscape features provide generally diverse aspects of information regarding the model usefulness for tuning, hence they should be jointly considered.

Finally, the results from diverse cases, including different systems and types of options, have implied that:

#### ◀ Findings 2-5 → Insight 3 ▶

It is unlikely to have a generally most useful model for tuning, but rather, it depends on the actual systems and the option types thereof.

## VII. FINE-GRAINED PREDICTION OF MODEL USEFULNESS FOR TUNING VIA MODEL4TUNE

### A. Motivation and Problem Formulation

While **RQ1** has confirmed our theory of landscape dominance on model usefulness for tuning, it remains coarse-grained:

TABLE XIII: Characteristics of tuners as the features. Note that the values can be extended as needed since it is easy to retrain Model4Tune.

Feature	Values	Description
<b>Sequential model-based</b>		
Reduction	{Lasso, Gini, Multi-sensitivity analysis, None}	Metrics/method to reduce the dimensionality of options.
Acquisition	{EI, UCB, Hedge, Max Mean}	Acquisition function.
Heuristic	{Greedy, Gradient descent, Local search, Selective exploration}	Heuristic family that searches on the acquisition.
<b>Batch model-based</b>		
Domain	{Database, Hyperparameter, Design models, General}	Tuner with domain specific designs (common for batch model-based tuners).
Incremental	{True, False}	Whether configurations from the previous iteration are exploited.
Heuristic	{Evolutionary, Local search, Sampling, Random}	Heuristic family of the search process.

- We do not know which exact pair of the global and local features is the most effective.
- For two non-dominated models (e.g.,  $\mathcal{A}$  has better  $\Delta g$  but with less preferred  $l$  than  $\mathcal{B}$ ), it is unclear which one is more useful.
- There is a lack of tool support to estimate the model usefulness without having to profile the models paired with different tuners.

Therefore, what is really helpful for the practitioners of configuration tuning is a fine-grained approach that can predict the relative model usefulness for a target system with a set of possible tuners, hence a more appropriate one can be chosen without the need to conduct expensive tuning and measurements. To that end, we formalize a learning to rank problem as:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{F}_i, r_i) \quad (19)$$

whereby the goal is to minimize the loss  $\mathcal{L}$  using a vector of features  $\mathbf{F}_i$  with respect to the relative ranking of the  $i$ th model-tuner pair ( $r_i$ ) across a total of  $n$  pairs.

Drawing on our insights from Section VI, in what follows, we delineate Model4Tune, an approach that predictably ranks the more useful models and tuners for tuning a target system.

### B. Model4Tune Designs

1) *Features for Prediction:* Model4Tune considers three categories of features in the learning to rank model usefulness:

- **Landscape Features  $\mathbf{F}_l$ :** Drawing on **Insight 1**, we consider the relative deviation between the model emulated landscape and that of the real system for one global feature and one local feature, i.e.,  $v_{model} - v_{system}$ . For the former, we found that taking the direction of deviation into account enables better prediction accuracy than purely the absolute deviation. For the latter, a relative deviation can still serve the same purpose as directly using the local feature of the model-emulated landscape, but with better numeric stability. For example, we still prefer a smaller value for PLO regardless if the relative deviation is used. Another advantage is that this could incorporate knowledge of the real system (in terms of its landscape), which we have found to be beneficial. Model4Tune uses Kur with MIE for sequential model-based tuners and Ske with PLO for batch model-based




Fig. 9: Model4Tune workflow.

tuners as the respective global and local features for all systems by default, as our experiments suggest that they provide the best prediction in general for their tuner types<sup>6</sup>.

- **Accuracy Metrics  $\mathbf{F}_a$ :** Here, we consider both the MAPE and  $\mu$ RD as the features for accuracy since they provide different aspects of information compared with the landscape features according to **Insight 2**.
- **Tuner Characteristics  $\mathbf{F}_t$ :** The model usefulness is inevitably tuner dependent; thus, we further classify the characteristics of tuners based on those studied in this work, as shown in Table XIII. Note that we use one-hot encoding for this due to its highly categorical nature, but the values can be easily extended and retrain Model4Tune. For example, BOCA [9] is a sequential model-based tuner that uses Gini score for option reduction; Expected Improvement (EI) as the acquisition function to be searched by selective exploration, in which only the important options are explored fully. Therefore, following the order in Table XIII, it is represented as  $\{\langle 0, 1, 0, 0 \rangle \langle 1, 0, 0, 0 \rangle \langle 0, 0, 0, 1 \rangle\}$ .

2) *Training Procedure:* As shown in Figure 9, Model4Tune uses LambdaRank [44] as the underlying

<sup>6</sup>We found that all combinations of the global and local features perform much better than the random ranking baseline, but Kur with MIE and Ske with PLO lead to particularly promising results.

TABLE XIV: Exempld dataset of samples for training Model4Tune. The best global and local landscape features for sequential model-based tuners are Kur and MIE; for batch model-based tuners, these are Ske and PLO.

	$F_l$		$F_a$		$F_t$			$y$
	Kur/Ske	MIE/PLO	MAPE	$\mu$ RD	Reduction/Domain	Acquisition/Incremental	Heuristic	
BOCA with SVR on APACHE	0.1510/−0.0013	−0.0494/−0.0687	64.0293	135.5281	0100	1000	0001	1
BOCA with LR on APACHE	0.2338/0.0001	0.0004/−0.0734	0.8130	122.0664	0100	1000	0001	5
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
GA with DaL on POLLY	0.0585/−0.0076	−0.0314/−0.0404	1.4244	6816.5666	0001	1	1000	2
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

learning to rank algorithm, which is pre-trained following the steps below:

- (i) Pick a system.
- (ii) Sample a set of configuration-performance measurements (*sampling*) and run different tuner-model pairs to collect their tuning performance, e.g., runtime, with repeated runs, i.e., *tuning*, in order to obtain their relative ranks  $y$  for training (the same as **RQ1**).
- (iii) Select a subset of configuration-performance measurements to train different surrogate models, then test their landscape features ( $F_l$ ) and accuracy metrics ( $F_a$ ) using the remaining measurements. The results are paired with the tuner’s characteristics ( $F_t$ ) and the ranked performance of the corresponding tuner-model pair under the system (on average across the runs). Since the sequential and batch model-based tuners are rather different in terms of how the surrogate model is leveraged and the system measurements, we independently train two separate prediction models for them. The above is important, as **Insight 3** suggests that the most useful model for tuning is system and/or options-dependent.
- (iv) Repeat (i) until data for all available systems have been collected.
- (v) Merge all data into a dataset to train LambdaRank as the example shown in Table XIV.

Note that since Model4Tune works on generic features, it naturally works as a cross-system prediction model. Upon prediction, one merely needs to collect some samples of configuration-performance measurements from the target system to train the models to be chosen from and compute their landscape/accuracy features (*sampling*), but there is no need to profile the tuners with the models via *tuning*; Model4Tune would then output the ranks of different model-tuner pairs.

### C. Evaluation

1) *Setup*: To evaluate Model4Tune, we compare it against a random guess that randomly ranks the model-tuner pairs under two common metrics [42], [57]:

- **Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG)** is a normalized metrics that assess the relative correct order of the top  $k$  items in the ranking returned.
- **Average Precision (AP)** evaluates the ability of returning correct ranks in the top  $k$  results while placing more relevant items at the top. Since AP requires a notion of “relevance”, we say that only the true top 50% of the model-tuner pairs are relevant.

Since we consider 10 models and 16 tuners (as in **RQ1**), there are  $10 \times 16 = 160$  model-tuner pairs to rank for each system. We perform the actual tuning when pairing each model for every tuner on a system under the same procedure in **RQ1**, which serves as the ground truth of ranking data. The  $k = 1$ ,  $k = 10$ ,  $k = 20$ , and full ranks are reported for both metrics.

We conduct leave-one-out evaluation across the systems: all ranking data of  $n - 1$  systems are used to pre-train Model4Tune and it is tested over all the ranking data from the remaining one system. For each system (the training and testing ones), we build and test each surrogate model the same way as **RQ1-3**, which gives us the values of  $F_l$  and  $F_a$  used in training and prediction. All the experiments are repeated 30 times, and we use Wilcoxon rank-sum test to verify the statistical significance. In total, we have 18 systems  $\times$  2 metrics  $\times$  4 values of  $k = 144$  cases.

