



UniTs - University of Trieste

---

Faculty of Scientific and Data Intensive Computing  
Department of mathematics informatics and geosciences

# Global and Multi- Objective Optimisation

*Lecturers:*  
**Prof. Luca Manzoni**

*Author:*  
**Andrea Spinelli**

July 7, 2025

This document is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike \(CC BY-NC-SA\)](#) license. You may share and adapt this material, provided you give appropriate credit, do not use it for commercial purposes, and distribute your contributions under the same license.

# Preface

Frank

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Problem formulation . . . . .	1
1.1.1	A simple illustrative example: OneMax . . . . .	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Genetic Algorithms</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Introduction . . . . .	3
2.2	Core Components . . . . .	4
2.2.1	Selection Methods and Genetic Operators . . . . .	4
2.2.2	Common Variants . . . . .	6
2.3	Representation . . . . .	6
2.3.1	Real-Valued GA . . . . .	6
2.3.2	Permutation-Based GA . . . . .	7
2.3.3	Graph Representation . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Evolution Strategies</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	10
3.2	Parameters and Notation . . . . .	10
3.3	Mutation in Evolution Strategies . . . . .	12
3.4	Evolution Strategies with Recombination . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Genetic Programming</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	15
4.2	Program Representation . . . . .	15
4.2.1	Tree-Based Representation . . . . .	16
4.3	Initialisation, Crossover and Mutation . . . . .	17
4.3.1	Population Initialisation . . . . .	17
4.3.2	Crossover . . . . .	18
4.3.3	Mutation . . . . .	19
4.3.4	The Genetic Operators in Action . . . . .	20
4.4	Code Re-use: Automatically Defined Functions (ADF) . . . . .	20
4.5	Bloat and Parsimony Pressure . . . . .	21
4.6	Alternative Program Representations . . . . .	22
4.6.1	Linear Genetic Programming (LGP) . . . . .	22
4.6.2	Cartesian Genetic Programming (CGP) . . . . .	23
4.6.3	Grammatical Evolution (GE) . . . . .	24
<b>5</b>	<b>Other Bio-Inspired Metaheuristics</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1	Differential Evolution (DE) . . . . .	27
5.1.1	The DE/rand/1 Algorithm . . . . .	27
5.1.2	DE Variants and Taxonomy . . . . .	29
5.2	Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) . . . . .	30

5.2.1	Introduction . . . . .	30
5.2.2	The PSO Algorithm . . . . .	30
5.3	Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) . . . . .	32
5.3.1	The ACO Algorithm for the TSP . . . . .	32
<b>6</b>	<b>Geometric Semantic GP</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1	Geometric Operators on Metric Spaces . . . . .	34
6.1.1	Geometric Crossover and Mutation . . . . .	35
6.1.2	Are Standard GP Operators Geometric? . . . . .	35
6.2	Geometric Semantic Operators . . . . .	36
6.2.1	Geometric Semantic Crossover (GSC) . . . . .	36
6.2.2	Geometric Semantic Mutation (GSM) . . . . .	37
6.3	Challenges and Advancements in GSGP . . . . .	37
<b>7</b>	<b>Estimation of Distribution Algorithms</b>	<b>38</b>
7.1	From Implicit to Explicit Models . . . . .	38
7.1.1	Model Fitting via Classification . . . . .	38
7.2	Probabilistic Model-Based EDAs . . . . .	40
7.2.1	Representing the Distribution of Promising Solutions . . . . .	40
7.2.2	Univariate EDAs . . . . .	41
7.2.3	Issues of Univariate EDAs and Beyond . . . . .	43


# 1

# Introduction

## 1.1 Problem formulation

Given a set  $S$  of candidate solutions to an optimization problem, we seek a mapping  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which assigns to each solution  $x \in S$  a fitness value  $f(x)$ . Our goal is to find:

$$\arg \max_{x \in S} f(x) \quad \text{or} \quad \arg \min_{x \in S} f(x).$$



In many practical settings it is not possible to solve this problem analytically: the search space  $S$  may be exponentially large, the function  $f$  may be a ‘‘black-box’’ (we have few assumptions on its smoothness or structure), and an exhaustive enumeration of all solutions can be infeasible. In such cases, we aim instead for heuristics that return solutions of acceptable quality in reasonable time.

### 1.1.1 A simple illustrative example: OneMax

As a motivating example, let  $S = \{0, 1\}^n$  and define:

$$f(x) = \text{the number of ones in } x.$$

Clearly the global maximiser is the string  $1^n$ , with fitness  $n$ . Even this trivial problem becomes intractable for large  $n$  if approached by brute-force enumeration.

#### Random search

A simplest stochastic approach is random search: pick an initial  $b \in S$ , then repeatedly sample:

$$x \sim \text{Uniform}(S),$$


and if  $f(x) \geq f(b)$  replace  $b$  by  $x$ . Terminate when a budget of evaluations is exhausted. In the worst case this explores a constant fraction of  $S$ , which is equivalent to an exhaustive search in some enumeration order, and so scales poorly in practice.

**Tip: Random search**

Even if repeated samples are avoided, random search still requires sampling a significant fraction of the space, so it is generally unfeasible for high-dimensional or combinatorial domains.

## Hill climbing

Hill climbing maintains a single incumbent solution  $b$ . At each iteration we choose a neighbour  $x$  of  $b$  (according to some neighbourhood structure) and replace  $b$  with  $x$  if  $f(x) \geq f(b)$ . The process stops when no improving neighbour can be found or a fixed evaluation budget is reached.



**Figure 1.1:** With a poor neighbourhood (left), hill climbing can get trapped in a local optimum. A richer neighbourhood (right) may eliminate local traps.

The effectiveness of hill climbing depends critically on the choice of neighbourhood. For **OneMax**, using the Hamming-1 neighbourhood (flip one bit at a time) guarantees reachability of the global optimum but may still require many steps; using only  $\pm 1$  on the integer-interpreted string can make the problem insoluble.

## Simulated annealing

Simulated annealing augments hill climbing with occasional downhill moves to escape local optima. Starting from  $b \in S$  and a “temperature”  $T$ , at each step we pick a neighbour  $x$ . If  $f(x) \geq f(b)$  we accept it, otherwise we accept it with probability

$$\exp((f(x) - f(b))/T).$$

We then decrease  $T$  according to a cooling schedule. Proper tuning of the schedule trades off exploration against exploitation.

**Tip: Simulated annealing**

Allowing uphill moves with probability depending on the temperature and fitness gap helps avoid entrapment in local maxima. The cooling schedule is crucial for performance.

## Multiple restarts and population-based search

Both hill climbing and simulated annealing can be repeated from fresh random starts to reduce the chance of permanent stagnation. A more powerful paradigm uses a whole population of candidate solutions that “interact” (e.g. by recombination), leading naturally to evolutionary algorithms.

# 2

# Genetic Algorithms

## 2.1 Introduction


Genetic Algorithms (GAs) are a class of stochastic optimization methods inspired by the principles of natural selection and genetics, first formalized by John Holland in the 1970s [1]. At their core, GAs maintain a population of candidate solutions, called *individuals*, which are evolved over multiple generations to approximate an optimal or sufficiently good solution to a problem.

Each individual in the population is typically represented as a fixed-length string (often a binary vector) termed the *genotype*. This genotype encodes a possible solution, whose *phenotype* is the actual candidate in the problem space, obtained by decoding the genotype. The quality of each individual is measured by a *fitness function*  $f$ , which assigns a scalar value indicating how well the individual solves the problem at hand.

The standard evolutionary cycle in a GA consists of the following steps:

- Selection:** Individuals are chosen probabilistically from the population based on their fitness. Fitter individuals have a higher probability of being selected as parents, implementing a form of artificial natural selection that drives evolution toward better solutions.
- Crossover:** Pairs of selected parents exchange genetic material to produce offspring, recombining their genotypes in various ways. This operator enables the algorithm to combine beneficial traits from different solutions and explore the search space effectively.
- Mutation:** Random, typically small, modifications are introduced into the offspring's genotypes to preserve genetic diversity and explore new regions of the search space. This operator helps prevent premature convergence and allows the discovery of novel solutions.
- Replacement:** The new generation replaces the old one, possibly retaining a fraction of the best solutions (elitism). This ensures the population maintains its best-found solutions while allowing for continuous improvement through evolution.

This process iterates for a predefined number of generations or until a stopping criterion is met. A summary of the cycle is illustrated in Figure 2.1.



**Figure 2.1:** Left: Diagram showing the main components and their interactions in the evolutionary process. Right: Example of genetic operators (selection, crossover, mutation) acting on binary strings.

## 2.2 Core Components

### Representation

The **genotype** is the encoded representation of a solution (commonly a binary string or vector over a finite alphabet) on which the genetic operators (crossover and mutation) act. The **phenotype** is the decoded, actual candidate solution evaluated by the fitness function. Selection operates at the phenotypic level, favoring those solutions that yield higher fitness.

#### Observation: Genotype vs. Phenotype

The distinction between the two allow GAs to operate flexibly: operators modify representations (genotypes) while selection is based on problem-specific performance (phenotypes).

### Key Parameters

The performance and behavior of a genetic algorithm depend on several critical parameters:

- **Population size  $N$ :** Number of individuals maintained at each generation (typically 100-200). Larger populations increase diversity and exploration but require more computational resources.
- **Number of generations  $G$ :** How many iterations the algorithm will perform (often determined empirically). This affects the total computational budget and exploration time.
- **Selection method:** The algorithm used to select parents (tournament, roulette wheel, ...). Different methods vary the selection pressures that affect diversity and convergence speed.
- **Crossover operator:** The method for recombining genotypes. Should be chosen based on problem representation and known/assumed relationships between genes.
- **Crossover probability  $p_{\text{cross}}$ :** Probability with which crossover is applied. Higher values (typically 0.6-0.9) promote more exploration through recombination.
- **Mutation operator:** The method for introducing random changes. Must be appropriate for the chosen representation while maintaining solution feasibility.
- **Mutation probability  $p_{\text{mut}}$ :** Probability of mutating each gene. Usually set to  $1/n$  for length- $n$  genotypes to maintain a balance between exploration and stability.
- **Elitism  $e$ :** Number or percentage of best individuals preserved into the next generation. Small values (1-5%) help maintain good solutions while allowing population turnover.

### 2.2.1 Selection Methods and Genetic Operators

#### Selection

Several strategies exist for parent selection, each with different characteristics in terms of selection pressure and diversity preservation:

- **Roulette Wheel Selection:**

Each individual's probability of being selected is proportional to its fitness  $f(x)$ :

$$P_{x,P} = \frac{f(x)}{\sum_{y \in P} f(y)}$$

This method is simple to implement, but can reduce diversity if a single individual dominates.

- **Ranked Selection:**

Individuals are ranked by fitness. Selection probabilities depend only on rank, not raw fitness, which helps control selection pressure and maintain diversity.

