MOGPS Supplementary Material

Benedikt Hofmeister, Marlene Bruns Clemens Hübler, Raimund Rolfes Institute of Structural Analysis, Leibniz University Hannover

December 2020

1 Test functions

1.1 Poloni function

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \left[1 + (A_1 - B_1(x_1, x_2))^2 + (A_2 - B_2(x_1, x_2))^2 \right] \\ (x_1 + 3)^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
(1)

where

$$A_{1} = 0.5 \sin(1) - 2\cos(1) + \sin(2) - 1.5\cos(2)$$

$$A_{2} = 1.5 \sin(1) - \cos(1) + 2\sin(2) - 0.5\cos(2)$$

$$B_{1}(x_{1}, x_{2}) = 0.5 \sin(x_{1}) - 2\cos(x_{1}) + \sin(x_{2}) - 1.5\cos(x_{2})$$

$$B_{2}(x_{1}, x_{2}) = 1.5\sin(x_{1}) - \cos(x_{1}) + 2\sin(x_{2}) - 0.5\cos(x_{2})$$

s.t. $[-\pi -\pi]^{T} \le \mathbf{x} \le [\pi -\pi]^{T}$.

See Poloni et al. [1].

1.2 Kursawe function

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left[-10 \exp\left(-0.2\sqrt{x_{i}^{2} + x_{i+1}^{2}}\right) \right] \\ \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left[|x_{i}|^{0.8} + 5 \sin\left(x_{i}^{3}\right) \right] \end{pmatrix}$$
(2)
s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} -5 & -5 & -5 \end{bmatrix}^{T} \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}^{T}$.

See Kursawe [2].

1.3 Viennet function 1

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5\left(x_1^2 + x_2^2\right) + \sin\left(x_1^2 + x_2^2\right) \\ \frac{\left(3x_1 - 2x_2 + 4\right)^2}{8} + \frac{\left(x_1 - x_2 + 1\right)^2}{27} + 15 \\ \frac{1}{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 1} - 1.1\exp\left[-\left(x_1^2 + x_2^2\right)\right] \end{pmatrix}$$
(3)

s.t.
$$\begin{bmatrix} -3 & -3 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}^T$$
.

See Viennet et al. [3].

1.4 Viennet function 2

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2 \\ x_1^2 + (x_2 + 1)^2 + 1 \\ (x_1 - 1)^2 + x_2^2 + 2 \end{pmatrix}$$
(4)
s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} -2 & -2 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

See Viennet et al. [3].

1.5 Schaffer function 1

$$\boldsymbol{f}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x^2 \\ (x-2)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
s.t. $-10 \le x \le 10.$
(5)

See Schaffer [4].

1.6 Schaffer function 2

$$\boldsymbol{f}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} -x, & \text{if } x \le 1 \\ x - 2, & \text{if } 1 < x \le 3 \\ 4 - x, & \text{if } 3 < x \le 4 \\ x - 4, & \text{if } x > 4 \\ (x - 5)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

s.t. $-5 \le x \le 10.$ (6)

See Schaffer [4].

1.7 Fonseca-Fleming function

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \exp\left[-(x_1 - 1)^2 - (x_2 + 1)^2\right] \\ 1 - \exp\left[-(x_1 + 1)^2 - (x_2 - 1)^2\right] \end{pmatrix}$$
(7)
s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} -4 & -4 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 4 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

See Fonseca and Fleming [5].

1.8 Four bar truss

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} L\left(2x_1 + \sqrt{2}x_2 + \sqrt{x_3} + x_4\right) \\ \frac{FL}{E}\left(\frac{2}{x_1} + \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{x_2} - \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{x_3} + \frac{2}{x_4}\right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(8)

where

$$F = 10$$
$$E = 2 \times 10^5$$
$$L = 200$$

s.t.
$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}^T$$
.

See Cheng and Li [6].

1.9 ZDT1

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ g\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{x_1}{g}}\right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(9)

where

$$g = 1 + 9 \sum_{i=2}^{N} x_i$$

s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \boldsymbol{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

See Zitzler et al. [7].

1.10 ZDT2

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ g\left(1 - \left(\frac{x_1}{g}\right)^2\right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(10)

where

$$g = 1 + 9\sum_{i=2}^{N} x_i$$

s.t.
$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$$
.

See Zitzler et al. [7].

1.11 ZDT3

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ g\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{x_1}{g}} - \frac{x_1}{g}\sin(10\pi x_1)\right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(11)

where

$$g = 1 + 9 \sum_{i=2}^{N} x_i$$
s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \mathbf{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

See Zitzler et al. [7].

1.12 ZDT6

$$\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - e^{-4x_1} \sin^6 6\pi x_1 \\ g \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - e^{-4x_1} \sin^6 6\pi x_1}{g} \right)^2 \right) \end{pmatrix}$$
(12)

where

$$g = 1 + 9 \left(\sum_{i=2}^{N} x_i\right)^{0.25}$$
s.t. $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \le \mathbf{x} \le \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$.

See Zitzler et al. [7].

2 Results



2.1 Poloni function

Figure 1: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Poloni test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (20|30).





Figure 2: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Kursawe test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (-15|5).



2.3 Viennet function 1

Figure 3: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Viennet test function 1 for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (10|17.5|0.2).



2.4 Viennet function 2

Figure 4: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Viennet test function 2 for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (10|10|10).



2.5 Schaffer function 1

Figure 5: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Schaffer test function 1 for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (5|5).



2.6 Schaffer function 2

Figure 6: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Schaffer test function 2 for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (2|20).



2.7 Fonseca-Fleming function

Figure 7: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the Fonseca-Fleming test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (1|1).



2.8 Four bar truss

Figure 8: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the four bar truss test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (3000|0.05).



2.9 ZDT1

Figure 9: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the ZDT1 test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (2|2).



2.10 ZDT2

Figure 10: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the ZDT2 test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (2|2).



2.11 ZDT3

Figure 11: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the ZDT3 test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (2|2).



2.12 ZDT6

Figure 12: Evolution of a) the hypervolume metric and b) the yield ratio over the number of objective function evaluations on the ZDT6 test function for different parameter sets. The reference point for the hypervolume metric is set to (2|2).

References

- C. Poloni, A. Giurgevich, L. Onesti, V. Pediroda, Hybridization of a multiobjective genetic algorithm, a neural network and a classical optimizer for a complex design problem in fluid dynamics, Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering 186 (2-4) (2000) 403–420. doi:10.1016/S0045-7825(99)00394-1.
- [2] F. Kursawe, A variant of evolution strategies for vector optimization, in: International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature, Springer, 1990, pp. 193–197. doi:10.1007/BFb0029752.
- [3] R. Viennet, C. Fonteix, I. Marc, Multicriteria optimization using a genetic algorithm for determining a pareto set, International Journal of Systems Science 27 (2) (1996) 255–260. doi:10.1080/00207729608929211.
- [4] J. D. Schaffer, Some experiments in machine learning using vector evaluated genetic algorithms, Ph.D. thesis, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA (1984).
- [5] C. M. Fonseca, P. J. Fleming, An overview of evolutionary algorithms in multiobjective optimization, Evolutionary Computation 3 (1) (1995) 1–16. doi:10.1162/evco.1995.3.1.1.
- [6] F. Y. Cheng, X. S. Li, Generalized center method for multiobjective engineering optimization, Engineering Optimization 31 (5) (1999) 641–661. doi:10.1080/03052159908941390.
- [7] E. Zitzler, K. Deb, L. Thiele, Comparison of multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: Empirical results, Evol. Comput. 8 (2) (2000) 173–195. doi:10.1162/106365600568202.