2) *Results*: As can be seen from Tables XV and XVI, Model4Tune performs significantly better than a random guess, showing clear advances in 82% (118 out of 144 cases) and 79% (114 out of 144 cases) for sequential and batch model-based tuners, respectively, with the majority of them exhibiting statistical significance. In particular, we see that with NDCG@1 and AP@1, Model4Tune achieves perfect prediction for some systems, meaning that it ranks the best model-tuner pairs correctly. As for the improvement over random ranking, the magnitude is also remarkable: up to 152.3% (PostgreSQL) for NDCG@1 and 201.7% (XGBoost) for AP@10 on sequential model-based tuners and up to 141.9% (Polly) for NDCG@1 and 243.7% (SQLite) for AP@10 on batch model-based tuners. The above suggests the practical effectiveness of Model4Tune in assisting practitioners for model-based configuration tuning.

### D. Discussion

We do not expect that Model4Tune would replace human expertise when designing configuration tuners, though, but what we anticipate is that it can serve as a powerful tool to assist practitioners in building better model-based tuners for an unforeseen system, saving the significant efforts that would otherwise be required for empirical verification. As such, we envisage several application scenarios of Model4Tune based on the extent of prior knowledge available:

- **Understand the generally “best” model-tuner pair.** While in our results, we have not found a generally best model-tuner pair, in practice, it is possible that such a pair can be identified for a smaller set of systems. Model4Tune would be able to quickly provide an initial

TABLE XV: Average ranking performance of Model4Tune over the random ranking for sequential model-based tuners. The  $\alpha^{\pm\beta\%}$  in each cell means Model4Tune achieves  $\alpha$  on a ranking metric which is  $+\beta\%$  better than (or  $-\beta\%$  worse than) the random ranking.  $\dagger$  and  $*$  respectively denote  $p < 0.001$  and  $0.001 \leq p < 0.05$  when comparing Model4Tune and the random ranking. **green cells** and **red cells** highlight the cases where Model4Tune is better and worse, respectively. Results for other combinations of global and local features can be found here: <https://github.com/ideas-labo/model4tune/blob/main/Results/Batch.pdf>.

System	NDCG@1	NDCG@10	NDCG@20	NDCG	AP@1	AP@10	AP@20	AP
APACHE	0.3000 <sup>-22.4%</sup>	0.1670 <sup>-64.3%</sup> †	0.1896 <sup>-63.5%</sup> †	0.7151 <sup>-12.5%</sup> †	0.0000 <sup>-100.0%</sup> †	0.0000 <sup>-100.0%</sup> †	0.0001 <sup>-100.0%</sup> †	0.1722 <sup>-34.5%</sup> †
7Z	0.6967 <sup>+63.3%</sup> †	0.7204 <sup>+46.8%</sup> †	0.6439 <sup>+21.2%</sup> †	0.8823 <sup>+7.1%</sup> †	0.6000 <sup>+63.6%</sup> †	0.5787 <sup>+100.7%</sup> †	0.4000 <sup>+39.5%</sup> †	0.2887 <sup>+9.2%</sup> †
DCONVERT	0.6700 <sup>+47.8%</sup> *	0.6820 <sup>+41.7%</sup> †	0.6934 <sup>+35.2%</sup> †	0.8860 <sup>+8.4%</sup> †	0.9333 <sup>+86.7%</sup> †	0.5416 <sup>+69.0%</sup> †	0.5144 <sup>+78.1%</sup> †	0.3256 <sup>+25.7%</sup> †
DEEPARCH	1.0000 <sup>+101.3%</sup> †	0.6927 <sup>+37.0%</sup> †	0.6751 <sup>+27.5%</sup> †	0.8900 <sup>+8.0%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+57.9%</sup> †	0.3828 <sup>+17.6%</sup>	0.3510 <sup>+20.9%</sup> *	0.2819 <sup>+8.0%</sup> †
EXASTENCILS	1.0000 <sup>+125.6%</sup> †	0.7629 <sup>+59.4%</sup> †	0.7340 <sup>+40.6%</sup> †	0.9120 <sup>+11.3%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+87.5%</sup> †	0.7261 <sup>+148.7%</sup> †	0.6106 <sup>+110.3%</sup> †	0.3518 <sup>+34.0%</sup> †
HADOOP	0.2767 <sup>-32.5%</sup>	0.2196 <sup>-53.0%</sup> †	0.3888 <sup>-24.4%</sup> †	0.7666 <sup>-6.3%</sup> †	0.0000 <sup>-100.0%</sup> †	0.0007 <sup>-99.8%</sup> †	0.0795 <sup>-71.2%</sup> †	0.2059 <sup>-21.2%</sup> †
MARIADB	0.6067 <sup>+29.1%</sup>	0.6140 <sup>+26.4%</sup> †	0.6073 <sup>+16.8%</sup> †	0.8533 <sup>+3.9%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+87.5%</sup> †	0.6291 <sup>+101.2%</sup> †	0.4836 <sup>+68.7%</sup> †	0.3169 <sup>+22.3%</sup> †
MONGODB	0.8600 <sup>+61.2%</sup> †	0.7342 <sup>+41.2%</sup> †	0.6539 <sup>+22.1%</sup> †	0.8824 <sup>+6.6%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+50.0%</sup> †	0.8052 <sup>+122.7%</sup> †	0.5837 <sup>+89.8%</sup> †	0.3257 <sup>+22.6%</sup> †
POSTGRESQL	0.9000 <sup>+152.3%</sup> †	0.8218 <sup>+77.5%</sup> †	0.7346 <sup>+46.1%</sup> †	0.9077 <sup>+11.7%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+130.8%</sup> †	0.6829 <sup>+123.0%</sup> †	0.4781 <sup>+72.9%</sup> †	0.2951 <sup>+13.7%</sup> †
REDIS	0.7033 <sup>+46.5%</sup> †	0.6117 <sup>+18.0%</sup> *	0.6585 <sup>+23.3%</sup> †	0.8746 <sup>+5.7%</sup> †	0.8667 <sup>+52.9%</sup> *	0.4663 <sup>+30.0%</sup> *	0.4756 <sup>+57.5%</sup> †	0.3366 <sup>+26.8%</sup> †
SPARK	1.0000 <sup>+106.9%</sup> †	0.8147 <sup>+62.7%</sup> †	0.8325 <sup>+59.8%</sup> †	0.9301 <sup>+13.1%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+66.5%</sup> †	0.5955 <sup>+90.0%</sup> †	0.5983 <sup>+117.3%</sup> †	0.3389 <sup>+32.2%</sup> †
STORM	0.8400 <sup>+65.8%</sup> †	0.9200 <sup>+79.8%</sup> †	0.8451 <sup>+59.3%</sup> †	0.9414 <sup>+14.1%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+57.9%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+184.0%</sup> †	0.8290 <sup>+175.3%</sup> †	0.3968 <sup>+51.8%</sup> †
HSMGP	0.4000 <sup>-20.0%</sup>	0.6961 <sup>+37.9%</sup> †	0.6535 <sup>+24.5%</sup> †	0.8704 <sup>+5.5%</sup> †	0.3333 <sup>-44.4%</sup> *	0.5786 <sup>+66.7%</sup> †	0.4334 <sup>+47.4%</sup> †	0.3011 <sup>+14.3%</sup> †
XGBOOST	0.8867 <sup>+106.2%</sup> †	0.9299 <sup>+91.4%</sup> †	0.8807 <sup>+68.5%</sup> †	0.9580 <sup>+17.0%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+100.0%</sup> †	0.9867 <sup>+201.7%</sup> †	0.8078 <sup>+164.6%</sup> †	0.4032 <sup>+53.6%</sup> †
HIPACC	0.4000 <sup>-24.5%</sup>	0.5592 <sup>+14.5%</sup> *	0.5322 <sup>+1.3%</sup>	0.8268 <sup>+0.2%</sup>	0.3333 <sup>-41.2%</sup>	0.3632 <sup>+15.8%</sup>	0.3076 <sup>+5.9%</sup>	0.2653 <sup>+1.4%</sup>
SQLITE	0.4200 <sup>+5.0%</sup>	0.4333 <sup>-13.6%</sup> *	0.5464 <sup>+1.7%</sup>	0.8181 <sup>-0.9%</sup>	0.8000 <sup>+100.0%</sup> *	0.2751 <sup>-16.0%</sup>	0.4085 <sup>+33.4%</sup> †	0.3012 <sup>+12.8%</sup> †
JAVAGC	0.7017 <sup>+43.2%</sup> *	0.6137 <sup>+24.5%</sup> †	0.6168 <sup>+18.4%</sup> †	0.8674 <sup>+5.5%</sup> †	0.8333 <sup>+56.2%</sup> *	0.3906 <sup>+25.3%</sup> *	0.2949 <sup>+6.5%</sup>	0.2697 <sup>+4.6%</sup> *
POLLY	0.3533 <sup>-25.4%</sup>	0.4903 <sup>-3.1%</sup>	0.5499 <sup>+1.8%</sup>	0.8305 <sup>+0.3%</sup>	0.4000 <sup>-14.3%</sup>	0.3321 <sup>+7.9%</sup>	0.3696 <sup>+26.4%</sup> †	0.2990 <sup>+13.8%</sup> †
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.6675</b> <sup>+45.3%</sup> †	<b>0.6380</b> <sup>+29.5%</sup> †	<b>0.6353</b> <sup>+21.1%</sup> †	<b>0.8674</b> <sup>+5.5%</sup> †	<b>0.7278</b> <sup>+39.9%</sup> †	<b>0.5186</b> <sup>+62.2%</sup> †	<b>0.4459</b> <sup>+53.4%</sup> †	<b>0.3042</b> <sup>+16.2%</sup> †