- **Tournament Selection:**

$t$  individuals are sampled (with replacement) from the population, and the fittest among them is selected. The tournament size  $t$  directly tunes *selection pressure*: higher  $t$  increases the probability that the best individuals are chosen.

 **Tip: Selection Pressure**

Tournament selection is widely used due to its simplicity and ease of adjusting selection pressure by changing the tournament size.

## Crossover

Crossover operators create new individuals by combining genetic material from two parents:

- **One-Point Crossover:**

A single crossover point  $k$  is randomly chosen between genes. The offspring inherit genes from parent A up to position  $k$ , and from parent B beyond  $k$ . This preserves contiguous gene sequences that may represent important building blocks:

Parent A: [1 1 1 | 1 1 1]

Parent B: [0 0 0 | 0 0 0]

Offspring: [1 1 1 | 0 0 0]

- **Multi-Point Crossover:**

Multiple crossover points are chosen, and genetic material is alternately swapped between parents. This allows more flexible recombination while still preserving some gene linkage:

Parent A: [1 1 | 1 1 | 1 1]

Parent B: [0 0 | 0 0 | 0 0]

Offspring: [1 1 | 0 0 | 1 1]

- **Uniform Crossover:**

For each gene position, the gene is swapped between parents with a fixed probability (commonly 1/2). This provides maximum mixing potential and is especially useful when there is little/no linkage between adjacent genes:

Parent A: [1 1 1 1 1 1]

Parent B: [0 0 0 0 0 0]

Offspring: [1 0 1 0 0 1]

The choice of crossover operator and its probability  $p_{\text{cross}}$  influences the balance between *exploration* and *exploitation* in the search process.

 **Tip: Crossover Design**

Select the crossover operator based on the structure of the problem representation. For representations where tightly coupled genes are adjacent, one-point crossover is often effective. For others, uniform crossover can better promote exploration.

## Mutation

Mutation introduces random changes to individuals, preserving genetic diversity and enabling the exploration of new areas in the search space. The most common operator for binary representations is the *bit-flip mutation*: for each gene, flip its value with probability  $p_{\text{mut}}$  (typically  $1/n$  for length- $n$  genotypes, so that on average one bit per individual mutates per generation).

## 2.2.2 Common Variants

Several variations of the basic GA have been developed:

- **Elitism**

Strategies that preserve the best individual(s) unchanged into the next generation, guaranteeing solution quality does not degrade. Variants include retaining the single best solution, top  $k$  solutions, or best  $p\%$ .

- **Steady-State GA**

Instead of replacing the entire population each generation, only a subset of individuals is replaced. The choice of which individuals to replace impacts algorithm dynamics.

- **Hybrid (Memetic) Algorithms**

These incorporate local search techniques to further improve individuals after genetic operations. Also called *Lamarckian algorithms* or *Baldwin effect algorithms*, they require tuning of local search frequency and intensity.

## 2.3 Representation

While we have focused on binary representations so far, genetic algorithms can be generalized to work with symbols from any finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  instead of just binary values. When using a larger alphabet, mutation needs to be adapted - rather than simply flipping bits, it selects uniformly between the  $|\Sigma| - 1$  alternative symbols. For ordered alphabets like  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , mutation can also be implemented to increment or decrement values, maintaining the ordering relationship.

### 2.3.1 Real-Valued GA


Traditional binary GAs can encode floating-point numbers using 32 or 64 binary genes, where different bit positions have varying impacts on the final value. However, real-valued GAs take a more direct approach by using floating-point genes directly and adapting the genetic operators accordingly.

#### Crossover

Real-valued GAs employ two main specialized crossover operators:


- **Intermediate recombination:** Creates offspring by taking weighted averages of the parents' genes. Given parents  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ :

$$y_i = \alpha_i p_i + (1 - \alpha_i) q_i, \quad \alpha_i \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$$



- **Line recombination:** Extends intermediate recombination by allowing exploration beyond parents:

$$y_i = \alpha_i p_i + (1 - \alpha_i) q_i, \quad \alpha_i \sim \text{Uniform}(-k, 1 + k)$$



#### Mutation

For real-valued representations, mutation operates by adding small perturbations to each coordinate.

$$p \leftarrow p + \epsilon$$

These perturbations  $\epsilon$  can be drawn from either a *uniform distribution* within specified bounds or a *Gaussian distribution* centered at the current value. The choice between these distributions affects how mutation explores the search space.


### 2.3.2 Permutation-Based GA

Many optimization problems involve finding optimal permutations of elements  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . These problems require specialized genetic operators that preserve the permutation constraints. While mutation typically operates by simply swapping two positions, crossover requires more sophisticated approaches.

#### Partially Mapped Crossover (PMX)

PMX is a sophisticated crossover operator that preserves permutation validity through a four-step process. It ensures that offspring maintain valid permutations by carefully handling element mappings and conflict resolution:

1. Two random crossover points are selected in both parent permutations, defining a matching segment
2. A mapping is constructed between corresponding elements in the segments, recording which values swap positions
3. The segments are directly exchanged between parents to create initial offspring
4. Remaining positions outside the segments are filled by:
  - Copying values from the original parent if no conflicts exist
  - For conflicts, following the mapping chain until finding a non-conflicting value




**Figure 2.2:** Partially Mapped Crossover [3].

This process guarantees that each element appears exactly once in the final offspring, maintaining permutation validity while allowing meaningful genetic exchange between parents.

#### Cycle Crossover

Cycle crossover provides an alternative approach that preserves absolute positions from the parents. It operates by identifying and preserving cycles in the permutations: starting at a position  $i$ , it copies the value from the first parent, then finds that same value in the second parent, continuing until a cycle is completed. The remaining values are then copied from the second parent.



**Figure 2.3:** Cycle Crossover. [3]

### 2.3.3 Graph Representation

Graphs are ubiquitous structures in computer science, appearing in applications ranging from social networks and transportation systems to neural networks and circuit design. When applying genetic algorithms to graph-based problems, the graph representation must be carefully chosen. Graphs can be encoded in two fundamental ways:

- **Direct encoding:** The graph structure is explicitly represented through its vertices and edges, providing straightforward access to the graph's components but potentially requiring significant memory for large graphs
- **Indirect encoding:** Instead of representing the graph directly, this approach encodes a constructive process or set of rules that, when executed, builds the desired graph structure. This can be more compact and enable the emergence of patterns, though interpretation requires additional computation

#### Direct Encoding

Direct encoding methods explicitly represent the graph structure, offering intuitive but potentially memory-intensive representations:

- **Adjacency Matrix**

A matrix  $A$  where entry  $a_{ij}$  represents the edge between vertices  $i$  and  $j$ . For weighted graphs, entries can be numerical values indicating edge weights, while for unweighted graphs, binary values (0/1) indicate edge presence:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & \text{no edge} & 0.6 & -5.3 \\ \text{no edge} & 5.6 & 0.1 & 0.2 \\ 2.4 & 0.8 & 4.1 & 8.3 \\ -0.2 & \text{no edge} & 0.5 & \text{no edge} \end{bmatrix}$$

Where "no edge" denotes absence of connection. This representation allows for efficient edge lookup ( $O(1)$ ) but requires  $O(|V|^2)$  space complexity.

- **Edge List**

A more compact representation that explicitly maintains sets of vertices  $V$  and edges  $E$ . Particularly efficient for sparse graphs where  $|E| \ll |V|^2$ .

For example, given vertices:

$$V = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$$

we might have edges

$$E = \{(a, b), (a, c), (d, a), (e, e)\}$$

For edge list representations, several specialized **mutation** operators are employed, each with carefully tuned probabilities to maintain graph validity:

- Add a new edge between existing vertices (preserving graph constraints like maximum degree)
- Remove an existing edge (maintaining connectivity if required)
- Add a new vertex (with appropriate edge connections)
- Remove a vertex and all its associated edges (ensuring graph remains valid)

#### Tip: Graph Crossover

Graph representations pose **significant challenges for crossover operations** due to the difficulty in preserving graph properties and structure. In practice, it is often more effective to rely solely on mutation rather than attempting to implement complex crossover schemes.

## Indirect Encoding

Indirect encoding takes a different approach by using **production rules** that generate graphs through an iterative expansion process. Rather than directly representing the graph structure, these rules define how to construct the graph step by step. Starting with a set of *non-terminal symbols*, the rules map each symbol to *sequences* or *matrices* that may contain both terminal and non-terminal symbols. This process continues recursively, until only terminal symbols remain.

### Example: Hiroaki Kitano's graph generation system

For example, Kitano's graph generation system uses production rules of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}, \\ A &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} c & d \\ a & c \end{bmatrix}, \quad B \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & e \end{bmatrix}, \quad C \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{bmatrix}, \quad D \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & b \end{bmatrix} \\ a &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad c \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad d \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad e \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Starting from the axiom  $S$ , we can iterate through the production rules:

$$S \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c & d \\ a & c \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & e \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & a \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ a & b \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \dots$$

This process continues until we reach a final  $8 \times 8$  binary matrix representing the adjacency matrix of a graph with 5 vertices (where some vertices may be isolated, meaning they have no connections to other vertices):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Production rules in indirect encoding systems can typically be represented as fixed-length vectors or strings, making them amenable to traditional genetic algorithm operators. For example, in Kitano's system, the first element represents the head (non-terminal symbol) and the remaining elements represent the body (the matrix elements). For instance, the rule  $s \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$  can be encoded as the vector  $[S, A, B, C, D]$ .

# 3

# Evolution Strategies

## 3.1 Introduction

**Evolution Strategies (ES)** are a family of optimization algorithms developed in Germany during the 1960s. Initially conceived for experimental optimization of hydrodynamic shapes, ES has since evolved into a robust methodology for numerical optimization, particularly in continuous domains. While sharing common roots with Genetic Algorithms (GAs) in the broader field of evolutionary computation, ES possesses distinct characteristics.

### Observation: ES and GAs: Similarities and Key Differences

#### Similarities:

- They maintain a **population** of candidate solutions.
- Offspring are generated primarily through **mutation**, which introduces variation.
- A **selection process** determines which individuals survive and/or reproduce, driving the population towards better solutions.

#### Key Differences:

- **No Crossover:** While modern ES can incorporate recombination, it was not a primary operator in early ES and is often considered secondary to mutation. GAs, conversely, typically emphasize crossover.
- **Selection Mechanism:** ES commonly employs deterministic **truncation selection**, where only the top-ranked individuals survive or become parents. GAs often use probabilistic selection methods like roulette wheel or tournament selection.
- **Representation:** ES is predominantly designed for and applied to problems with **real-valued (floating-point) individuals**, whereas GAs were initially developed with binary strings and have been adapted for other representations.
- **Self-Adaptation:** A hallmark of advanced ES is the self-adaptation of strategy parameters (e.g., mutation strengths and directions), which are encoded within the individuals and evolve alongside the solutions themselves.

