

Decomposition Based Evolutionary Algorithm with a Dual Set of Reference Vectors: Supplementary Material

Kalyan Shankar Bhattacharjee*, Hemant Kumar Singh*, Tapabrata Ray* and Qingfu Zhang†

*School of Engineering and Information Technology, The University of New South Wales, Australia.

Email: k.bhattacharjee@student.adfa.edu.au, {h.singh,t.ray}@adfa.edu.au

†Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong. Email: qingfu.zhang@cityu.edu.hk

1) *Regular Problems*: Next we demonstrate the performance of DBEA-DS on 13 unconstrained benchmark problems from DTLZ [1] and WFG [2]: DTLZ1-DTLZ4 and WFG1-WFG9. The performances delivered by the proposed approach is compared in terms of HV in Table I and IGD in Table II with several recent and popular algorithms. The performances delivered by the other algorithms are obtained from [3].

Based on mean HV statistics listed in Table I, DBEA-DS performs at par with the best performing algorithm in 3 objective and 5 objective instances of DTLZ1, DTLZ2, DTLZ4, WFG2 and WFG4-WFG9 problems i.e. 10 out of 13 problems. The proposed approach delivers at par performance with the best performing algorithm in the context of 8 objective instances of WFG4-WFG9 i.e. 6 out of 13 problems. In the context of 8 objectives instances of DTLZ1 and DTLZ3, DBEA-DS performs significantly worse. It is important to note that, performance of different algorithms based on HV varies significantly based on different reference points as seen in [3]. Therefore, it is very difficult to judge the performance of an algorithm based on HV alone. Hence, IGD values are also presented below for these problems.

For IGD computation of these problems, reference sets have

been obtained from the authors of [3] and results of the listed algorithms are also from the same source [3]. Based on the mean IGD statistics, DBEA-DS performs best in 3 objective instances of DTLZ1-DTLZ4, and 8 objective instances of WFG4-WFG8 problems. In the context of 5 and 8 objective instances of DTLZ1, DTLZ3 and WFG1, DBEA-DS performs significantly worse in terms of mean IGD values. However, the proposed approach delivers at par performance with the best performing algorithm in terms of mean IGD values in the context of other instances of other problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Deb, L. Thiele, M. Laumanns, and E. Zitzler, "Scalable test problems for evolutionary multiobjective optimization," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Evolutionary Multiobjective Optimization*, 2005, pp. 105–145.
- [2] S. Huband, L. Barone, L. While, and P. Hingston, "A scalable multi-objective test problem toolkit," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Evolutionary Multi-criterion Optimization*. Springer, 2005, pp. 280–295.
- [3] H. Ishibuchi, S. Yu, M. Hiroyuki, and N. Yusuke, "Performance of decomposition-based many-objective algorithms strongly depends on Pareto front shapes," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 2016.