TABLE XVI: Average ranking performance of Model4Tune over the random ranking for batch model-based tuners. The format is the same as Table XV. Results for other combinations of global and local features can be found here: <https://github.com/ideas-labo/model4tune/blob/main/Results/Batch.pdf>.

System	NDCG@1	NDCG@10	NDCG@20	NDCG	AP@1	AP@10	AP@20	AP
APACHE	0.4000 <sup>-14.3%</sup>	0.4347 <sup>-11.1%</sup>	0.4013 <sup>-22.7%</sup> †	0.7772 <sup>-5.3%</sup> †	0.6667 <sup>+25.0%</sup>	0.2959 <sup>-2.4%</sup>	0.1882 <sup>-33.0%</sup> †	0.2142 <sup>-17.3%</sup> †
7Z	0.9000 <sup>+114.3%</sup> †	0.7427 <sup>+62.6%</sup> †	0.7566 <sup>+51.8%</sup> †	0.9037 <sup>+11.3%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+114.3%</sup> †	0.6422 <sup>+115.8%</sup> †	0.5577 <sup>+100.8%</sup> †	0.3073 <sup>+18.7%</sup> †
DCONVERT	0.8767 <sup>+102.3%</sup> †	0.6128 <sup>+29.4%</sup> †	0.6292 <sup>+23.9%</sup> †	0.8698 <sup>+6.6%</sup> †	0.9333 <sup>+86.7%</sup> †	0.4967 <sup>+76.3%</sup> †	0.4358 <sup>+65.5%</sup> †	0.3021 <sup>+18.8%</sup> †
DEEPARCH	0.3800 <sup>-10.2%</sup>	0.4307 <sup>-13.6%</sup> *	0.4816 <sup>-8.1%</sup> *	0.8147 <sup>-0.9%</sup>	0.0667 <sup>-81.8%</sup> *	0.1500 <sup>-53.1%</sup> †	0.1624 <sup>-43.0%</sup> †	0.2496 <sup>-4.6%</sup>
EXASTENCILS	0.7000 <sup>+84.2%</sup> †	0.5020 <sup>+7.1%</sup>	0.6742 <sup>+32.8%</sup> †	0.8726 <sup>+7.3%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+150.0%</sup> †	0.4072 <sup>+33.0%</sup> *	0.5267 <sup>+84.5%</sup> †	0.3304 <sup>+27.6%</sup> †
HADOOP	0.9533 <sup>+86.9%</sup> †	0.8753 <sup>+80.5%</sup> †	0.9009 <sup>+77.2%</sup> †	0.9521 <sup>+16.4%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+66.7%</sup> †	0.9366 <sup>+205.0%</sup> †	0.9119 <sup>+241.0%</sup> †	0.4114 <sup>+61.5%</sup> †
MARIADB	0.5000 <sup>-5.7%</sup>	0.5230 <sup>+2.2%</sup>	0.5499 <sup>+2.6%</sup>	0.8327 <sup>+0.4%</sup>	1.0000 <sup>+57.9%</sup> †	0.3381 <sup>-6.9%</sup>	0.2831 <sup>-9.8%</sup>	0.2658 <sup>-1.2%</sup>
MONGODB	1.0000 <sup>+91.1%</sup> †	0.9650 <sup>+94.3%</sup> †	0.8948 <sup>+74.7%</sup> †	0.9626 <sup>+17.1%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+66.7%</sup> †	0.9857 <sup>+196.1%</sup> †	0.8461 <sup>+200.1%</sup> †	0.4105 <sup>+57.6%</sup> †
POSTGRESQL	0.5000 <sup>+23.0%</sup>	0.5839 <sup>+24.2%</sup> †	0.5801 <sup>+10.7%</sup> *	0.8355 <sup>+2.0%</sup> *	1.0000 <sup>+130.8%</sup> †	0.6799 <sup>+130.0%</sup> †	0.5299 <sup>+87.2%</sup> †	0.2996 <sup>+13.9%</sup> †
REDIS	0.9000 <sup>+86.2%</sup> †	0.8532 <sup>+68.5%</sup> †	0.8506 <sup>+61.5%</sup> †	0.9373 <sup>+13.6%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+100.0%</sup> †	0.7930 <sup>+141.3%</sup> †	0.6891 <sup>+137.5%</sup> †	0.3352 <sup>+27.6%</sup> †
SPARK	0.6633 <sup>+68.6%</sup> †	0.5447 <sup>+10.3%</sup>	0.5895 <sup>+11.2%</sup> *	0.8435 <sup>+2.6%</sup> *	0.6333 <sup>+35.7%</sup>	0.2687 <sup>-21.7%</sup>	0.2797 <sup>-10.9%</sup>	0.2518 <sup>-6.5%</sup>
STORM	0.5633 <sup>+44.4%</sup> *	0.6238 <sup>+32.7%</sup> †	0.6346 <sup>+22.6%</sup> †	0.8601 <sup>+5.2%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+172.7%</sup> †	0.5301 <sup>+83.1%</sup> †	0.4491 <sup>+61.6%</sup> †	0.3042 <sup>+17.3%</sup> †
HSMGP	0.4600 <sup>-11.0%</sup>	0.5412 <sup>+2.6%</sup>	0.6523 <sup>+20.8%</sup> †	0.8602 <sup>+3.5%</sup> †	0.8000 <sup>+41.2%</sup>	0.4235 <sup>+14.6%</sup>	0.4986 <sup>+59.3%</sup> †	0.3319 <sup>+24.0%</sup> †
XGBOOST	0.4000 <sup>+16.5%</sup>	0.3867 <sup>-18.9%</sup> †	0.4636 <sup>-11.2%</sup> †	0.7986 <sup>-2.3%</sup> *	0.0000 <sup>-100.0%</sup> †	0.0041 <sup>-98.6%</sup> †	0.0537 <sup>-81.7%</sup> †	0.1985 <sup>-25.0%</sup> †
HIPACC	0.8233 <sup>+75.2%</sup> †	0.9003 <sup>+92.7%</sup> †	0.8547 <sup>+69.3%</sup> †	0.9478 <sup>+16.2%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+87.5%</sup> †	0.9057 <sup>+217.5%</sup> †	0.7438 <sup>+184.4%</sup> †	0.4018 <sup>+57.2%</sup> †
SQLITE	0.9000 <sup>+119.5%</sup> †	0.9502 <sup>+107.0%</sup> †	0.7295 <sup>+43.5%</sup> †	0.9073 <sup>+11.4%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+150.0%</sup> †	0.9446 <sup>+243.7%</sup> †	0.5135 <sup>+94.1%</sup> †	0.3051 <sup>+18.9%</sup> †
JAVAGC	0.9000 <sup>+86.2%</sup> †	0.7052 <sup>+45.7%</sup> †	0.6490 <sup>+25.3%</sup> †	0.8871 <sup>+8.1%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+87.5%</sup> †	0.6097 <sup>+122.0%</sup> †	0.4509 <sup>+76.5%</sup> †	0.3038 <sup>+19.4%</sup> †
POLLY	1.0000 <sup>+141.9%</sup> †	0.9212 <sup>+93.6%</sup> †	0.8433 <sup>+63.2%</sup> †	0.9498 <sup>+16.0%</sup> †	1.0000 <sup>+150.0%</sup> †	0.8921 <sup>+214.9%</sup> †	0.7095 <sup>+164.9%</sup> †	0.3706 <sup>+43.0%</sup> †
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.7122</b> <sup>+60.3%</sup> †	<b>0.6720</b> <sup>+38.9%</sup> †	<b>0.6742</b> <sup>+30.2%</sup> †	<b>0.8785</b> <sup>+7.2%</sup> †	<b>0.8389</b> <sup>+74.9%</sup> †	<b>0.5724</b> <sup>+85.6%</sup> †	<b>0.4905</b> <sup>+74.0%</sup> †	<b>0.3108</b> <sup>+19.3%</sup> †