## 3.2 Parameters and Notation

Two key parameters define the size of the parent and offspring populations in ES:

- $\mu$ : The number of **parent individuals** selected in each generation to create offspring.
- $\lambda$ : The number of **offspring individuals** generated in each generation.

It is generally required that  $\lambda \geq \mu$ .


Based on how parents and offspring are managed and selected, two main ES schemes are distinguished: the  $(\mu, \lambda) - ES$  and the  $(\mu + \lambda) - ES$ .

## The $(\mu, \lambda) - ES$ Scheme

In the  $(\mu, \lambda) - ES$  (read “mu comma lambda ES”), the algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Generate an initial population of  $\lambda$  offspring
2. Evaluate the fitness of all individuals in the current population.
3. Select the  $\mu$  best-performing individuals from these  $\lambda$  offspring only (truncated selection) to become the parents of the next generation.
4. Generate  $\lambda$  new offspring by applying mutation (and/or recombination) to the  $\mu$  parents.
5. Discard the previous generation’s parents entirely (no parent survives to the next generation).
6. Return to step 2 and repeat until a termination criterion is met.

This scheme is inherently **non-elitist** because parents never survive into the next generation. As a result, the  $(\mu, \lambda) - ES$  can more easily escape local optima, but it also risks losing the best-so-far solution if it is not re-discovered by an offspring.




**Figure 3.1:** The lifecycle of a  $(\mu, \lambda) - ES$

## The $(\mu + \lambda) - ES$ Scheme

In the  $(\mu + \lambda) - ES$  (read “mu plus lambda ES”), the algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Generate an initial population of  $\lambda$  offspring.
2. Evaluate the fitness of all individuals in the current population.
3. Select the  $\mu$  highest-fitness individuals to serve as the parents of the next generation.
4. Generate  $\lambda$  new offspring by applying mutation and/or recombination to the  $\mu$  parents.
5. Form the next population by combining parents and offspring, resulting in  $\mu + \lambda$  individuals.
6. Return to step 2 and repeat until a termination criterion is met.

This scheme is **elitist** because it always retains the top  $\mu$  solutions from one generation to the next. Elitism tends to accelerate convergence toward high-quality solutions but can also lead to premature convergence if population diversity is lost too quickly.




**Figure 3.2:** The lifecycle of a  $(\mu + \lambda) - ES$ .

### ③ Example: Illustrative (1,3)-ES

Consider a simple (1,3)-ES, a specific type of  $(\mu, \lambda)$ -ES where  $\mu = 1$  and  $\lambda = 3$ .

1. Start with one parent individual.
2. This single parent generates three offspring (e.g., by applying mutation three independent times).
3. The fitness of these three offspring is evaluated.
4. The single best offspring out of the three becomes the sole parent for the next generation. The original parent and the other two offspring are discarded.



This process continues over several generations, with each generation showing a parent producing multiple offspring, some being discarded, and one being selected to continue. Generally, this leads to an increase in fitness over time as the population evolves toward better solutions.

## 3.3 Mutation in Evolution Strategies

Mutation serves as the fundamental mechanism for generating diversity and enabling exploration in Evolution Strategies. While recombination can introduce additional variation, mutation remains the primary driver of evolutionary change, particularly in simpler ES variants that rely solely on mutation for population diversity. The effectiveness of an ES algorithm heavily depends on the design and implementation of its mutation operators.

### Properties of a Good Mutation Operator

A well-designed mutation operator should ideally exhibit the following properties:

- **Reachability:**

Any point in the search space should be reachable from any other point in a finite number of mutation steps. This ensures the algorithm is not, in principle, confined to a subspace.

- **Unbiasedness:**

The mutation operator itself should not introduce any bias towards particular regions of the search space based on fitness values. The guidance towards promising regions is the role of selection.

- **Scalability (Adaptability):**


The "strength" or step size of the mutation should be adaptable to the characteristics of the fitness landscape. For instance, larger steps might be beneficial early in the search (exploration), while smaller steps are preferred later for fine-tuning (exploitation).

## Mutation for Different Representations

- **Binary Values:** For individuals represented as binary strings, mutation typically involves ***bit-flips***, similar to GAs, where each bit has a probability of being inverted.
- **Real Values:** For individuals represented as vectors of real numbers  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , mutation is commonly performed by adding random noise, often from a Gaussian distribution:

$$x'_i = x_i + N(0, \sigma_i^2)$$

Here,  $x_i$  is the  $i$ -th component of the individual,  $N(0, \sigma_i^2)$  is a random number drawn from a Gaussian (normal) distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation  $\sigma_i$  (or variance  $\sigma_i^2$ ). The  $\sigma_i$  values are called ***mutation strengths*** or ***step sizes*** and are critical parameters. A key question is how to determine appropriate values for these  $\sigma_i$ 's.



**Figure 3.3:** Gaussian mutation adds a random value drawn from a normal distribution to  $x_i$ .

Setting  $\mu = 0$  for the Gaussian noise seems natural as it ensures mutation is unbiased in direction. However, selecting the variance is crucial and often addressed through self-adaptation.

## Self-Adaptation of Mutation Parameters

A powerful feature of many ES variants is ***self-adaptation***, where the strategy parameters (like mutation step sizes  $\sigma_i$ ) are not fixed but are themselves part of the individual's genotype and evolve alongside the solution variables.

- An individual can be represented as a pair  $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{s} \rangle$ , where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the vector of solution variables and  $\mathbf{s}$  is a vector of strategy parameters (e.g.,  $\sigma_i$  values for each  $x_i$ ).
- When an individual is mutated, its strategy parameters  $\mathbf{s}$  are typically mutated first.
- Then, these mutated strategy parameters  $\mathbf{s}'$  are used to mutate the solution variables  $\mathbf{x}$  to get  $\mathbf{x}'$ .
- Selection acts on the fitness of  $\mathbf{x}'$ , indirectly selecting for effective strategy parameters as well.

This enables the ES to adapt its mutation strategy to the fitness landscape's local characteristics.

## The One-Fifth (1/5) Success Rule

The ***1/5 success rule***, introduced by Ingo Rechenberg in the 1970s, is an early and influential heuristic for adapting a single, global mutation step size  $\sigma$  in a simple ES. The rule aims to maintain a certain rate of successful mutations (those that lead to fitter offspring).

Let  $p_s$  be the success rate (mutations producing offspring with fitness  $\geq$  parent) over a fixed period. The rule states:

- If  $p_s > 1/5$ : The success rate is too high, thus the step size  $\sigma$  might be too small. Increase  $\sigma$ .
- If  $p_s < 1/5$ : The success rate is too low, thus the step size  $\sigma$  might be too large. Decrease  $\sigma$ .
- If  $p_s = 1/5$ : The step size is considered optimal; leave  $\sigma$  unchanged.

Operationally, this is often implemented by using two parameters:  $k$  and  $c$ .  $k$  is the number of generations between updates of  $\sigma$  and  $c$  is a constant, typically  $0.817 < c < 1$  (e.g.,  $c \approx 0.85$ ).

- If  $p_s > 1/5$ , then set  $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma / c$ . (Since  $c < 1$ ,  $1/c > 1$ , so  $\sigma$  increases).
- If  $p_s < 1/5$ , then set  $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma \cdot c$ . ( $\sigma$  decreases).
- Otherwise (if  $p_s \approx 1/5$ ),  $\sigma$  remains unchanged.

#### 💡 Tip: Rationale of the 1/5 Success Rule

The 1/5 success rule provides a simple mechanism for controlling the balance between exploration and exploitation. A high success rate ( $> 1/5$ ) implies that the algorithm is making progress easily, possibly with steps that are too small; increasing the step size encourages broader exploration. A low success rate ( $< 1/5$ ) suggests that many mutations are detrimental, possibly because the step size is too large; decreasing it allows for finer exploitation of the current region. The value 1/5 was derived empirically and theoretically for specific model problems (e.g., the sphere model and corridor model).

## 3.4 Evolution Strategies with Recombination

In ES, while mutation serves as the main search mechanism, **recombination** (crossover) can be added as a complementary operator, proving particularly valuable in advanced ES implementations. This process typically combines  $\rho$  parent solutions to generate offspring. The extended notation is:

- $(\mu/\rho, \lambda) - ES$ :  $\mu$  parents are chosen, and from these, groups of  $\rho$  parents are used for recombination to produce  $\lambda$  offspring. The next generation is selected from these  $\lambda$  offspring.
- $(\mu/\rho + \lambda) - ES$ : It follows the same parent selection and recombination process, but the next generation is selected from both the  $\mu$  current parents and the  $\lambda$  offspring combined.

For real-valued representations, two main recombination types are used:

- **Discrete Recombination**: Each component  $j$  of offspring  $\mathbf{x}'$  inherits its value from a randomly selected parent:

$$x'_j = x_{p_j, j}, \quad p_j \in \{1, \dots, \rho\}$$

Strategy parameters  $\mathbf{s}$  can be recombined similarly.

- **Intermediate Recombination**: Each component  $j$  is the average of corresponding parent values:

$$x'_j = \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} x_{i,j}$$

Common choices are  $\rho = 2$  (midpoint) or  $\rho = \mu$  (all parents contribute).

#### 💡 Example: Recombination in Practice

Suppose we use  $\rho = 2$  parents for recombination.

- **Discrete Recombination**: For an offspring  $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$  from parents  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ : For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $x'_j$  is randomly chosen to be either  $p_{1,j}$  or  $p_{2,j}$ .
- **Intermediate Recombination**: For an offspring  $\mathbf{x}'$  from parents  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ : For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $x'_j = (p_{1,j} + p_{2,j})/2$ .

Recombination can be either **global** (using one set of  $\rho$  parents for all components of an offspring) or **local/component-wise** (using different parent sets for each component), with global recombination being more common in practice.

# 4


# Genetic Programming

## 4.1 Introduction

**Genetic Programming (GP)** is a specialized domain within evolutionary computation where the individuals of the population are not fixed-length strings representing parameters, but executable computer programs. Popularized by John Koza in the late 1980s, GP aims to stochastically evolve populations of programs to find one that performs a user-defined task satisfactorily.

While the high-level evolutionary cycle of GP is analogous to that of a Genetic Algorithm (involving initialization, fitness evaluation, selection, and variation through crossover and mutation) the core of GP's uniqueness lies in its representation. Instead of evolving solutions *to* a problem, GP *evolves the problem-solving logic itself*.

This shift in representation from data structures to programs opens up a vast application space, from symbolic regression and controller design to automatic programming and machine learning model discovery.



**Figure 4.1:** The general evolutionary cycle in Genetic Programming, which closely mirrors the cycle of a standard GA but operates on programs instead of fixed-length genotypes.

The fundamental challenge of GP's power, is finding a program representation that can be effectively manipulated by genetic operators to create syntactically valid and semantically useful offspring.


## 4.2 Program Representation

Representing programs as linear strings, similar to GAs, is problematic. Applying standard crossover to raw source code strings often results in syntactically invalid offspring, as the operator has no awareness of the underlying program structure. This is because the crossover point is likely to break syntax, resulting in non-compilable or nonsensical offspring. To overcome this problem, GP typically represents programs as *syntax trees* (or expression trees).

