An Introduction to Evolutionary Multiobjective Optimization

TIES451 Selected Topics in Soft Computing



Content

- A brief review of evolutionary optimization.
- Evolutionary multiobjective optimization
 - Basic concepts in multiobjective optimization
- Evolutionary multiobjective optimization (EMO) algorithms
 - Goals
 - Different types of approaches
- Other issues
- Recent developments



A brief review of evolutionary optimization



Evolutionary optimization



Charles Darwin



Offsprings created by reproduction, mutation, etc.

Natural selection - A guided search procedure

Individuals suited to the environment survive, reproduce and pass their genetic traits to offspring.

Populations adapt to their environment. Variations accumulate over time to generate new species.

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF IYVÄSKYLÄ



GA and DE which we studied earlier are examples of this kind of algorithm.

- **Crossover**: An operator which involves two or more individuals called parents and creates one or more individual(s) called offspring.
- Mutation: An operator which considers only a single individual, perturbs it to create a new offspring.

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

From a single objective to multiple objectives





Multiobjective Optimization

 Let us consider multiobjective optimization problem (MOP) to be of the form:

 $\begin{array}{ll} minimize & \{f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x)\}\\ subject \ to & x \in S \subset R^n \end{array}$

- with $k \ge 2$ (conflicting) objectives.
- Decision vector /variables: $x = (x_1, ..., x_n)$
- Objective vector: $f = (f_1(x), ..., f_k(x))$





- Usually a MOP has several optimal solutions with different trade-offs called **Pareto optimal** solutions.
- A decision vector $x^* \in S$ is a Pareto optimal solution for a MOP, if there does not exist another $x \in S$ such that $f_i(x) \le f_i(x^*)$ for all i = 1, ..., k and $f_j(x) < f_j(x^*)$ for at least one index *j*.
- An objective vector is Pareto optimal, if its corresponding decision vector is Pareto optimal.



Concept of nondominated solutions:

- solution **a** dominates solution **b**, if
 - **a** is no worse than **b** in all objectives
 - **a** is strictly better than **b** in at least one objective.





Ideal point:

- Usually infeasible
- lower bound of the Pareto front.

Nadir point:

- Upper bound of the Pareto front.
- Hard to find, but can be approximated
- Normalization of objective vectors:
 - $f_{i}^{\text{norm}} = (f_i z_i^{\text{utopia}})/(z_i^{\text{nadir}} z_i^{\text{utopia}})$





EMO algorithms



EMO algorithms

- What are evolutionary f_2 multiobjective optimization algorithms?
 - Evolutionary algorithms used to solve multiobjective optimization problems.
 - EMO algorithms use a population of solutions to obtain a **diverse set** of solutions close to the Pareto optimal front.



Goals



Goals



Changes to single objective evolutionary algorithms

- Fitness computation must be changed
- Non-dominated solutions are preferred to maintain the drive towards the Pareto optimal front (attain convergence)
- Emphasis to be given to less crowded or isolated solutions to maintain diversity in the population



What are less-crowded solutions ?

- Crowding can occur in decision space and/or objective phase.
 - Decision space diversity sometimes are needed
 - As in engineering design problems, all solutions would look the same.





Main Issues in EMO

- How to maintain diversity and obtain a diverse set of Pareto optimal solutions?
 - How to maintain non-dominated solutions?
- How to maintain the push towards the Pareto front ? (Achieve convergence)



Algorithm design issues

- The approximation of the Pareto front is itself multi-objective.
 - Convergence: Compute solutions as close as possible to Pareto front quickly.
 - Diversity: Maximize the diversity of the Pareto solutions.
- It is impossible to describe
 - What a good approximation can be for a Pareto optimal front.
 - Proximity to the Pareto optimal front.



Fitness assignment

- Unlike single objective, multiple objectives exists.
 - Fitness assignment and selection go hand in hand.
- Fitness assignment can be classified in to following categories:
 - Decoposition based
 - Objective based
 - Dominance based



Decomposition based

- Decomposes MOPs into a set of scalar subproblems.
- Solves the subproblems simultaneously by evolving a population of solutions
- Any scalarizing technique can be incorporated in to the framework
- 🔹 e.g., MOEA/D



Objective based

- Switch between objectives in the selection phase.
 - Every time an individual is chosen for reproduction, a different objective decides.
 - E.g. Vector evaluated genetic algorithm (VEGA)



Dominance based

- Pareto dominance based fitness ranking proposed by Goldberg in 1989.
- Different ways
 - **Dominance rank**: Number of individuals by which an individual is dominated.
 - E.g. MOGA, SPEA2
 - **Dominance depth**: The fitness is based on the front an individual belongs.
 - NSGA-II
 - **Dominance count**: Number of individuals dominated by an individual.
 - SPEA2, SIBEA

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ



Diversity preservation

Chance of an individual being selected

- **Increases**: Low number of solutions in its neighborhood.
- **Decreases**: High number of solutions in its neighborhood.
- There are at least three types:
 - Kernel methods
 - Nearest neighbor
 - Histogram



Kernel methods:

- Sum of f values, where f is a function of distance.
- E.g. NSGA

Nearest neighbor

- The perimeter of the cuboid formed by the nearest neighbors as the vertices.
- E.g. NSGA-II



🕨 Histogram

- Number of elements in a hyperbox.
- E.g. PAES





Challenges in EMO algorithms

- Traditional EMO algorithms e.g. NSGA-II cannot handle problems with more than 3 objectives.
 - Need for solutions which increases exponentially with the number of objectives to represent the Pareto optimal front.
 - Lack enough selection pressure towards the Pareto optimal front.
 - Non-dominated solutions increases in the population.
 - Visualization of four and higher dimensional Pareto optimal front is difficult.

© Karthik Sindhya, JYU

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Some ways the tackle the challenges

- Instead of entire Pareto optimal front, generate only a smaller subset of preferred Pareto optimal solutions, e.g., R-NSGA-II, I-SIBEA
- Use a pre-defined multiple targeted search: NSGA-III, MOEA/D, RVEA.



Other issues

Test problems

Performance assessments



Test problems

- It is common in the MOEA community to use test problems to test the efficacy of the algorithms proposed.
- However, any MOEA which performs well on the test suite cannot be guaranteed to work well with real world problems.



Performance assessment

- Compare different algorithms to establish efficacy on a set of test problems.
- Measure convergence and diversity of the approximation.
 - Diversity metrics: Spread, spacing etc.
 - Convergence metrics: error ratio, inverted generational distance.
 - Convergence and diversity: Hypervolume, coverage etc.



Performance assessment

Hypervolume: The volume of the space dominated by the approximation in the objective space.



Source codes available:

- 1. Weighted hypervolume:
 - 1. http://www.tik.ee.ethz.ch/sop/d ownload/supplementary/weight edHypervolume/
- 2. Matlab
 - 1. http://www.mathworks.com/ma tlabcentral/fileexchange/19651hypervolume-indicator



Performance assessment

Inverted Generational Distance (IGD):

$$IGD(A, P^*) = \frac{\sum_{v \in P^*} d(v, A)}{|P^*|}$$

- -d(v, A) is the minimum Euclidian distance between v and the individuals in A.
- A is the approximation obtained from the MOEA.
- $-P^*$ is the reference set of large enough individuals in the Pareto optimal front.

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Further topics which will be covered in the course:

- Constraint handling techniques (covered in the reading assignment)
- Hybrid EMO / memetic algorithms and genetic programming (covered in a discussion session)



Recent developments