idea as to which pair is more promising across, e.g., a category of systems, hence providing insights on tuner designs for the target system when none of its data is available.

- **Foresee the promising model-tuner pairs for a target system.** When it is possible to measure configuration performance samples for a target system, Model4Tune can then directly predict the promising model-tuner pair(s). One can then choose to follow the same pairs, or at least the output serves as a foundation to reason about different design alternatives.
- **Predict the useful models under a tuner for a target system.** It is not uncommon that the tuner has already

been decided for a target system. As such, with the measured data, Model4Tune can also hint at the more useful models for the selected tuner, reducing the efforts required to investigate all the alternatives.

## VIII. THREATS TO VALIDITY

Here, we elaborate on the potential threats to the validity of this work.

### A. Construct Threats

1) *Landscape Features:* Indeed, there are many landscape features and metrics [36], [55], [77], [93]. In this work, we use the most representative ones, with respect to both

global and local features, and omit those that do not fit our purpose. While those omissions might limit the ability to characterize the configuration landscape, this study remains able to provide reasonable insights to cover the core landscape aspects, especially when fitness landscape analysis for model-based configuration tuning is unexplored. We leave a more comprehensive coverage of other landscape features as future work.

2) *Accuracy Metrics*: We consider both MAPE and  $\mu$ RD, which are residual and ranked metrics, respectively. Those are the most common metrics from prior work [27], [32], [71], [72] and come from diverse types.

3) *Ranking Metrics*: To evaluate Model4Tune, we use NDCG and AP, since they are widely applied to recommendation problems in software engineering. Other metrics, such as Discounted Cumulative Gain [42], Mean Reciprocal Rank [78], and Precision@K [98], are neither ill-suited to our domain nor are they rarely used.

4) *Options Categorization*: To better interpret the landscape information with respect to domain knowledge, we have manually categorized the options. We have done so following a systematic methodology as used in a relevant empirical study in the field [53], including code inspection and document comprehension. However, we agree that unintentional ignorance or cognitive bias is possible.

5) *Stochastic Bias*: The surrogate models, tuners, and the proposed Model4Tune can exhibit stochastic behaviors. To mitigate this, we repeat each experiment 30 times and use statistical tests, including Wilcoxon Signed Rank/Rank Sum Test and Scott-Knott ESD Test, to validate the significance. While more repetitions can reduce noise further, the 30-run setup balances statistical reliability and computational cost.

## B. Internal Threats

1) *Parameters for Landscape Features*: The calculation of the landscape features requires specific settings. For example, we follow prior work [14] to generate sequences via random walks with a length of 50 for CL; for FDC and others, we use Hamming distance to measure the distance between configurations, consistent with prior work on configurable systems [14], [36], [55]. Although these settings might not be optimal, they serve as a readily available rule-of-thumb.

2) *Parameters for Models and Tuners*: For all the settings of surrogate model and tuners, e.g., the  $d$  in DaL and the  $k$  in BOCA, we follow the default settings that have been used by their authors.

3) *Budget, Training, and Testing Sample Size*: We systematically set the budget for ensuring reasonable convergence of all tuners. For training and testing datasets, we use the common strategy for binary options, while leveraging SPLConqueror [86] to generate the size for numeric options—both are standard practice from previous works [12], [20], [27].

## C. External Threats

1) *Configurable Systems*: We study 18 configurable systems across diverse domains with configuration spaces ranging

from  $2.04 \times 10^3$  to  $2.67 \times 10^{41}$ . Indeed, considering more systems might prove fruitful.

2) *Surrogate Models*: Our study considers 10 surrogate models that are of diverse types and technical foundations. Those are also commonly used ones for model-based configuration tuning. Although such is one of the largest scales in the relevant studies [7], [12], [23], [111], we admit that it is still not an exhaustive list.

3) *Tuners*: We examine 16 most commonly used tuners, including both the sequential and batch model-based ones, spanning across different communities, e.g., database, system, and software engineering. This ensures a good diversity and generalization. Yet, indeed, newer tuners can be used to consolidate our results.

## IX. RELATED WORK

In this section, we discuss the studies that are relevant to this work.

### A. Fitness Landscape Analysis

1) *Fitness Landscape Analysis for Software Engineering*: Fitness landscape analysis has been applied to some other optimization problems in Software Engineering. For example, Smith-Miles and Muñoz [87] propose the Instance Space Analysis (ISA), which is part of the fitness landscape analysis, to study average performance bias and test instance imbalance in the landscape of software testing. Similarly, Neelofar et al. [73] apply ISA to evaluate Search-Based Software Testing (SBST) algorithms, exploring the adequacy of common benchmarks; factors influencing SBST effectiveness; and the strengths and weaknesses of SBST techniques. Albulian et al. [3] empirically analyze fitness landscapes of Java classes for unit test generation; they find that neutral plateaus caused by private methods, exceptions, and boolean lags harm search while ruggedness helps, and suggest targeted improvements.

While those problems are known to be difficult to optimize as configuration tuning, their characteristics are rather different, e.g., configuration tuning is known as expensive and sparse, but this might not be the case for the others.

2) *Fitness Landscape Analysis for Configuration*: A limited number of works have considered the concept of landscape for configuration research. Examples are Lustosa et al. propose nisSNEAK [59], which uses clustering techniques to explore the configuration space, reducing computational costs while maintaining high predictive accuracy and SMOOTHIE [108]—a tool that emphasizes optimizing hyperparameters by smoothing the loss landscape. Yet, the definition of landscape in those works differs from ours in the sense that they have not exploited any well-established landscape features. The most closely related work is perhaps from Huang et al. [36], which models the configuration space as a network as part of a proposed methodology, revealing the ruggedness of the configuration landscape, the distribution of local optima and the influence of feature interactions for a given system. However, they have not studied the role of surrogate models therein.

Overall, the above works differ from ours in the sense that:

- they have not distinguished the global and local landscape features;
- they mainly focus on studying the landscape of the real system rather than that emulated by the surrogate models, and how it can be considered useful for tuning;
- they have not provided a readily available tool, derived from the spatial landscape information, for assisting the practitioners in the field.

### B. Surrogate Models for Configuration Performance

Prior works have proposed various surrogate models to guide configuration tuning, ranging from statistical approaches [31], [86] to more recent deep learning-based methods [20], [27], [28], [32].

For instance, *SPLConqueror* [86] integrates linear regression with diverse sampling techniques to capture interactions among configuration options. *DECART* [31] enhances the CART model with hyperparameter tuning and an efficient resampling strategy. However, these statistical models often struggle to accurately capture the sparse configuration data—a common characteristic of configurable software systems [28]. To improve accuracy, deep learning-based approaches have gained traction over the past decade for modeling configuration performance. For example, *HINNP*erf [20] utilize the embedding method and hierarchical network blocks to model the complex interactions between configuration options. Similarly, *DaL* [27] partitions sparse configuration data into distinct, focused subsets, training a dedicated deep neural network for each to achieve superior accuracy.