### 4.2.1 Tree-Based Representation

In the tree-based representation, each program is structured as a rooted tree: **internal nodes** correspond to functions or operators, while the **leaf nodes** are terminals, which can be variables or constants. This tree-based structure offers several key advantages for genetic programming:

- **Modularity:** Any subtree forms a valid, self-contained sub-program or expression, enabling flexible manipulation and reuse of code fragments.
- **Closure and Validity:** Genetic operators can operate on entire subtrees, ensuring that offspring remain syntactically valid and executable.
- **Interpretability:** The hierarchical structure mirrors the way mathematical and logical expressions are naturally composed, making evolved programs easier to visualize and understand.
- **Fitness Evaluation:** The output of a program can be computed by recursively evaluating the tree from the leaves up to the root, allowing for efficient and systematic fitness assessment.



**Figure 4.2:** The expression  $5 + (7 \times 2)$  as a syntax tree. Internal nodes represent functions or operators (`+`, `*`), while leaf nodes are terminals (5, 7, 2).

### Terminals and Functions

A Genetic Programming (GP) system is built from two fundamental sets of building blocks, which together define the "language" in which solutions can be expressed:

- **Terminal Set ( $\mathcal{T}$ ):** contains all possible leaf nodes of the tree, elements that do not take any arguments. Terminals are the basic inputs and constants that the evolved programs can use. Typical examples include:
  - **Input Variables:** represent the problem-specific inputs, such as  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ .
  - **Constants:** fixed values such as numbers, or logical values (`true`, `false`).
- **Function Set ( $\mathcal{F}$ ):** This set contains all possible internal nodes, elements that take one or more arguments (their *arity*), corresponding to their child nodes in the tree. The function set determines the kinds of computations and logic the GP system can evolve. Examples include:
  - **Arithmetic Operators:** `+`, `-`, `*`, `/` (often with protected division to avoid errors).
  - **Trigonometric Functions:** `sin`, `cos`, `tan`, etc.
  - **Boolean Operators:** `AND`, `OR`, `NOT`, `XOR`, etc., for logical or rule-based problems.
  - **Conditional Constructs:** `IF-ELSE`, `IF-GREATER`, etc., enabling programs to make decisions.
  - **Other Domain-Specific Functions:** functions as `abs`, `log`, `exp`, or user-defined primitives.

The combination of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  forms the **primitive set**, which specifies the fundamental components available to the GP system for constructing solutions.

#### Tip: Primitive Set

Choosing the primitive set is important: it should be **expressive enough** to represent solutions, but **not so large or complex** that it makes the search inefficient or the evolved programs unnecessarily complicated.

## Properties of the Primitive Set

The choice of primitives is critical and must satisfy two important properties for the GP system to function correctly.

- **Closure**

The ***closure*** property requires that any function in  $\mathcal{F}$  must be able to accept any value returned by another function or any terminal from  $\mathcal{T}$ . This ensures that any tree constructed from the primitives is valid. It has two main aspects:

- **Type Consistency:** All functions, operators, and terminals must operate on and return the same data type (or be part of a strongly-typed GP system that can handle multiple types). For example, if all functions expect numbers, a terminal returning `true` would violate closure.
- **Evaluation Safety:** Functions prone to runtime errors must be "protected." For example, `safe_div(a, b)` returns 1 if  $b = 0$ , avoiding division-by-zero during evaluation.

- **Sufficiency**

The ***sufficiency*** property requires that the primitive set must be capable of representing a solution to the problem. For instance, if the target function is an exponential, but the primitive set only contains polynomials and variables, it may be impossible to find an exact solution. While perfect sufficiency is often not knowable in advance, the set should be chosen to be rich enough to allow for good approximations.

## 4.3 Initialisation, Crossover and Mutation

### 4.3.1 Population Initialisation

Unlike the straightforward random initialisation of binary strings in a GA, generating a population of valid, random program trees in GP requires a more structured approach. The aim is to produce a diverse set of trees with varying sizes and shapes. The most widely used method for this is ***Ramped Half-and-Half***.

#### Ramped Half-and-Half

This method combines two fundamental tree-generation strategies:

- **The Grow Method:** nodes are randomly selected from the entire primitive set  $(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{T})$  as the tree is built, up to a specified maximum depth. Once a branch reaches this maximum depth, only terminals from  $\mathcal{T}$  can be chosen. This approach tends to produce ***asymmetric trees*** of various shapes and sizes, since a branch may terminate before reaching the maximum depth if a terminal is selected at an internal node.
- **The Full Method:** nodes are chosen exclusively from the function set  $\mathcal{F}$  until the maximum depth is reached. At this depth, all leaf nodes are filled with terminals from  $\mathcal{T}$ . This results in "bushy" ***full trees*** where all terminals are located at the same depth.


To ensure diversity in the initial population, the **Ramped Half-and-Half** method works as follows:

1. A range of maximum depths is defined (e.g., from 2 to 6).
2. The population is divided into groups, each assigned a maximum depth from this range.
3. For each depth group, half of the individuals are generated using the *grow* method and the other half using the *full* method.

This approach guarantees that the initial population contains a broad variety of program structures and sizes, which is essential for effective evolutionary search.

## Ephemeral Constants

When a problem requires numeric constants, they can be pre-defined in the terminal set (e.g.,  $\mathcal{T} = \{x, y, 1, \pi\}$ ). However, a more flexible approach is the use of **ephemeral constants**. An ephemeral constant is a special terminal that, when selected, generates a random constant within a predefined range (e.g., a random float in  $[-1, 1]$ ). Each time this terminal appears in a tree, it holds a different, randomly generated value.




**Figure 4.3:** The *Ephemeral* terminal generates a random constant in  $[0, 3]$ . Each instance holds a different random value.

### 4.3.2 Crossover

The standard crossover operator in GP is **subtree crossover**. It operates as follows:

1. Two parent trees are selected from the population.
2. A random node (the crossover point) is chosen in each parent tree.
3. Swap the selected subtrees between parents to create one or two offspring.



**Figure 4.4:** Subtree Crossover.

This operator is simple yet powerful, as it combines potentially useful, self-contained building blocks (subtrees) from different parents. A common constraint is to enforce a maximum depth on offspring to prevent them from growing excessively large after crossover.


#### Observation: Non-Homologous Crossover

Unlike one-point or uniform crossover in GAs, which align genes by position (**homologous**), subtree crossover is **non-homologous**. The exchanged subtrees can come from different positions and depths and have different sizes and shapes. This allows for a more flexible and dynamic exchange of genetic material.


### 4.3.3 Mutation

In GP, mutation involves making a small, random change to a single parent tree. There are several common mutation operators, each with a different effect:

- **Subtree Mutation:** A random crossover point is selected in the tree, and the entire subtree rooted at that point is replaced by a new, randomly generated tree (often using the `grow` method). This is a major mutation, capable of drastically changing the program's behavior.




- **Point Mutation:** A random node in the tree is replaced by another primitive from the set. To maintain validity, a function can only be replaced by a function of the same arity, and a terminal can only be replaced by another terminal. This is a much smaller, more targeted change than subtree mutation.



- **Hoist Mutation:** A random subtree is selected from within the tree, and this subtree becomes the new, complete tree. This is a size-reducing operator, as it replaces the entire tree with one of its smaller parts.



- **Shrink Mutation:** A randomly selected subtree is replaced by a single, randomly chosen terminal. This is another effective operator for reducing program size.




- **Permutation Mutation:** The arguments of a selected function are permuted. For a binary operator, this would mean swapping its two child subtrees. This is most effective for non-commutative functions.



#### 4.3.4 The Genetic Operators in Action

Let's provide a visual overview of the main steps in a typical Genetic Programming (GP) evolutionary cycle. The figure shows how an initial population of program trees is evaluated for fitness, followed by the selection of individuals based on their fitness values. The selected individuals then undergo genetic operations such as crossover, where subtrees are exchanged to create new offspring, and mutation, where random changes are introduced to maintain diversity. This process is repeated over successive generations to evolve better solutions.




#### 4.4 Code Re-use: Automatically Defined Functions (ADFs)

A fundamental limitation of standard Genetic Programming is that, when a useful code fragment (i.e. a subtree) is required in multiple locations within a program, the evolutionary process must independently evolve this fragment each time it is needed. To address this inefficiency and to promote modularity and code reuse, the concept of **Automatically Defined Functions (ADFs)** was introduced, drawing inspiration from *subroutines* in conventional programming languages.

With ADFs, an individual is no longer a single tree but a *forest* of trees, comprising:

- A primary **result-producing branch**, which serves as the main program tree.
- One or more **function-defining branches**, each corresponding to a distinct ADF.

Each ADF has a unique identifier (e.g., ‘ADF1’, ‘ADF2’) and a fixed arity, with arguments denoted (e.g., ‘ARG1’, ‘ARG2’). These ADFs may be invoked as functions within the main program tree or within other ADFs, thereby enabling the construction of hierarchical and nested function calls.



**Figure 4.5:** Illustration of Automatically Defined Functions (ADFs).

When employing ADFs, genetic operators are applied to all trees within the forest. For instance, crossover may occur between the main program trees of two parent individuals, between their respective ADF trees, or between an ADF tree and a main program tree. This co-evolutionary mechanism enables GP to autonomously discover and exploit useful, reusable submodules.


## 4.5 Bloat and Parsimony Pressure

### Bloat

A common and challenging problem in GP is ***bloat***: the tendency for programs to grow in size over generations without a corresponding improvement in fitness. This happens because larger trees can often have more neutral crossover or mutation points, giving them a slight selective advantage.

One major symptom of bloat is the emergence of large **non-coding regions**, also known as ***introns***. These are sections of code that have no effect on the final output (e.g., a subtree like  $(x - x)$ , which always evaluates to 0, or an **IF** statement that is never taken).

Bloat is problematic because it significantly increases the computational cost of fitness evaluations, slowing down the evolutionary process.



**Figure 4.6:** Illustration of bloat in GP.


### Controlling Bloat

Several methods are used to combat bloat:

1. **Strict Size/Depth Limits:** The most direct method is to impose a hard maximum limit on tree depth or the number of nodes. Offspring that exceed this limit after are discarded.
2. **Size-Reducing Operators:** Including mutation operators like **Hoist** and **Shrink** in the evolutionary process can help counteract growth.
3. **Parsimony Pressure:** This widely used technique modifies the fitness function to penalize larger trees, creating selection pressure for both correctness and simplicity. A common approach is to use a weighted combination of fitness and size:

$$f_{adj}(p) = \alpha f(p) - (1 - \alpha) \text{size}(p)$$

Here,  $f(p)$  is the original fitness of program  $p$ ,  $\text{size}(p)$  is its size (number of nodes), and  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a parameter that balances the importance of fitness versus parsimony. When  $\alpha$  is close to 1, fitness dominates; when it is smaller, parsimony is emphasized.



