Self-adaptation via Multi-objectivisation: A Theoretical Study





School of Computer Science University of Birmingham United Kingdom

July 2022

¹p.k.lehre@cs.bham.ac.uk ²xxq896@cs.bham.ac.uk



- Elitist EAs can get stuck on local optima (Jagerskupper and Storch, 2007; Dang et al., 2020; Doerr, 2022; Dang et al., 2021).
- Sparse deceptive regions (sparse local optima)

Motivation - Previous Works



- SPARSELOCALOPT ⇒ a kind of fitness landscapes with *sparse deceptive regions* (local optima) and *dense fitness valleys* (Dang et al., 2021).
- Non-linear non-elitist selection and sufficiently high mutation rate (Dang et al., 2021) ⇒
 - Sparse local optimal individuals ⇒ higher chance to be selected but only survive a small percentage of such individuals after mutation;
 - Dense fitness valley individuals ⇒ less chance of being selected but can have higher chance of surviving mutation.

Motivation - Problems



- However,
 - We need know the sparsity of local optima to set the mutation rate;
 - Fitness functions could contain several local optimums with different sparsities.

Contribution: A new EA for single-objective (MOSA-EA)

• The Multi-Objective Self-Adaptive EA (MOSA-EA)³

- Non-elitism
- Self-adaptation
- Multi-objectivisation



³Implementation can be found in https://github.com/ChengCheng-Qin/mosa-ea.

- Theoretical study: Escaping local optima (Runtime analyses)
 - MOSA-EA can efficiently escape an artificial local optimum with unknown sparsity.
 - Other fixed mutation rate EAs fail.
- Empricial study: Complex combinatorial optimisation problems
 - MOSA-EA can outperforms a range of EAs on random NK-LANDSCAPE and *k*-SAT instances.



• MOSA-EA:

- Multi-objective sorting mechanism ⇒ Strict non-dominated Pareto fronts
- (μ, λ) selection \Rightarrow from sorted population.
- Self-adapting mutation rate strategy \Rightarrow New mutation rate χ' is
 - $A\chi$ with probability p_{inc} ; • χ/A otherwise.



Table: Runtime analyses of EAs¹ on PEAKEDLO_{*m,k*} (for some constant $c, \delta > 0$)

Algorithm	PeakedLO _{m,k}	Runtime T
$(\mu + \lambda)$ EA (μ, λ) EA	Any $k \le n$ and $k, m \in \Omega(n)$ Any $k \le n$ and $k, m \in \Omega(n)$	$\Pr(T \le e^{cn}) \le e^{-\Omega(n)}$ $\Pr(T \le e^{cn}) \le e^{-\Omega(n)/2}$ $\Pr(T \le e^{cn}) \le e^{-\Omega(\lambda)}$
(μ, λ) MOSA-EA	Any $k \in (\ln(3/2) - o)$ n and k , $m \in \Omega(n)$ Any $n \ge k \in \Omega(n)$, $\lceil m \rceil < 2A (1 + \ln(p_{\text{inc}})/\ln(\alpha_0) - o(1)) k^3$	$E[T] = O\left(n^2 \log(n)\right)$

¹With the initial population $P_0 = \{0^k *^{n-k}\}^{\lambda}$

 $^{2}\lambda, \mu \in \text{poly}(n)$

 $^3{\rm For}$ some constants $p_{\rm inc}$ < 2/5, α \geq 4, A > 1 based on restrictions in Theorem 5 of the Paper.



- The error thresholds for sparse and dense regions are different.
- MOSA-EA maximises fitness and mutation rate on Pareto fronts.
- For each individual, the mutation rate will be closed to its error threshold.
- Individuals with mutation rates larger than error thresholds will "vanish" in the next generation.
- Partition the two-dimensional search space into "fitness levels" and "mutation rate sub-levels"
- Use the level-based theorem (Corus et al., 2018) to derive the runtime.

Supplemental Experimental Results

- MOSA-EA outperforms other heuristic algorithms on
 - random NK-LANDSCAPE (maximisation, above) and
 - random *k*-SAT (minimisation, below).
- More empirical analyses will be published in (Qin & Lehre, PPSN'22).



Figure: The best fitness value achieved in 10^8 fitness evaluations on 100 random NK-LANDSCAPE (n = 100) (above) and k-SAT (k = 5) (below) instances

• Novelty:

• MOSA-EA treats parameter control as another objective.

• Significance:

- MOSA-EA can escape local optima with unknown sparsity
- MOSA-EA can outperform other EAs on complex optimisation problems.
- MOSA-EA is free to set mutation rate.

• Next steps:

- Performance in more scenarios?
- Self-adapt more parameters?
- . . .

Title: Self-adaptation via Multi-objectivisation: A Theoretical Study

Authors: Per Kristian Lehre & Xiaoyu Qin {p.k.lehre, xxq896}@cs.bham.ac.uk

Code can be found here:



References

- Case, B. and Lehre, P. K. (2020). Self-adaptation in non-Elitist Evolutionary Algorithms on Discrete Problems with Unknown Structure. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 1–1.
- Corus, D., Dang, D.-C., Eremeev, A. V., and Lehre, P. K. (2018). Level-Based Analysis of Genetic Algorithms and Other Search Processes. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 22(5):707–719.
- Dang, D.-C., Eremeev, A., and Lehre, P. K. (2020). Escaping Local Optima with Non-Elitist Evolutionary Algorithms. In *Proceedings of AAAI 2021*. AAAI Press.
- Dang, D.-C., Eremeev, A., and Lehre, P. K. (2021). Non-elitist Evolutionary Algorithms Excel in Fitness Landscapes with Sparse Deceptive Regions and Dense Valleys. In *Proceedings of the Genetic* and Evolutionary Computation Conference, Lille, France. ACM.
- Doerr, B. (2022). Does Comma Selection Help to Cope with Local Optima? *Algorithmica*.

Jagerskupper, J. and Storch, T. (2007). When the Plus Strategy Outperforms the Comma Strategyand When Not. In 2007 IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computational Intelligence, pages 25–32, Honolulu, HI. IEEE.

A Framework of Self-adaptive EAs



More Experimental Results in (Qin & Lehre, PPSN '22)



Figure: The highest fitness values found in the end of runs in 10° fitness evaluations on 100 random NK-LANDSCAPE instances with different k (n = 100).



Figure: The medians of the smallest number of unsatisfied clauses found in 10^8 fitness evaluations on 100 random *k*-SAT instances with different total numbers of clauses *m* (k = 5, n = 100).