There are also studies on so-called white-box/interpretable models; however, the explainability therein is mainly about the distribution analysis of the model [67] or correlating the model to the particular codebase of a system [99], [100], rather than to the spatial information of the landscape emulated by the model as what we investigated in this work.

The suitability of models for different systems has also been studied. Zhao et al. [115] note that Gaussian Processes (GP) effectively model continuous options but struggle with categorical ones, whereas Random Forests (RF) can handle both types but often lack high accuracy in low-dimensional configuration space.

Yet, the above share a common general belief: higher model accuracy can directly enhance configuration tuning performance and vice versa, which has been demonstrated as misleading in previous work [12].

### C. Models-based Configuration Tuning

Over the past decade, researchers have proposed and used various search heuristics to find better-performing configurations with a limited budget [9], [22], [43], [48], [72], [95], [112], [116].

1) *Batch Model-based Tuners*: Batch model-based tuners focus on the tuning/heuristics designs [4], [8], [48], [116]. Among the others, *BestConfig* [116] utilizes the divide-and-diverge sampling method and the recursive bound-and-search algorithm to explore the sample space. The key is to leverage the sparse nature of the configuration space. Some

other tuners treat configuration tuning as a black box tuning problem. Examples include *SWAY* [8], which is an effort from the software engineering community that seeks to focus on the “exploration” of the space first: it selects a large set of configurations and then samples within that set to narrow down to the optimal one. *MMO* [11] is a multi-objectivization model that addresses the single performance search by tuning into a multi-objective one through an auxiliary objective, e.g., the other unconcerned performance metric.

The above tuning/heuristics can, but do not have to, seamlessly integrate any pre-trained surrogate model to create batch model-based tuners—a common practice in the field [11], [15], [16], [83]. For instance, Chen et al. [11] demonstrate that their tuner can be paired with any model to enable cost-effective tuning. Similarly, Shi et al. [83] employ linear regression as a surrogate to enhance the tuner’s exploration capabilities.

2) *Sequential Model-based Tuners*: Sequential model-based tuners require more sophisticated search strategies, as their models must be updated during the tuning process. Numerous examples exist, primarily differing in the choice of surrogate model and its update mechanism following the Bayesian optimization framework [9], [72], [95], [112]. For example, *OtterTune* [95] and *ResTune* [112] use Gaussian Processes (GP) as their surrogate models, while *FLASH* [72] leverages Decision Trees (DT) to accelerate the search. Other tuners, such as *PromiseTune* [10], use Random Forest to identify promising regions/rules in the configuration landscape, which are then purified by causality inference, and finally incorporate such into a Bayesian optimization process.

Despite the widespread adoption of sequential model-based tuners, they still assume that a more accurate surrogate model is the primary factor in achieving superior tuning performance [20], [27], [32], [86], [110].

### D. Empirical Studies on Configuration

Various empirical studies exist on configuration from several different perspectives.

1) *General Configuration Studies*: In general, most empirical studies on configuration focus on understanding the characteristics of configurable systems. Among others, Xu et al. [106] demonstrate that the number of configuration options has increased significantly over the years, and as such, most developers have not yet exploited the full benefits offered by those configurations. Zhang et al. [114] investigate how configurations evolve among system versions, from which some patterns were discovered. Other studies focus on understanding the consequences of inappropriate configuration, e.g., those that lead to performance bugs [33]. Huang et al. [53] study the identification of performance-sensitive options and the relevant dependencies.

While those works do not target model and tuning, they provide insights about the characteristics of configurable software systems and hence are orthogonal to this study.

2) *Studies for Configuration Learning*: Since using surrogate models is often considered a promising way to relieve the expansiveness of configuration tuning, many studies have been conducted on different aspects of building such a model [7],

[13], [26], [40], [62]. For example, Gong and Chen [26] study the impact of encoding on the accuracy of the model, respectively. Jamshidi et al. [40] investigate how a model learned in one environment, e.g. hardware or version, can be transferred to the other while maintaining a good level of accuracy. Chen [13] seeks to understand the best way to update a model when a new configuration is measured, considering complete retraining or incremental learning. In fact, those works emphasize the accuracy of the model as a key metric, but are not concerned with how the model can be used for other tasks, e.g., configuration tuning.

### 3) *Prior Understandings of Surrogate Models for Tuning:*

Some studies have focused explicitly on comparing model-based tuners, covering general configurable systems [82] or specific domains such as database systems [96], [111] and defect predictors [51]. For example, Zhang et al. [113] study and train a meta-ranker to recommend suitable tuners for a given workload. However, the proposed method has a completely different goal compared with that of `Model4Tune`: instead of predicting the best model-tuner pair for an unforeseen system/workload using landscape features, the meta-ranker seeks to infer the best tuner for a workload using its similarity to the other past workloads of the same system, together with standard features such as the number of options etc. Aken et al. [96] replace the model chosen by `OtterTune` with alternative models and compare their tuning performance, aiming to find the most effective model to be used with `OtterTune`. Nevertheless, again, their studies neither summarize how the accuracy of models can impact the tuning nor how/why the model would impact the tuning. Our previous work [12] reveals that the accuracy can lie, but it has not systematically and comprehensively formalized the rationals; more importantly, there still lack guidelines and supports for evaluating model uselessness for tuning beyond accuracy.

Overall, existing research has acknowledged that the differently chosen model can influence the tuning results, but there is still a lack of clear understanding regarding how to assess the usefulness of models; how/why they are important for tuning; and what role do they play therein—all of which are what we seek to disclose in this work through the paradigm of fitness landscape analysis.

## X. CONCLUSION

This paper presents the first contribution to assess/explain how and why surrogate models can help (or harm) configuration tuning via fitness landscape analysis—a new perspective beyond the classic accuracy studies. We propose a new theory dubbed, landscape dominance, to better quantify the usefulness of models for tuning, based on which we conduct a large-scale empirical study (up to 27,000 cases) and reveal that:

- The landscape dominance is an effective metric for quantifying model usefulness for tuning;
- Landscape features provide largely different aspects of assessment compared with accuracy metrics;
- The model-emulated landscape is still far from being close to the real landscape, but this might still be acceptable.

- No single model is the most preferred for tuning based on landscape dominance;
- Memory and queue-related options are more influential on the landscape emulated by a model.

Drawing on landscape dominance and other findings, we propose `Model4Tune`, the first tool to predict the usefulness of model-tuner pairs for configuration tuning. Results over 18 systems demonstrate that `Model4Tune` considerably outperforms the random guessing by 79% – 82% of the cases in general with up to 244% improvements.

We envisage that this work not only fills the important gap in understanding the role of surrogate models for tuning, but also provides a readily available tool that can greatly assist practitioners in designing better, more specialized tuners. Most importantly, we hope that our findings will stimulate a batch of new research directions in the field.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adair, G. Ochoa, and K. M. Malan, “Local optima networks for continuous fitness landscapes,” in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion, GECCO 2019, Prague, Czech Republic, July 13-17, 2019*, 2019, pp. 1407–1414. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3319619.3326852>
- [2] J. Aguilar-Rodríguez, J. Payne, and A. Wagner, “A thousand empirical adaptive landscapes and their navigability,” *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 1, p. 0045, 01 2017.
- [3] N. M. Albulian, G. Fraser, and D. Sudholt, “Causes and effects of fitness landscapes in unit test generation,” in *GECCO ’20: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, Cancún Mexico, July 8-12, 2020*, 2020, pp. 1204–1212. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377930.3390194>
- [4] C. Ansótegui, M. Sellmann, and K. Tierney, “A gender-based genetic algorithm for the automatic configuration of algorithms,” in *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2009*, I. P. Gent, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 142–157.
- [5] A. Arcuri and L. C. Briand, “A practical guide for using statistical tests to assess randomized algorithms in software engineering,” in *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2011, Waikiki, Honolulu, HI, USA, May 21-28, 2011*, R. N. Taylor, H. C. Gall, and N. Medvidovic, Eds. ACM, 2011, pp. 1–10. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1985793.1985795>
- [6] R. Cao, L. Bao, C. Q. Wu, P. Zhangsun, Y. Li, and Z. Zhang, “CM-CASL: comparison-based performance modeling of software systems via collaborative active and semisupervised learning,” *J. Syst. Softw.*, vol. 201, p. 111686, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2023.111686>
- [7] R. Cao, L. Bao, P. Zhangsun, C. Q. Wu, S. Wei, R. Sun, R. Li, and Z. Zhang, “Ptssbench: a performance evaluation platform in support of automated parameter tuning of software systems,” *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 31, no. 1, p. 4, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-023-00402-z>
- [8] J. Chen, V. Nair, R. Krishna, and T. Menzies, ““sampling” as a baseline optimizer for search-based software engineering,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 597–614, 2018.
- [9] J. Chen, N. Xu, P. Chen, and H. Zhang, “Efficient compiler autotuning via bayesian optimization,” in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1198–1209.
- [10] P. Chen and T. Chen, “Promisetune: Unveiling causally promising and explainable configuration tuning,” in *48th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. ACM, 2026.
- [11] P. Chen, T. Chen, and M. Li, “MMO: meta multi-objectivization for software configuration tuning,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2024.
- [12] P. Chen, J. Gong, and T. Chen, “Accuracy can lie: On the impact of surrogate model in configuration tuning,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 548–580, 2025.