#### Tip: Parsimony Pressure Tuning

The parameter  $\alpha$  must be chosen carefully. If it is too close to 1, bloat will not be controlled. If it is too small, evolution may be stifled by penalizing necessary complexity, resulting in trivial, low-fitness solutions. Its value is often tuned empirically to balance the two objectives.

## 4.6 Alternative Program Representations


While tree-based representation is the canonical form of Genetic Programming, it is not the only one. Several alternative representations have been developed to address some of the challenges of tree-based GP or to better suit specific problem domains, such as evolving imperative programs or designing digital circuits. These methods often replace the explicit tree structure with a linear genotype that is either executed directly or used to generate a more complex phenotype.

### 4.6.1 Linear Genetic Programming (LGP)

**Linear Genetic Programming (LGP)** departs from the LISP-like expression trees and instead represents programs as a linear sequence of instructions, much like a program in assembly language.

#### Representation and Execution

In LGP, an individual is a variable-length sequence of simple instructions that operate on a set of registers. The program is executed by interpreting these instructions sequentially, and the final result is typically read from a designated output register after execution.



**Figure 4.7:** An example of a Linear GP individual.

#### Observation: LGP vs. Genetic Algorithms

At first glance, LGP's linear genotype seems very similar to that of a standard GA. However, there is a crucial distinction:

- In a GA, the genotype *is* the solution.
- In LGP, the genotype is a *program* that must be executed to produce a result. The fitness is determined by the outcome of this execution, not by the instruction sequence itself. This introduces a complex genotype-to-phenotype mapping.

#### Genetic Operators in LGP

Since the representation is linear, LGP can adapt standard GA operators.


- **Crossover:** A common approach is a two-point crossover. Since individuals can have different lengths, the crossover points in each parent are chosen independently. A segment of instructions is then swapped between the two parents.
- **Mutation:** Mutation can take several forms, such as changing an instruction's operator (e.g., ADD to SUB), altering a register pointer, or modifying a constant value. Macro-mutations, like inserting or deleting an entire instruction, are also used to change the program's length.

## 4.6.2 Cartesian Genetic Programming (CGP)

**Cartesian Genetic Programming (CGP)** is a form of genetic programming introduced by Julian F. Miller. In CGP, candidate programs are represented as **directed acyclic graphs** (DAGs). This representation is particularly well-suited for tasks involving multiple inputs and outputs. Although the phenotype (the expressed program) is a graph, the underlying genotype is a linear, fixed-length string of integers, similar in spirit to the representation used in LGP.


### Representation and Encoding

A CGP individual consists of a two-dimensional grid of computational nodes, typically organized into a specified number of rows and columns. Each node in the grid implements a function selected from a predefined function set.



**Figure 4.8:** Genotype-to-phenotype mapping in CGP.

- The **genotype** is a fixed-length sequence of integers. It encodes the following information:
  - For each node in the grid:
    - The function to be computed by the node (identified by an index into the function set).
    - The source of each input to the node, specified as the address (index) of either a program input or an output from a preceding node in the grid.
  - For each program output:
    - The address (index) of the node whose output is to be used as the program's final output.
- Each node is typically encoded by a fixed group of integers (a *gene*), for example: `[function_id, input1_addr, input2_addr]`.
- The complete genotype is formed by concatenating the genes for all nodes, followed by the output node addresses.



**Figure 4.9:** CGP individual and its genotype.

### 💡 Tip: Non-Coding Genes in CGP

A key feature of CGP is that not all nodes in the grid need to be part of the final, active graph that connects inputs to outputs. Nodes whose outputs are not used by any subsequent active node are effectively non-coding genes (introns). This neutrality is believed to be beneficial for the evolutionary search, allowing genetic changes to accumulate without immediate phenotypic effect.

## Genetic Operators in CGP

Evolution in CGP is typically driven exclusively by **mutation**. A common strategy is a  $(1+\lambda)$ -ES, where a parent generates  $\lambda$  offspring via mutation, and the fittest individual among the parent and offspring survives. Crossover is rarely used. **Point mutation** is the primary operator: one or more integers in the genotype are randomly changed to another valid value. This can either change a node's function or re-wire its connections.

### 4.6.3 Grammatical Evolution (GE)

**Grammatical Evolution (GE)** offers a powerful bridge between the simplicity of a linear genome and the structural complexity of high-level languages. Instead of evolving program trees directly, GE evolves a sequence of integers which, guided by a formal grammar, deterministically generates a syntactically correct program. This approach separates the genotype (the integer string) from the phenotype (the final program).

#### Backus-Naur Form (BNF) Grammar

The core engine of GE is a context-free grammar, specified in **Backus-Naur Form (BNF)**. Invented by John Backus and Peter Naur for the ALGOL language, a BNF grammar formally defines a language as a set of production rules. A grammar is a quadruple  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S})$ :

- **Terminals ( $\mathcal{T}$ )**: The set of final (non-expandable) symbols that form the language's strings.
- **Non-Terminals ( $\mathcal{N}$ )**: The set of abstract symbols that can be expanded into other symbols.
- **Production Rules ( $\mathcal{P}$ )**: A set of rules mapping a non-terminal to a sequence of terminals and/or non-terminals. The pipe symbol  $|$  is used to denote alternative expansions.
- **Start Symbol ( $\mathcal{S}$ )**: The specific non-terminal where the expansion process begins.

### 💡 Example: BNF Grammar for Sum of Integers

Consider the following grammar from the slides:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| • $\mathcal{T} = \{+, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$ | $S \rightarrow S + S \mid C$   |
| • $\mathcal{N} = \{S, C, D\}$                         | • $\mathcal{P} : C \rightarrow D \mid DC$  |
| • $\mathcal{S} = S$                                   | $D \rightarrow 0 \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid 4 \mid 5 \mid 6 \mid 7 \mid 8 \mid 9$ |

This grammar can generate strings representing the sum of any positive integers (e.g., "42+8+6"). The expansion process, or **derivation**, starts with  $S$  and repeatedly applies rules to expand non-terminals until only terminals remain. For example:


$$S \rightarrow S + S \rightarrow C + S \rightarrow DC + S \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 42 + 8 + 6$$

This derivation can also be viewed as the construction of a syntax tree, where non-terminals are internal nodes and terminals are the leaves.

## The Genotype-to-Phenotype Mapping

GE uses a linear vector of integers, called **codons**, as its genotype. This genome guides the derivation process. To generate a program (phenotype), GE performs the following steps:

1. Start the derivation string with the axiom  $S$ .
2. Read the next codon from the genome.
3. Identify the leftmost non-terminal in the current derivation string.
4. Count the number  $N_r$  of alternative production rules available for this non-terminal.
5. Select which rule to apply using the formula:  $\text{rule\_index} = \text{codon} \pmod{N_r}$ .
6. Replace the non-terminal with the chosen expansion.
7. Repeat from step 2 until only terminals are left in the string or a termination limit is reached.



**Figure 4.10:** The core mapping mechanism in GE.

An integer codon is used to select a production rule via the modulo operator.

### Example: Full Derivation Walkthrough

Let's consider the following grammar:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 S & \rightarrow (S \text{ OP } S) \mid V \mid N & (3 \text{ choices}) \\
 OP & \rightarrow + \mid \times \mid - \mid \div & (4 \text{ choices}) \\
 V & \rightarrow x_1 \mid x_2 \mid x_3 & (3 \text{ choices}) \\
 N & \rightarrow -DD \mid -D \mid D \mid DD & (4 \text{ choices}) \\
 D & \rightarrow 0 \mid 1 \mid \dots \mid 9 & (10 \text{ choices})
 \end{array}$$

and the genome:

$[3, 5, 22, 6, 9, 2, 56, 18, 24, 1]$

#### Mapping Process:

1. Start with axiom  $S$ .
2. Read codon **3**. For  $S$  (3 choices), rule is  $3 \pmod{3} = 0$ .
3. Read codon **5**. For  $S$  (3 choices), rule is  $5 \pmod{3} = 2$ .
4. Read codon **22**. For  $N$  (4 choices), rule is  $22 \pmod{4} = 2$ .
5. ...

The process continues, always expanding the leftmost non-terminal using the next available codon. The final phenotype is the program  $(5 \times x_2)$ .

Note that the last three codons are not used in the derivation.

#### Full Derivation Chain:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \underline{S} & \rightarrow (\underline{S} \text{ OP } S) \quad [0] \\
 & \rightarrow (\underline{N} \text{ OP } S) \quad [2] \\
 & \rightarrow (\underline{D} \text{ OP } S) \quad [2] \\
 & \rightarrow (5 \text{ OP } S) \quad [6] \\
 & \rightarrow (5 \times \underline{S}) \quad [1] \\
 & \rightarrow (5 \times \underline{N}) \quad [1] \\
 & \rightarrow (5 \times \underline{V}) \quad [1] \\
 & \rightarrow (5 \times x_2)
 \end{array}$$

## Unique Properties and Challenges

The indirect genotype-phenotype mapping in GE leads to several distinctive characteristics:

- **Variable-Length Genomes and Wrapping:**

Genomes can have different lengths. If the derivation process exhausts all codons before the program is complete, GE can "wrap around" and reuse codons from the beginning of the genome.

- **Handling Incomplete Derivations:**

To prevent infinite recursions (e.g.  $S \rightarrow S + S \rightarrow S + S + S \rightarrow \dots$ ), a maximum number of derivation steps is enforced. If a genome fails to produce a complete program within this limit, it is deemed invalid and assigned a very low fitness score.

- **Degeneracy and Neutrality:**

There is no one-to-one mapping between genotype and phenotype. Many different integer genomes can produce the exact same final program. This is known as degeneracy and is a source of neutral mutations (changes in the genotype that do not change the phenotype), which can be beneficial for traversing the fitness landscape.

- **Epistasis and the Ripple Effect:**


The function of a gene is highly dependent on the genes that came before it, as they determine the sequence of derivation steps. A single mutation early in the genome can cause a "ripple effect," completely changing how the rest of the codons are interpreted and leading to a radically different phenotype.

## Genetic Operators for GE

Since the genotype is a linear vector of integers, GE can leverage standard GA operators.

- **Crossover:** One-point and two-point crossover are commonly used.
- **Mutation:** Randomly replaces a codon with a new integer.

More advanced, GE-specific crossover operators also exist. For example, **sensible crossover** is a one-point crossover that uses the actual effective length of each individual. Other operators include **ripple crossover**, and **homologous crossover**, which attempts to align two genomes based on their derivation history and perform crossover at points where their derivations begin to differ, aiming for a more meaningful exchange of information.



**Figure 4.11:** Homologous crossover in GE.

### 💡 Tip: PonyGE2

Grammatical evolution is available in the **PonyGE2** library:

<https://github.com/PonyGE/PonyGE2>

**Tip:** To install PonyGE2, you must *clone or download* the repository from GitHub.

You cannot use `pip` or Anaconda for installation.

