

Using Genetic Improvement & Code Transplants to Specialise a C++ Program to a Problem Class

Authors











Justyna Petke Mark Harman William B. Langdon Westley Weimer Centre for Research on Evolution, Search and Testing University University College London of Virginia



Genetic Improvement

Seeks to automatically improve an existing program

Criteria can be non-functional properties of the system

Uses genetic programming

Relies on a set of test cases



Genetic Improvement





Contributions

Introduction of multi-donor software transplantation

Use of genetic improvement as means to specialise software



Motivation for choosing a SAT solver - impact

Bounded Model Checking

Planning

Software Verification

Automatic Test Pattern Generation

Combinational Equivalence Checking

Combinatorial Interaction Testing

and many other applications..



Motivation for choosing MiniSAT

MiniSAT-hack track in SAT solver competitions

- human-optimised versions of MiniSAT available
- good source for software transplants



Results

Solver	Donor	Lines	Seconds
MiniSAT (original)	—	1.00	1.00
MiniSAT-best09	—	1.46	1.76
MiniSAT-bestCIT	—	0.72	0.87
MiniSAT-best09+bestCIT	—	1.26	1.63
MiniSAT-gp	best09	0.93	0.95
MiniSAT-gp	bestCIT	0.72	0.87
MiniSAT-gp	best09+bestCIT	0.94	0.96
MiniSAT-gp-combined	best09+bestCIT	0.54	0.83



Results

Achieved 17% runtime improvement on MiniSAT for the Combinatorial Interaction Testing domain by combining best individuals



MiniSAT

Core algorithm developed in the 1960s Optimised by experts for over 13 years Achieved 17% improvement using GI in 14 hours (for a particular problem class)



Results

Resultant version of MiniSAT is 4% better than any of the human-modified versions of MiniSAT In 2011 SAT competition up to 9% runtime improvement achieved vs. 17% by specialising and using GI with transplantation and filtering



Impact

- First use of transplantation within GI
- Shown the approach improves highly-optimised software
- Speed-up achieved within hours not years