- [13] T. Chen, "All versus one: an empirical comparison on retrained and incremental machine learning for modeling performance of adaptable software," in *2019 IEEE/ACM 14th International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems (SEAMS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 157–168.
- [14] —, "Planning landscape analysis for self-adaptive systems," in *International Symposium on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems, SEAMS 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 22-24, 2022, 2022*, pp. 84–90. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3524844.3528060>
- [15] T. Chen, K. Li, R. Bahsoon, and X. Yao, "FEMOSAA: feature-guided and knee-driven multi-objective optimization for self-adaptive software," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 5:1–5:50, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3204459>
- [16] T. Chen and M. Li, "Multi-objectivizing software configuration tuning," in *ESEC/FSE '21: 29th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, Athens, Greece, August 23-28, 2021*, D. Spinellis, G. Gousios, M. Chechik, and M. D. Penta, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 453–465. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3468264.3468555>
- [17] —, "Do performance aspirations matter for guiding software configuration tuning? an empirical investigation under dual performance objectives," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 68:1–68:41, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571853>
- [18] —, "The weights can be harmful: Pareto search versus weighted search in multi-objective search-based software engineering," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 5:1–5:40, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514233>
- [19] —, "Adapting multi-objectivized software configuration tuning," vol. 1, no. FSE. ACM, 2024.
- [20] J. Cheng, C. Gao, and Z. Zheng, "Hinnperf: Hierarchical interaction neural network for performance prediction of configurable systems," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 1–30, 2023.
- [21] L. T. DeCarlo, "On the meaning and use of kurtosis." *Psychological methods*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 292, 1997.
- [22] H. Dou, K. Wang, Y. Zhang, and P. Chen, "Atconf: auto-tuning high dimensional configuration parameters for big data processing frameworks," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 2737–2755, 2023.
- [23] K. Dreczkowski, A. Grosnit, and H. Bou-Ammar, "Framework and benchmarks for combinatorial and mixed-variable bayesian optimization," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, Eds., 2023. [Online]. Available: [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/dbc4b67c6430c22460623186c3d3fdc2-Abstract-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/dbc4b67c6430c22460623186c3d3fdc2-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html)
- [24] A. Fekry, L. Carata, T. Pasquier, A. Rice, and A. Hopper, "To tune or not to tune? in search of optimal configurations for data analytics," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020, pp. 2494–2504.
- [25] F. Fournier, L. Limonad, and Y. David, "Agentic AI process observability: Discovering behavioral variability," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2505.20127, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2505.20127>
- [26] J. Gong and T. Chen, "Does configuration encoding matter in learning software performance? an empirical study on encoding schemes," in *19th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, MSR 2022, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, May 23-24, 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 482–494. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3524842.3528431>
- [27] —, "Predicting software performance with divide-and-learn," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, December 3-9, 2023*, S. Chandra, K. Blincoe, and P. Tonella, Eds. ACM, 2023, pp. 858–870. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3611643.3616334>
- [28] —, "Predicting configuration performance in multiple environments with sequential meta-learning," *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.*, vol. 1, no. FSE, pp. 359–382, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3643743>
- [29] —, "Deep configuration performance learning: A systematic survey and taxonomy," *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 25:1–25:62, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3702986>
- [30] J. Gong, T. Chen, and R. Bahsoon, "Dividable configuration performance learning," *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 106–134, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2024.3491945>
- [31] J. Guo, D. Yang, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, A. Sarkar, P. Valov, K. Czarnecki, A. Wasowski, and H. Yu, "Data-efficient performance learning for configurable systems," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 23, pp. 1826–1867, 2018.
- [32] H. Ha and H. Zhang, "Deeperf: performance prediction for configurable software with deep sparse neural network," in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 25-31, 2019*, 2019, pp. 1095–1106. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00113>
- [33] X. Han and T. Yu, "An empirical study on performance bugs for highly configurable software systems," in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement, ESEM 2016, Ciudad Real, Spain, September 8-9, 2016*. ACM, 2016, pp. 23:1–23:10. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2961111.2962602>
- [34] M. Harman, P. McMinn, J. Teixeira de Souza, and S. Yoo, "Search based software engineering: Techniques, taxonomy, tutorial," in *Empirical Software Engineering and Verification - International Summer Schools, LASER 2008-2010, Elba Island, Italy, Revised Tutorial Lectures*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, B. Meyer and M. Nordio, Eds., vol. 7007. Springer, 2010, pp. 1–59. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25231-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25231-0_1)
- [35] M. Huang and K. Li, "On the hyperparameter loss landscapes of machine learning models: An exploratory study," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, V.1, KDD 2025, Toronto, ON, Canada, August 3-7, 2025*, 2025, pp. 555–564. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3690624.3709229>
- [36] M. Huang, P. Mao, and K. Li, "Rethinking performance analysis for configurable software systems: A case study from a fitness landscape perspective," *Proc. ACM Softw. Eng.*, vol. 2, no. ISSTA, Jun. 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3728954>
- [37] F. Hutter, H. H. Hoos, and K. Leyton-Brown, "Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration," in *Learning and Intelligent Optimization: 5th International Conference, LION 5, Rome, Italy, January 17-21, 2011. Selected Papers 5*. Springer, 2011, pp. 507–523.
- [38] F. Hutter, H. H. Hoos, K. Leyton-Brown, and T. Stützle, "Paramils: an automatic algorithm configuration framework," *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, vol. 36, pp. 267–306, 2009.
- [39] P. Jamshidi and G. Casale, "An uncertainty-aware approach to optimal configuration of stream processing systems," in *24th IEEE International Symposium on Modeling, Analysis and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems, MASCOTS 2016, London, United Kingdom, September 19-21, 2016*. IEEE Computer Society, 2016, pp. 39–48. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/MASCOTS.2016.17>
- [40] P. Jamshidi, N. Siegmund, M. Velez, C. Kästner, A. Patel, and Y. Agarwal, "Transfer learning for performance modeling of configurable systems: an exploratory analysis," in *Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2017, Urbana, IL, USA, October 30 - November 03, 2017*, G. Rosu, M. D. Penta, and T. N. Nguyen, Eds. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 497–508. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2017.8115661>
- [41] P. Jamshidi, M. Velez, C. Kästner, and N. Siegmund, "Learning to sample: exploiting similarities across environments to learn performance models for configurable systems," in *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/SIGSOFT FSE 2018, Lake Buena Vista, FL, USA, November 04-09, 2018*, G. T. Leavens, A. Garcia, and C. S. Pasareanu, Eds. ACM, 2018, pp. 71–82. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236024.3236074>
- [42] K. Järvelin and J. Kekäläinen, "Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques," *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 422–446, 2002. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/582415.582418>
- [43] K. Kanellis, C. Ding, B. Kroth, A. Müller, C. Curino, and S. Venkataraman, "Llamatune: sample-efficient dbms configuration tuning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05128*, 2022.
- [44] G. Ke, Q. Meng, T. Wang, T. Wang, W. Chen, W. Ma, Q. Ye, and T. Liu, "Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017*,