# Other Bio-Inspired Metaheuristics

Beyond Genetic Algorithms, Evolution Strategies, and Genetic Programming, the field of bio-inspired computation offers a rich landscape of other powerful metaheuristics. This chapter introduces three prominent algorithms: Differential Evolution, a simple yet powerful method for real-valued optimization; Particle Swarm Optimization, which models the collective intelligence of social swarms; and Ant Colony Optimization, which mimics the foraging behavior of ants via indirect communication.

## 5.1 Differential Evolution (DE)

**Differential Evolution (DE)**, introduced by Storn and Price in 1997, is a population-based stochastic optimization algorithm designed primarily for real-valued optimization problems in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . While it follows a general evolutionary pattern, DE distinguishes itself from canonical Genetic Algorithms in two fundamental ways:

1. **Generation of New Solutions:** DE creates new candidate solutions by combining existing ones in a unique way, using vector differences to guide the search direction and step size. This "differential mutation" is the hallmark of the algorithm.
2. **Selection Process:** The selection mechanism is typically a simple one-to-one competition, where a newly created "trial" vector replaces its parent in the next generation only if it has better or equal fitness.

These characteristics make DE a remarkably simple, robust, and effective algorithm for continuous optimization tasks.

### 5.1.1 The DE/rand/1 Algorithm

The most fundamental DE variant is known as **DE/rand/1**. The algorithm iterates through each individual in the population (the "target vector") and applies differential mutation, crossover, and selection to generate a corresponding individual for the next generation's population.

#### Differential Mutation

For each target vector  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in the current population, a "donor" vector  $\mathbf{v}_i$  is created. This is the core of DE's search mechanism. The process is as follows:

1. Select three other vectors ( $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$ ) at random from the current population, ensuring they are distinct from each other and from the target vector  $x_i$ .
2. Compute the **donor vector**  $v_i$  using the formula:

$$v_i = a + F \cdot (b - c)$$

where  $F \in [0, 2]$  is a crucial hyperparameter called **mutation factor** or **differential weight**. It scales the difference vector  $(b - c)$ , controlling the amplification of the differential variation.

### Observation: The Role of the Difference Vector

The vector difference  $(b - c)$  represents a random direction and magnitude derived from the population's current diversity. By adding this scaled difference to another vector  $a$ , DE creates a new trial point, effectively "perturbing" an existing solution with a vector that reflects the population's current spatial distribution.

### Binomial Crossover

After creating the donor vector  $v_i$ , it is combined with the original target vector  $x_i$  to create a ***trial vector***  $u_i$ . This step, analogous to crossover in GAs, introduces genetic material from the parent into the mutated vector. In DE, this is typically done via ***binomial crossover***: For each coordinate  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  of the trial vector, a new value is chosen:

$$u_{i,j} = \begin{cases} v_{i,j} & \text{if } \text{rnd}_{i,j} \leq p_{CR} \text{ or } j = j_{rand} \\ x_{i,j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here,  $p_{CR} \in [0, 1]$  is the ***crossover probability***,  $\text{rnd}_{i,j}$  is a uniform random number in  $[0, 1]$  drawn for each component, and  $j_{rand}$  is a randomly chosen index from  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ . The  $j = j_{rand}$  condition ensures that the trial vector  $u_i$  receives at least one component from the donor vector  $v_i$ .

### Selection

The final step is a one-to-one competition between the trial vector  $u_i$  and its parent target vector  $x_i$ . The winner, which is the vector with the better fitness, survives to become part of the population for the next generation. For a minimization problem:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{next gen}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_i & \text{if } f(\mathbf{u}_i) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ \mathbf{x}_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This entire process (mutation, crossover, selection) is repeated for every individual in the population to form the next generation.

### Graphical Representation

In DE, creating a trial vector can be visualized as vector arithmetic in the search space:




Figure 5.1: A graphical representation of the DE operators.

## 5.1.2 DE Variants and Taxonomy

### Taxonomy of DE Strategies

The `DE/rand/1` scheme is just one of many possible DE strategies. A standard taxonomy, `DE/x/y`, is used to describe them:

- `x` specifies how the base vector for the mutation is chosen (e.g., `rand` for a random vector, `best` for the best individual in the population).
- `y` is the number of difference vectors used.

The most common variants alter the differential mutation formula to change the balance between exploration and exploitation.

#### ?

### Advanced Concept: Common DE Mutation Strategies

Here are some popular mutation strategies beyond the basic `DE/rand/1`:

- **DE/best/1:** Uses the best individual found so far,  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}}$ , as the base vector. This increases exploitation and convergence speed, but may lead to premature convergence.

$$v_i = \mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} + F \cdot (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})$$

- **DE/current-to-best/1:** A hybrid strategy that includes both the current individual and the best individual, providing a good balance.

$$v_i = \mathbf{x}_i + F \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} - \mathbf{x}_i) + F \cdot (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})$$

- **DE/rand/2:** Uses two different difference vectors, increasing the potential for exploration.

$$v_i = \mathbf{a} + F \cdot (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}) + F \cdot (\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{e})$$

- **DE/rand-to-best/1:** Perturbs a random vector with a vector pointing towards the best solution.

$$v_i = \mathbf{a} + F \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{\text{best}} - \mathbf{a}) + F \cdot (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})$$

### Adaptive Differential Evolution (JADE)

**JADE** (*Adaptive DE with Optional External Archive*) is a powerful adaptive variant of Differential Evolution, introduced in 2009 by Zhang and Sanderson [4]. JADE enhances the standard DE algorithm with several key innovations:

- **New Mutation Strategy:** JADE introduces the `DE/current-to-pbest` mutation scheme, which improves the balance between exploration and exploitation by guiding individuals toward the best solutions found so far.
- **External Archive:** An external archive of sub-optimal (recently replaced) solutions is maintained. This archive is used during mutation to increase population diversity and help escape local optima.
- **Dynamic Hyper-parameter Update:** JADE adaptively updates its control parameters ( $F$  and  $p_{CR}$ ) during the run, allowing the algorithm to self-tune and respond to the problem landscape.

## 5.2 Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)

### 5.2.1 Introduction

**Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)** is a population-based metaheuristic belonging to the family of **swarm intelligence** algorithms. Swarm intelligence is inspired by the collective behavior of decentralized, self-organized systems, such as flocks of birds, schools of fish, or colonies of ants. The core idea is that complex, global, and intelligent behavior can emerge from the interactions of many simple agents, each with very limited capabilities and no centralized control. These agents follow simple rules, and their collective action solves complex problems. In PSO, the individuals are called **particles** and the population is called a **swarm**.

### 5.2.2 The PSO Algorithm

PSO models a swarm moving through an  $m$ -dimensional problem search space. Each particle represents a candidate solution and has two main properties:

- a **position**  $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ , which is the point in the search space the particle currently occupies.
- a **velocity**  $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$ , which determines its direction and speed of movement.


At each discrete time step  $t$ , a particle's position is updated based on its velocity:

$$\mathbf{x}_i(t+1) = \mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{v}_i(t+1)$$

#### The Velocity Update Rule

The velocity update is the heart of the PSO algorithm. It models the social and cognitive forces that guide a particle's movement. The new velocity  $\mathbf{v}_i(t+1)$  is a combination of three components:

1. **Inertia**: The tendency of the particle to continue moving in its current direction.
2. **Cognitive Attraction**: The particle's memory of its own personal best position found so far, denoted  $b_i$ . This represents the particle's individual experience.
3. **Social Attraction**: The attraction towards the global best position found so far by any particle in the entire swarm, denoted  $g$ . This represents the collective experience of the group.



**Figure 5.2:** The three components influencing a particle's new velocity.

The full velocity update formula combines these influences ( $\odot$  denotes the element-wise product):

$$\mathbf{v}_i(t+1) = w \cdot \mathbf{v}_i(t) + c_c \cdot \mathbf{r}_1 \odot (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{x}_i(t)) + c_s \cdot \mathbf{r}_2 \odot (\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{x}_i(t))$$

Where:

- $w$  is the **inertia weight**, balancing global and local exploration.
- $c_c$  and  $c_s$  are the **cognitive** and **social factors**, controlling attraction to personal and global best.
- $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$  are vectors of random numbers in  $[0, 1]^m$  that introduce stochasticity.


### 💡 Tip: PSO Parameters

The algorithm's behavior is sensitive to its parameters. Commonly used default values have been established through empirical studies:

- **Cognitive and Social Factors:**  $c_c$  and  $c_s$  are often both set to approximately 1.49445.
- **Inertia Weight:**  $w$  is often decreased linearly during the run, for example from 0.9 to 0.4. A higher initial value encourages global exploration, while a lower final value allows for fine-tuning around the best-found solutions.

## Boundary Conditions

When a particle moves beyond the limits of the search space, it is necessary to apply a boundary handling strategy to determine how its position and velocity should be managed.



**Figure 5.3:** Boundary handling strategies.

There are several widely used approaches for dealing with particles that cross the boundaries:


- **Absorbing:** The particle is halted at the boundary, and its velocity component perpendicular to the boundary is set to zero.
- **Reflecting:** The particle rebounds off the boundary, reversing the relevant component of its velocity.
- **Damping:** Similar to reflecting, but the velocity is also multiplied by a damping factor  $r_{\text{damp}}$ , which reduces its magnitude.
- **Invisible:** The particle is permitted to move outside the boundary, but its position is not evaluated or updated until it returns to the feasible region.
- **Invisible/Reflecting:** The particle remains invisible while outside the boundary, but if it tries to re-enter, it is reflected back.
- **Invisible/Damping:** The particle is invisible outside the boundary, and when it re-enters, its velocity is damped.

The choice of boundary handling strategy can have a substantial impact on how the swarm explores the search space and converges to solutions.

## 5.3 Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)

**Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)** is another major paradigm of swarm intelligence, primarily used to solve combinatorial optimization problems on graphs (e.g., the Traveling Salesperson Problem). The core inspiration for ACO is the foraging behavior of ants, which exhibit complex collective problem-solving capabilities despite being individually simple.

This behavior is coordinated through **stigmergy**, a mechanism of indirect communication where individuals interact by modifying their local environment. Ants deposit a chemical substance called a **pheromone** as they travel. Other ants can sense this pheromone and are more likely to follow paths with higher concentrations. Because pheromone evaporates over time, shorter paths, which can be traversed more frequently in a given time period, accumulate stronger pheromone trails. This creates a feedback loop that guides the colony to find the shortest paths between nest and food.




**Figure 5.4:** The Double Bridge Experiment, a classic illustration of stigmergy. Ants initially explore both paths randomly. Because the shorter path is traversed more quickly, its pheromone trail is reinforced faster than the longer path's trail, eventually attracting the entire colony.

### 5.3.1 The ACO Algorithm for the TSP

Let's illustrate ACO with its most famous application: the Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP). The goal is to find the shortest Hamiltonian circuit in a complete graph of  $m$  cities.