- December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA, 2017, pp. 3146–3154. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/6449f44a102fde848669bdd9eb6b76fa-Abstract.html>
- [45] P. Kerschke, M. Preuss, S. Wessing, and H. Trautmann, “Detecting funnel structures by means of exploratory landscape analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, ser. GECCO ’15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 265–272. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2739480.2754642>
- [46] M. M. Khan and W. Yu, “Robotune: high-dimensional configuration tuning for cluster-based data analytics,” in *Proceedings of the 50th international conference on parallel processing*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [47] R. Krishna, V. Nair, P. Jamshidi, and T. Menzies, “Whence to learn? transferring knowledge in configurable systems using BEETLE,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 2956–2972, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2020.2983927>
- [48] R. Krishna, C. Tang, K. Sullivan, and B. Ray, “Conex: Efficient exploration of big-data system configurations for better performance,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 893–909, 2020.
- [49] J. Lee, S. Seo, J. Choi, and S. Park, “K2vtune: A workload-aware configuration tuning for rocksdb,” *Inf. Process. Manag.*, vol. 61, no. 1, p. 103567, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2023.103567>
- [50] B. Li, J. Li, K. Tang, and X. Yao, “Many-objective evolutionary algorithms: A survey,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 13:1–13:35, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2792984>
- [51] K. Li, Z. Xiang, T. Chen, S. Wang, and K. C. Tan, “Understanding the automated parameter optimization on transfer learning for cross-project defect prediction: an empirical study,” in *ICSE ’20: 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering, Seoul, South Korea, 27 June - 19 July, 2020*. ACM, 2020, pp. 566–577. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377811.3380360>
- [52] M. Li, T. Chen, and X. Yao, “How to evaluate solutions in pareto-based search-based software engineering: A critical review and methodological guidance,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 1771–1799, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2020.3036108>
- [53] H. Liang, Y. Huang, and T. Chen, “The same only different: On information modality for configuration performance analysis,” in *47th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2025, Ottawa, ON, Canada, April 26 - May 6, 2025*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 2522–2534. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00212>
- [54] A. Liaw, M. Wiener *et al.*, “Classification and regression by random-forest,” *R news*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 18–22, 2002.
- [55] A. Liefvooghe, F. Daolio, S. Verel, B. Derbel, H. Aguirre, and K. Tanaka, “Landscape-aware performance prediction for evolutionary multiobjective optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 1063–1077, 2020.
- [56] A. Liefvooghe, S. Vérel, B. Lacroix, A. Zavoianu, and J. A. W. McCall, “Landscape features and automated algorithm selection for multi-objective interpolated continuous optimisation problems,” in *GECCO ’21: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, Lille, France, July 10-14, 2021*, 2021, pp. 421–429. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3449639.3459353>
- [57] T.-Y. Liu *et al.*, “Learning to rank for information retrieval,” *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 225–331, 2009.
- [58] M. López-Ibáñez, J. Dubois-Lacoste, L. P. Cáceres, M. Birattari, and T. Stützle, “The irace package: Iterated racing for automatic algorithm configuration,” *Operations Research Perspectives*, vol. 3, pp. 43–58, 2016.
- [59] A. Lustosa and T. Menzies, “Learning from very little data: On the value of landscape analysis for predicting software project health,” *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, vol. 33, no. 3, Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3630252>
- [60] Y. Ma, T. Chen, and K. Li, “Faster configuration performance bug testing with neural dual-level prioritization,” in *47th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2025, Ottawa, ON, Canada, April 26 - May 6, 2025*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 988–1000. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00201>
- [61] K. M. Malan and A. P. Engelbrecht, “A survey of techniques for characterising fitness landscapes and some possible ways forward,” *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 241, pp. 148–163, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.04.015>
- [62] H. Martin, M. Acher, J. A. Pereira, and J. Jézéquel, “A comparison of performance specialization learning for configurable systems,” in *SPLC ’21: 25th ACM International Systems and Software Product Line Conference, Leicester, United Kingdom, September 6-11, 2021, Volume A*, M. R. Mousavi and P. Schobbens, Eds. ACM, 2021, pp. 46–57. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461001.3471155>
- [63] P. E. McKight and J. Najab, “Kruskal-wallis test,” *The corsini encyclopedia of psychology*, pp. 1–1, 2010.
- [64] O. Mersmann, B. Bischl, H. Trautmann, M. Preuss, C. Weihs, and G. Rudolph, “Exploratory landscape analysis,” in *13th Annual Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2011, Proceedings, Dublin, Ireland, July 12-16, 2011*, 2011, pp. 829–836. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2001576.2001690>
- [65] A. Mohan, C. Benjamins, K. Wienecke, A. Dockhorn, and M. Lindauer, “Autorl hyperparameter landscapes,” in *International Conference on Automated Machine Learning, 12-15 November 2023, Hasso Plattner Institute, Potsdam, Germany, 2023*, pp. 13:1–27. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v224/mohan23a.html>
- [66] D. Montgomery, E. Peck, and G. Vining, *Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis*, ser. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=tCigEAAAQBAJ>
- [67] C. S. Mühlbauer, F. Sattler, and N. Siegmund, “Analyzing the impact of workloads on modeling the performance of configurable software systems,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE), IEEE, 2023*.
- [68] C. L. Müller and I. F. Sbalzarini, “Global characterization of the CEC 2005 fitness landscapes using fitness-distance analysis,” in *Applications of Evolutionary Computation - EvoApplications 2011: EvoCOMPLEX, EvoGAMES, EvoIASP, EvoINTELLIGENCE, EvoNUM, and EvoSTOC, Torino, Italy, April 27-29, 2011, Proceedings, Part I*, 2011, pp. 294–303. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20525-5\\_30](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20525-5_30)
- [69] M. A. Muñoz, M. Kirley, and S. K. Halgamuge, “Exploratory landscape analysis of continuous space optimization problems using information content,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 74–87, 2015.
- [70] L. Myers and M. J. Sirois, “Spearman correlation coefficients, differences between,” *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences*, vol. 12, 2004.
- [71] V. Nair, T. Menzies, N. Siegmund, and S. Apel, “Using bad learners to find good configurations,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 11th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2017, Paderborn, Germany, September 4-8, 2017*, E. Bodden, W. Schäfer, A. van Deursen, and A. Zisman, Eds. ACM, 2017, pp. 257–267. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3106237.3106238>
- [72] V. Nair, Z. Yu, T. Menzies, N. Siegmund, and S. Apel, “Finding faster configurations using flash,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 794–811, 2018.
- [73] Neelofar, K. Smith-Miles, M. A. Muñoz, and A. Aleti, “Instance space analysis of search-based software testing,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 2642–2660, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2022.3228334>
- [74] A. Papkou, L. Garcia-Pastor, J. A. Escudero, and A. Wagner, “A rugged yet easily navigable fitness landscape,” *Science*, vol. 382, no. 6673, p. eadh3860, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.adh3860>
- [75] K. Pearson, “Contributions to the mathematical theory of evolution.—ii. skew variation in homogeneous material,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. (A)*, vol. 186, pp. 343–414, 1895.
- [76] K. Peng, C. Kaltenecker, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and T. Menzies, “VEER: disagreement-free multi-objective configuration,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2106.02716, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.02716>
- [77] E. Pitzer and M. Affenzeller, “A comprehensive survey on fitness landscape analysis,” in *Recent Advances in Intelligent Engineering Systems*, ser. Studies in Computational Intelligence, J. C. Fodor, R. Klempous, and C. P. S. Araujo, Eds. Springer, 2012, vol. 378, pp. 161–191. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23229-9\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23229-9_8)
- [78] D. R. Radev, H. Qi, H. Wu, and W. Fan, “Evaluating web-based question answering systems,” in *LREC*, vol. 3, 2002, p. 1.
- [79] C. E. Rasmussen, C. K. Williams *et al.*, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. Springer, 2006, vol. 1.
- [80] I. Samoladas, L. Angelis, and I. Stamelos, “Survival analysis on the duration of open source projects,” *Inf. Softw. Technol.*,

- vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 902–922, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2010.05.001>
- [81] M. Sayagh, N. Kerzazi, B. Adams, and F. Petrillo, “Software configuration engineering in practice interviews, survey, and systematic literature review,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 646–673, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2867847>
- [82] A. S. Sayyad, K. Goseva-Popstojanova, T. Menzies, and H. Ammar, “On parameter tuning in search based software engineering: A replicated empirical study,” in *2013 3rd International Workshop on Replication in Empirical Software Engineering Research*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 84–90.
- [83] J. Shi, Z. Yang, H. J. Kang, B. Xu, J. He, and D. Lo, “Greening large language models of code,” *International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2024.
- [84] J. Shlens, “A tutorial on principal component analysis,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1404.1100, 2014. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.1100>
- [85] Y. Shu, Y. Sui, H. Zhang, and G. Xu, “Perf-al: Performance prediction for configurable software through adversarial learning,” in *Proceedings of the 14th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM)*, 2020, pp. 1–11.
- [86] N. Siegmund, M. Rosenmüller, M. Kuhleemann, C. Kästner, S. Apel, and G. Saake, “Spl conqueror: Toward optimization of non-functional properties in software product lines,” *Software Quality Journal*, vol. 20, pp. 487–517, 2012.
- [87] K. Smith-Miles and M. A. Muñoz, “Instance space analysis for algorithm testing: Methodology and software tools,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 255:1–255:31, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3572895>
- [88] A. J. Smola and B. Schölkopf, “A tutorial on support vector regression,” *Statistics and computing*, vol. 14, pp. 199–222, 2004.
- [89] Y.-Y. Song and Y. Lu, “Decision tree methods: applications for classification and prediction,” *Shanghai archives of psychiatry*, vol. 27, no. 2, p. 130–135, April 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC4466856>
- [90] P. F. Stadler, “Landscapes and their correlation functions,” *Journal of Mathematical chemistry*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–45, 1996.
- [91] C. Tantithamthavorn, S. McIntosh, A. E. Hassan, and K. Matsumoto, “An empirical comparison of model validation techniques for defect prediction models,” no. 1, 2017.
- [92] —, “The impact of automated parameter optimization on defect prediction models,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 683–711, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2018.2794977>
- [93] S. L. Thomson, L. K. L. Goff, E. Hart, and E. Buchanan, “Understanding fitness landscapes in morpho-evolution via local optima networks,” in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, July 14-18, 2024*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3638529.3654059>
- [94] P. Valov, J. Petkovich, J. Guo, S. Fischmeister, and K. Czarnecki, “Transferring performance prediction models across different hardware platforms,” in *Proceedings of the 8th ACM/SPEC on International Conference on Performance Engineering, ICPE 2017, L’Aquila, Italy, April 22-26, 2017*, W. Binder, V. Cortellessa, A. Koziolok, E. Smirni, and M. Poess, Eds. ACM, 2017, pp. 39–50. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3030207.3030216>
- [95] D. Van Aken, A. Pavlo, G. J. Gordon, and B. Zhang, “Automatic database management system tuning through large-scale machine learning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM international conference on management of data*, 2017, pp. 1009–1024.
- [96] D. Van Aken, D. Yang, S. Brillard, A. Fiorino, B. Zhang, C. Bilien, and A. Pavlo, “An inquiry into machine learning-based automatic configuration tuning services on real-world database management systems,” *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 1241–1253, 2021.
- [97] D. A. van Veldhuizen and G. B. Lamont, “Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: Analyzing the state-of-the-art,” *Evol. Comput.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 125–147, 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1162/106365600568158>
- [98] O. Vechtomova, “Introduction to Information Retrieval christopher d. manning, prabhakar raghavan, and hinrich schütze, cambridge university press, 2008,” *Comput. Linguistics*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 307–309, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1162/coli.2009.35.2.307>
- [99] M. Velez, P. Jamshidi, F. Sattler, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and C. Kästner, “Configcrusher: towards white-box performance analysis for configurable systems,” *Autom. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 265–300, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-020-00273-8>
- [100] M. Velez, P. Jamshidi, N. Siegmund, S. Apel, and C. Kästner, “White-box analysis over machine learning: Modeling performance of configurable systems,” in *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1072–1084. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00100>
- [101] S. Wattanakriengkrai, D. Wang, R. G. Kula, C. Treude, P. Thongtanunam, T. Ishio, and K. Matsumoto, “Giving back: Contributions congruent to library dependency changes in a software ecosystem,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 2566–2579, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2022.3225197>
- [102] M. Weber, C. Kaltenecker, F. Sattler, S. Apel, and N. Siegmund, “Twins or false friends? A study on energy consumption and performance of configurable software,” in *45th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2023, Melbourne, Australia, May 14-20, 2023*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2098–2110. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00177>
- [103] S. Wright, “The roles of mutation, inbreeding, crossbreeding, and selection in evolution,” *proceedings of the sixth international congress on genetics*, 1932.
- [104] T. Xia, R. Krishna, J. Chen, G. Mathew, X. Shen, and T. Menzies, “Hyperparameter optimization for effort estimation,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1805.00336, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.00336>
- [105] Z. Xiang, J. Gong, and T. Chen, “Dually hierarchical drift adaptation for online configuration performance learning,” in *48th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. ACM, 2026.
- [106] T. Xu, L. Jin, X. Fan, Y. Zhou, S. Pasupathy, and R. Talwadker, “Hey, you have given me too many knobs!: understanding and dealing with over-designed configuration in system software,” in *Proceedings of the 2015 10th Joint Meeting on Foundations of Software Engineering, ESEC/FSE 2015, Bergamo, Italy, August 30 - September 4, 2015*, E. D. Nitto, M. Harman, and P. Heymans, Eds. ACM, 2015, pp. 307–319. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2786805.2786852>
- [107] Y. Ye, T. Chen, and M. Li, “Distilled lifelong self-adaptation for configurable systems,” in *47th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2025, Ottawa, ON, Canada, April 26 - May 6, 2025*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 1333–1345. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE55347.2025.00094>
- [108] R. Yedida and T. Menzies, “SMOOTHIE: A theory of hyper-parameter optimization for software analytics,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2401.09622, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.09622>
- [109] —, “Is Hyper-Parameter Optimization Different for Software Analytics?,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 51, no. 06, pp. 1629–1644, Jun. 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/TSE.2025.3550103>
- [110] Z. Yu, Z. Bei, and X. Qian, “Datasize-aware high dimensional configurations auto-tuning of in-memory cluster computing,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS 2018, Williamsburg, VA, USA, March 24-28, 2018*, X. Shen, J. Tuck, R. Bianchini, and V. Sarkar, Eds. ACM, 2018, pp. 564–577. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173162.3173187>
- [111] X. Zhang, Z. Chang, Y. Li, H. Wu, J. Tan, F. Li, and B. Cui, “Facilitating database tuning with hyper-parameter optimization: A comprehensive experimental evaluation,” *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 1808–1821, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol15/p1808-cui.pdf>
- [112] X. Zhang, H. Wu, Z. Chang, S. Jin, J. Tan, F. Li, T. Zhang, and B. Cui, “Restune: Resource oriented tuning boosted by meta-learning for cloud databases,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 international conference on management of data*, 2021, pp. 2102–2114.
- [113] X. Zhang, H. Wu, Y. Li, Z. Tang, J. Tan, F. Li, and B. Cui, “An efficient transfer learning based configuration adviser for database tuning,” *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 539–552, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol17/p539-zhang.pdf>
- [114] Y. Zhang, H. He, O. Legunsen, S. Li, W. Dong, and T. Xu, “An evolutionary study of configuration design and implementation in cloud systems,” in *43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE 2021, Madrid, Spain, 22-30 May*

2021. IEEE, 2021, pp. 188–200. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE43902.2021.00029>
- [115] X. Zhao, X. Zhou, and G. Li, “Automatic database knob tuning: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- [116] Y. Zhu, J. Liu, M. Guo, Y. Bao, W. Ma, Z. Liu, K. Song, and Y. Yang, “Bestconfig: tapping the performance potential of systems via automatic configuration tuning,” in *Proceedings of the 2017 Symposium on Cloud Computing*, 2017, pp. 338–350.