The ACO algorithm follows a general cycle:

1. **Initialize** pheromone trails on the graph edges.
2. **Construct Solutions:** A colony of artificial ants construct tours (solutions) probabilistically.
3. **Update Pheromones:** Pheromone trails are updated based on quality of the solutions found.
4. **Repeat** until a termination criterion is met.



**Figure 5.5:** The ACO cycle.

## Solution Construction

Each ant begins at a randomly selected city and incrementally constructs a tour by selecting the next city to visit from the set of unvisited cities, denoted  $N_i^k$  for ant  $k$  currently at city  $i$ . The selection of the next city  $j \in N_i^k$  is governed by a probabilistic rule that incorporates two factors:

- **Pheromone Trails** ( $\tau_{ij}$ ): The current amount of pheromone on edge  $(i, j)$ , representing the collective learning of the colony.
- **Heuristic Information** ( $\eta_{ij}$ ): A problem-specific value, which for the TSP is typically  $\eta_{ij} = 1/d_{ij}$ , where  $d_{ij}$  is the distance between cities  $i$  and  $j$ .

The probability that ant  $k$  in city  $i$  moves to city  $j$  at time  $t$  is defined as:

$$p_{ij}^k(t) = \frac{[\tau_{ij}(t)]^\alpha [\eta_{ij}]^\beta}{\sum_{l \in N_i^k} [\tau_{il}(t)]^\alpha [\eta_{il}]^\beta}, \quad j \in N_i^k$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are parameters that determine the relative importance of pheromone trails and heuristic information, respectively.

## Pheromone Update

Once all ants have completed their tours, the pheromone levels on all edges are updated according to two mechanisms:

1. **Evaporation:** Each pheromone value is decreased by a factor  $\rho \in [0, 1]$ , known as the evaporation rate.
2. **Deposition:** Each ant  $k$  deposits an amount of pheromone  $\Delta \tau_{ij}^k$  on every edge  $(i, j)$  it traversed in its tour. Typically,  $\Delta \tau_{ij}^k = 1/L_k$  if ant  $k$  used edge  $(i, j)$  in its tour, where  $L_k$  is the total length of the tour constructed by ant  $k$ ; otherwise,  $\Delta \tau_{ij}^k = 0$ .

The pheromone update rule for each edge  $(i, j)$  is given by:

$$\tau_{ij}(t+1) = (1 - \rho) \tau_{ij}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^n \Delta \tau_{ij}^k$$

Edges that are part of better solutions, specifically those that contribute to shorter tours, receive larger amounts of pheromone during the update phase. Additionally, edges that are included in the tours of more ants accumulate even more pheromone over time. As a result, these edges become increasingly attractive to subsequent ants constructing their own solutions. The desirability of an edge, as reflected by its pheromone level, directly influences the probability that it will be selected in the future. This mechanism allows the algorithm to reinforce promising regions of the search space, gradually biasing the collective search toward optimal or near-optimal solutions.

# 6

# Geometric Semantic GP

Traditional Genetic Programming operators, such as subtree crossover and mutation, operate on the *syntactic* structure of program trees. While effective, this approach provides little to no direct control over the *behavioral* or *semantic* change induced by the operators. An operator might cause a drastic change in program output or no change at all (in the case of introns), making the search process somewhat undirected.

**Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming (GSGP)** proposes a radical shift in perspective. It defines genetic operators that work directly on the semantics of the programs, treating them as points in a geometric space. By doing so, it allows for a fine-grained control over the search process, ensuring that offspring are behaviorally located "between" their parents (for crossover) or within a controlled distance of their parent (for mutation).

## 6.1 Geometric Operators on Metric Spaces

The foundation of GSGP lies in defining the space of solutions as a **metric space**. A metric space is a set  $S$  equipped with a **distance function** (or metric)  $d : S \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , which satisfies four key properties for any  $x, y, z \in S$ :

- **Identity:**  $d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$  The distance is zero if and only if the points are identical.
- **Symmetry:**  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$  The distance from  $x$  to  $y$  is the same as from  $y$  to  $x$ .
- **Non-negativity:**  $d(x, y) \geq 0$  Distance is always non-negative.
- **Triangular Inequality:**  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$  The shortest path is the direct one.


Within a metric space, we can define geometric concepts like segments and balls:

- A **segment**  $S(x, y)$  between two points  $x$  and  $y$  is the set of all points  $z$  for which holds:

$$S(x, y) = \{z \in S \mid d(x, z) + d(z, y) = d(x, y)\}$$

- A **ball**  $B(x, r)$  of radius  $r$  centered in  $x$  is the set of all points  $y$  whose distance from  $x$  is at most  $r$ :

$$B(x, r) = \{y \in S \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$$



**Figure 6.1:** Segments and balls in different metric spaces ( $\mathbb{R}^2$ ) and Hamming,  $\{0, 1\}^3$

### 6.1.1 Geometric Crossover and Mutation

Using these definitions, we can formally characterize genetic operators:

- A **geometric crossover** operator, when applied to parents  $x$  and  $y$ , must produce an offspring  $z$  that lies on the segment between them:  $z \in S(x, y)$ .
- A **geometric mutation** operator, when applied to a parent  $x$ , must produce an offspring  $y$  that lies within a ball of a defined radius  $r$  around it:  $y \in B(x, r)$ .

#### Observation: Exploration vs. Exploitation


This geometric framework provides a clear distinction between the roles of operators.

- **Crossover is for Exploitation:** A geometric crossover operator generates offspring only within the bounds defined by the parents. It cannot create anything truly new, but rather explores the space "between" existing solutions. Over generations, it is confined to the convex hull of the initial population.
- **Mutation is for Exploration:** A geometric mutation operator is capable of producing offspring outside the segment of the parents, effectively enlarging the search space and allowing the algorithm to escape the initial population's convex hull.

### 6.1.2 Are Standard GP Operators Geometric?

Many operators in GAs are naturally geometric. For instance, one-point crossover on binary strings with Hamming distance is a geometric crossover. However, this is **not the case for standard GP**.


The standard subtree crossover in GP is **not geometric**. A simple counterexample is crossing a tree  $T$  with itself. In a metric space, the segment  $S(T, T)$  contains only the point  $T$  itself. Yet, applying subtree crossover to two identical copies of  $T$  can produce a different tree  $T'$ , meaning  $T' \notin S(T, T)$ . This violates the definition of a geometric crossover.



**Figure 6.2:** An example demonstrating that standard GP subtree crossover is not geometric. Crossing a tree with itself produces a new tree, which is impossible for a geometric operator.

## 6.2 Geometric Semantic Operators

Standard GP operators act on the *syntactic space* (all possible program trees), but what matters is the *semantic space* (all possible program behaviors). A program's *semantics* are its output vector on a given set of fitness cases (inputs).



**Figure 6.3:** The distinction between syntax and semantics. Two different trees,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  (different syntax), produce two different vectors of outputs for the same set of inputs (different semantics). The core idea of GSGP is to design operators that are geometric in the *semantic space*, not the syntactic one. This requires:


1. Defining a distance metric on the semantics of programs (e.g., Euclidean distance between their semantic vectors).
2. Designing new crossover and mutation operators that construct an offspring tree whose *semantics* are guaranteed to lie on the segment between the parent semantics (for crossover) or in a ball around the parent's semantics (for mutation).

### 6.2.1 Geometric Semantic Crossover (GSC)

GSC generates an offspring  $T_{off}$  whose semantics are a linear interpolation of the semantics of its parents,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . This is achieved by constructing the offspring tree as:

$$T_{off} = (R \times T_1) + ((1 - R) \times T_2)$$

Where  $R$  is a randomly generated program tree whose outputs are guaranteed to be in the range  $[0, 1]$ . For any input, the output of  $T_{off}$  will be on the segment between the outputs of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .



**Figure 6.4:** The structure of Geometric Semantic Crossover.


The effect on the semantic space is that the offspring's behavior is bounded by the behavior of its parents, providing a highly controlled and exploitative search.

## 6.2.2 Geometric Semantic Mutation (GSM)

GSM generates a mutated offspring  $T_{off}$  by adding a bounded random perturbation to the semantics of a single parent  $T_1$ . The construction is:

$$T_{off} = T_1 + (m \times R')$$

Where  $m$  is the ***mutation step*** (a constant that defines the mutation radius) and  $R'$  is a randomly generated tree whose outputs are guaranteed to be in the range  $[-1, 1]$ . This ensures the offspring's semantics lie within a "ball" of a specified radius around the parent's semantics.




**Figure 6.5:** The structure of Geometric Semantic Mutation. The offspring tree is created by adding a scaled random component (controlled by mutation step  $m$ ) to the parent tree  $T_1$ .

## 6.3 Challenges and Advancements in GSGP

While semantically powerful, GSGP faces a significant practical challenge: the trees it produces grow exponentially with each generation. The formula for GSC, for example, combines three trees to make one, leading to rapid and unsustainable bloat.

This has led to the development of more advanced implementations like ***Fast GSGP***, which use techniques such as **subtree sharing** and optimized data structures to manage this complexity, making the approach viable in practice. These methods have shown that GSGP can significantly outperform standard GP on many benchmark problems, especially in terms of generalization to unseen data.



**Figure 6.6:** Fast GSGP illustration.

# 7

# Estimation of Distribution Algorithms

## 7.1 From Implicit to Explicit Models

Traditional evolutionary algorithms, such as Genetic Algorithms (GAs), employ operators like selection, crossover, and mutation to navigate the search space. Collectively, these operators induce an *implicit* model of solution quality: selection favors promising individuals, while crossover and mutation explore their neighborhoods to discover new candidates. However, this implicit modeling limits the algorithm's ability to directly capture and exploit the structure of high-quality solutions.

In contrast, *Estimation of Distribution Algorithms (EDAs)*, also referred to as *Probabilistic Model-Building Genetic Algorithms (PMBGAs)*, adopt a fundamentally different strategy. Rather than relying on traditional genetic operators, EDAs construct an *explicit* probabilistic model that characterizes the distribution of promising solutions identified thus far. This model is then used to sample a new population of candidate solutions, which subsequently informs the next iteration of model refinement. The evolutionary process is thereby reframed as a cycle of model construction, sampling, and iterative improvement.


### 7.1.1 Model Fitting via Classification

A principled approach to explicit modeling is to recast the problem as a classification task. Here, the objective is to train a machine learning classifier to discriminate between "good" and "bad" regions of the search space, using the fitness values of individuals in the current population as labels.

#### Learnable Evolution Models

The *Learnable Evolution Model (LEM)* framework formalizes this classification-based approach. Its iterative procedure can be summarized as follows:

1. Execute several standard evolutionary steps to generate a diverse population.
2. Partition the population into two classes according to fitness: a "fit" set and an "unfit" set.
3. Train a classifier (e.g., decision tree, support vector machine, or neural network) to distinguish between fit and unfit individuals. This classifier serves as an explicit model of high-fitness regions in the search space.
4. Eliminate unfit individuals and generate new candidates by sampling from regions identified by the classifier as "fit."
5. Repeat this process until a predefined termination criterion is satisfied.



**Figure 7.1:** The classification process in a Learnable Evolution Model.


## Generating New Individuals

A key challenge in this approach is how to generate new individuals using the trained model. This depends on whether the model is **generative** or **discriminative**.


- **Generative models** can directly produce new samples that conform to the learned data distribution.
- **Discriminative models**, such as most classifiers, can only determine whether a given, existing individual belongs to the "fit" class or not.

Since classifiers are typically discriminative, two main sampling techniques are used:

- **Rejection Sampling:** new individuals are generated randomly from the entire search space and are then passed to the classifier. If the classifier labels an individual as "fit," it is accepted into the new population; otherwise, it is rejected, and the process repeats. This method is simple but can be highly *inefficient*, especially late in the search when the "fit" region may be very small compared to the entire space, leading to a high rejection rate.



- **Region-Based Sampling:** New individuals are generated by sampling directly from regions of the search space identified as "fit" by the classifier. For classifiers such as decision trees, these regions correspond to explicit rules or hyper-rectangles. Sampling is restricted to these regions, improving efficiency by avoiding the generation of individuals from unpromising areas. The effectiveness of this method depends on the classifier's ability to define such regions.



## 7.2 Probabilistic Model-Based EDAs

Instead of using a classifier, the most common family of EDAs builds and samples from an explicit **probability distribution** that represents the distribution of promising individuals in the population.

### 7.2.1 Representing the Distribution of Promising Solutions

The core task of an EDA is to build a probabilistic model that captures the features of high-performing individuals. The primary challenge lies in creating a representation that is both expressive enough to guide the search effectively and compact enough to be computationally feasible. A full, explicit joint probability distribution is almost always intractable due to the curse of dimensionality. Several strategies have been developed to address this.

#### Histogram-Based Models

A conceptually simple way to model the distribution is to create a multi-dimensional histogram. The search space is partitioned into a grid of discrete hypercubes (or "bins"), and the model stores the average fitness or count of promising solutions that fall into each bin. New solutions can then be sampled from the bins with higher scores.

However, this method's utility is severely limited by its exponential complexity. If each of the  $n$  dimensions of the search space is divided into just  $d$  intervals, the total number of hypercubes is  $d^n$ . This number grows so rapidly that the approach becomes unfeasible even for a small number of dimensions, necessitating more compact representations.

#### Gaussian Mixture Models for Continuous Spaces

For problems in continuous domains (e.g.,  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ), a more scalable approach is to model the probability distribution of good solutions as a **Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM)**. Instead of a discrete grid, the distribution is represented as the sum of a fixed number,  $b$ , of multivariate Gaussian distributions. This allows the model to represent multiple promising regions in the search space simultaneously.

A full  $n$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution is defined by:

- A mean vector  $\vec{\mu}$  of length  $n$ .
- A covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  of size  $n \times n$ , which captures the dependencies between variables.

While more compact than a histogram, the space required to store the full covariance matrix for each component is  $n^2$ . The total space complexity to represent the distribution as a sum of  $b$  Gaussians is  $b(n + n^2)$ , which can still be prohibitive if all variable interactions are modeled.

#### Marginal Distribution Models

To drastically reduce complexity, many EDAs adopt a powerful simplifying assumption: that the variables (genes) are **mutually independent**. This assumption allows the high-dimensional joint probability distribution to be factorized into the product of  $n$  one-dimensional **marginal distributions**.


$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n) = P_1(x_1) \cdot P_2(x_2) \cdots P_n(x_n)$$

This is the foundation of **univariate EDAs**. Under this model, the complexity of a Gaussian mixture is greatly reduced. Each of the  $n$  marginal distributions is a 1D Gaussian mixture, which only requires storing a mean and a variance for each of its  $b$  components. The total space complexity falls from  $O(bn^2)$  to a much more manageable  $O(bn)$ .


## Models for Finite Discrete Spaces

The concept of using marginal distributions extends naturally to discrete domains.


- If a gene can take one of  $k$  possible discrete values, its marginal distribution can be represented by a probability vector of length  $k - 1$ .
- For the very common case of **Boolean spaces** ( $\{0, 1\}^n$ ), the model is particularly simple. The marginal distribution for each gene can be described by a single value: the probability of that gene being 1. The entire probabilistic model is thus captured by a single  $n$ -dimensional vector of probabilities, which is extremely compact.




(a) Histogram-based model.



(b) Gaussian Mixture Model.



(c) Marginal distributions from a joint distribution.



(d) Marginal distributions for a finite discrete space.

**Figure 7.2:** Four different approaches to modeling the distribution of promising solutions in EDAs.

### 7.2.2 Univariate EDAs

**Univariate EDAs** adopt a standard approach in which the high-dimensional distribution over all genes is simplified by marginalizing everything to one dimension by modeling only the distribution of each gene individually. This means we are making a strong assumption: the value of each gene can be determined independently from the values of the other genes. While this independence assumption is often not strictly true in real-world problems, it allows for very simple and computationally efficient algorithms. We will examine two classic univariate EDA algorithms:

- **Population-Based Incremental Learning (PBIL)**
- **Compact Genetic Algorithm (cGA)**

## Population-Based Incremental Learning (PBIL)

**Population-Based Incremental Learning (PBIL)** is a foundational univariate EDA that iteratively refines a probabilistic model to guide the search for optimal solutions.

For a problem of dimension  $n$ , PBIL maintains a vector of marginal distributions  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n$ . The initial distribution is typically uniform. At each iteration:

- A population of new individuals is generated by independently sampling each gene  $j$  from  $D_j$ .
- The  $b$  fittest individuals are selected from the population (truncated selection).
- For each gene  $j$ , let  $N_j$  denote the empirical distribution of gene  $j$  among the  $b$  selected individuals.
- The probability vector is updated towards the observed distribution in the selected set:

$$D_j \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)D_j + \alpha N_j$$

where  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  is a learning rate that controls the speed of adaptation.

This process is repeated until a stopping criterion is met.

Population-Based Incremental Learning (PBIL) can be *extended to continuous domains*, such as  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , by representing each marginal distribution as a Gaussian distribution parameterized by a mean  $\mu_{D_j}$  and a variance  $\sigma_{D_j}^2$ . After the selection step, for each gene  $j$ , the sample mean  $\mu_{N_j}$  and sample variance  $\sigma_{N_j}^2$  are computed from the selected individuals:

$$\mu_{N_j} = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{P_i \in P} P_{i,j} \quad \sigma_{N_j}^2 = \frac{1}{|P| - 1} \sum_{P_i \in P} (P_{i,j} - \mu_{N_j})^2$$

The parameters of the Gaussian are then updated according to the following rules:

$$\mu_{D_j} \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)\mu_{D_j} + \alpha\mu_{N_j}, \quad \sigma_{D_j}^2 \leftarrow (1 - \alpha)\sigma_{D_j}^2 + \alpha\sigma_{N_j}^2$$

This approach enables PBIL to adapt both the central tendency and the dispersion of each marginal distribution, thereby facilitating efficient exploration and exploitation in continuous search spaces.

PBIL can also be extended to discrete spaces with more than two values per gene by representing each marginal as a categorical distribution and updating each probability component accordingly. In all cases, the learning rate  $\alpha$  allows for gradual adaptation, balancing exploration and exploitation.

## Compact Genetic Algorithm (cGA)

The **Compact Genetic Algorithm (cGA)** is a streamlined EDA designed for Boolean search spaces. Unlike traditional genetic algorithms, cGA does not maintain an explicit population. Instead, it iteratively updates a probability vector through pairwise competitions.

1. **Probability Vector:** Maintain a vector  $D$ , where  $D_j$  is the probability of gene  $j$  being 1.
2. **Sampling:** At each iteration, sample two individuals,  $P_i$  and  $P_k$ , independently from  $D$ .
3. **Competition:** Evaluate  $P_i$  and  $P_k$  and identify the winner ( $U$ ) and loser ( $V$ ) based on fitness.
4. **Update:** For each gene  $j$  where  $U_j \neq V_j$ , adjust  $D_j$  by a small step  $1/d$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } U_j = 1 \text{ and } V_j = 0 : & \quad D_j \leftarrow D_j + 1/d \\ \text{If } U_j = 0 \text{ and } V_j = 1 : & \quad D_j \leftarrow D_j - 1/d \end{aligned}$$

Repeat this process for a fixed number of iterations or until convergence. The cGA thus efficiently evolves the probability vector to represent promising solutions without explicitly storing a population.

### 7.2.3 Issues of Univariate EDAs and Beyond

Univariate EDAs assume that the distribution of each gene can be found independently from all the other genes: they do not model any linkage or interaction between genes. While this assumption simplifies the model, it is often unrealistic: in many real-world problems, genes interact in complex ways, and optimizing them independently is not effective.

- **Gene independence is rarely true:** If genes were truly independent, we could optimize each one separately. In practice, dependencies between genes are common and important.
- **Local optima:** Because univariate EDAs cannot capture these dependencies, they may get stuck in local optima—situations where changing a single gene does not improve the solution, but changing several together would.
- **Need for multivariate models:** To address this, ***multivariate EDAs*** have been developed. These use more advanced probabilistic models that can represent and exploit dependencies between variables, allowing for more effective search in complex landscapes.

One of the most well-known multivariate EDAs is the ***Bayesian Optimization Algorithm (BOA)***. Unlike PBIL, which uses marginal distributions, BOA employs a Bayesian network to model dependencies between genes. This network is used to generate new samples and is updated at each generation.

 **Tip: BOA: Further Reading**

The following paper [2] describes the BOA algorithm:

Pelikan, Martin, David E. Goldberg, and Erick Cantú-Paz.

“*BOA: The Bayesian optimization algorithm.*”

Proceedings of the genetic and evolutionary computation conference GECCO-99.

Vol. 1. 1999.

# Bibliography

- [1] John H. Holland. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems: An Introductory Analysis with Applications to Biology, Control, and Artificial Intelligence*. The MIT Press, Apr. 1992. ISBN: 9780262275552. doi: [10.7551/mitpress/1090.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1090.001.0001). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1090.001.0001>.
- [2] Martin Pelikan et al. “BOA: the Bayesian optimization algorithm”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation - Volume 1*. GECCO’99. Orlando, Florida: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1999. ISBN: 1558606114.
- [3] Maritzol Tenemaza et al. “Improving Itinerary Recommendations for Tourists Through Metaheuristic Algorithms: An Optimization Proposal”. In: *IEEE Access* PP (Apr. 2020), pp. 1–1. doi: [10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2990348](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2990348).
- [4] Jingqiao Zhang et al. “JADE: Adaptive Differential Evolution With Optional External Archive”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 13.5 (2009), pp. 945–958. doi: [10.1109/TEVC.2009.2014613](https://doi.org/10.1109/TEVC.2009.2014613).