An Overview of Evolutionary Algorithms in Multiobjective Optimization

Carlos M. Fonseca
Department of Automatic Control
and Systems Engineering
The University of Sheffield
Sheffield S1 3JD, U.K.
C.Fonseca@shef.ac.uk

Peter J. Fleming
Department of Automatic Control
and Systems Engineering
The University of Sheffield
Sheffield S1 3JD, U.K.
P.Fleming@shef.ac.uk

Abstract
The application of evolutionary algorithms (EAs) in multiobjective optimization is cur-
rently receiving growing interest from researchers with various backgrounds. Most re-
search in this area has understandably concentrated on the selection stage of EAs, due to
the need to integrate vectorial performance measures with the inherently scalar way in
which EAs reward individual performance, that is, number of offspring.
    In this review, current multiobjective evolutionary approaches are discussed, rang-
ing from the conventional analytical aggregation of the different objectives into a sin-
gle function to a number of population-based approaches and the more recent ranking
schemes based on the definition of Pareto optimality. The sensitivity of different methods
to objective scaling and/or possible concavities in the trade-off surface is considered, and
related to the (static) fitness landscapes such methods induce on the search space. From the
discussion, directions for future research in multiobjective fitness assignment and search
strategies are identified, including the incorporation of decision making in the selection
procedure, fitness sharing, and adaptive representations.
Keywords
evolutionary algorithms, multiobjective optimization, fitness assignment, search strategies

1. Introduction

Many real-world problems involve multiple measures of performance, or objectives, which
should be optimized simultaneously. In certain cases, objective functions may be optimized
separately from each other, and insight gained concerning the best that can be achieved
in each performance dimension. However, suitable solutions to the overall problem can
seldom be found in this way. Optimal performance according to one objective, if such an
optimum exists, often implies unacceptably low performance in one or more of the other
objective dimensions, creating the need for a compromise to be reached. A suitable solution
to such problems involving conflicting objectives should offer "acceptable," though possibly
sub-optimal in the single-objective sense, performance in all objective dimensions, where
"acceptable" is a problem-dependent and ultimately subjective concept.

    The simultaneous optimization of multiple, possibly competing, objective functions de-
viates from single-function optimization in that it seldom admits a single, perfect (or Utopian)
solution. Instead, multiobjective optimization (MO) problems tend to be characterized by
a family of alternatives that must be considered equivalent in the absence of information
concerning the relevance of each objective relative to the others. Multiple solutions, or mul-
timodality, arise even in the simplest nontrivial case of two competing objectives, where both

are unimodal and convex functions of the decision variables. As the number of competing objectives increases and less well behaved objectives are considered, the problem of finding a satisfactory compromise solution rapidly becomes increasingly complex.

Conventional optimization techniques, such as gradient-based and simplex-based methods, and also less conventional ones, such as simulated annealing, are difficult to extend to the *true* multiobjective case, because they were not designed with multiple solutions in mind. In practice, multiobjective problems have to be reformulated as single objective prior to optimization, leading to the production of a single solution per run of the optimizer.

Evolutionary algorithms (EAs), however, have been recognized to be possibly well suited to multiobjective optimization since early in their development. Multiple individuals can search for multiple solutions in parallel, eventually taking advantage of any similarities available in the family of possible solutions to the problem. The ability to handle complex problems, involving features such as discontinuities, multimodality, disjoint feasible spaces and noisy function evaluations, reinforces the potential effectiveness of EAs in multiobjective search and optimization, which is perhaps a problem area where evolutionary computation really distinguishes itself from its competitors.

This article reviews current evolutionary approaches to multiobjective optimization, discussing their similarities and differences. It also tries to identify some of the main issues raised by multiobjective optimization in the context of evolutionary search, and how the methods discussed address them. From the discussion, directions for future work in multiobjective evolutionary algorithms are identified.

2. Evolutionary Approaches to Multiobjective Optimization

The family of solutions of a multiobjective optimization problem is composed of all those elements of the search space that are such that the components of the corresponding objective vectors cannot be all simultaneously improved. This is known as the concept of Pareto optimality.

A more formal definition of Pareto optimality is as follows: Consider, without loss of generality, the minimization of the n components f_k, $k = 1, \ldots, n$, of a vector function $\mathbf{f}$ of a vector variable $\mathbf{x}$ in a universe $\mathcal{U}$, where

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_n(\mathbf{x})).$$

Then, a decision vector $\mathbf{x_u} \in \mathcal{U}$ is said to be Pareto-optimal if and only if there is no $\mathbf{x_v} \in \mathcal{U}$ for which $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x_v}) = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ *dominates* $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x_u}) = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$, that is, there is no $\mathbf{x_v} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, v_i \leq u_i \qquad \wedge \qquad \exists i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid v_i < u_i.$$

The set of all Pareto-optimal decision vectors is called the Pareto-optimal, efficient, or admissible set of the problem. The corresponding set of objective vectors is called the nondominated set. In practice, however, it is not unusual for these terms to be used interchangeably to describe solutions of a multiobjective optimization problem.

The notion of Pareto optimality is only a first step toward the practical solution of a multiobjective problem, which usually involves the choice of a *single* compromise solution from the nondominated set according to some preference information.

2.1 Plain Aggregating Approaches
Because evolutionary algorithms require scalar fitness information on which to work, a scalarization of the objective vectors is always necessary. In most problems where no global

criterion directly emerges from the problem formulation, objectives are often artificially combined, or aggregated, into a scalar function according to some understanding of the problem, and the EA is applied. Many such approaches developed for use with conventional optimizers can also be used with EAs.

Optimizing a combination of the objectives has the advantage of producing a single compromise solution, requiring no further interaction with the decision maker (DM). The problem is, if the optimal solution cannot be accepted, either due to the function used excluding aspects of the problem that were unknown prior to optimization or to an inappropriate setting of the coefficients of the combining function, new runs of the optimizer may be required until a suitable solution is found.

Several applications of evolutionary algorithms in the optimization of aggregating functions have been reported in the literature. A number of authors (Syswerda & Palmucci, 1991; Jakob, Gorges-Schleuter, & Blume, 1992; Jones, Brown, Clark, Willet, & Glen, 1993) provide examples of the use of the popular weighted-sum approach. Using target vector optimization, which consists of minimizing the distance in objective space to a given goal vector, Wienke, Lucasius, and Kateman (1992) report work on a problem in atomic emission spectroscopy. Goal attainment (Gembicki, 1974), a related technique that seeks to minimize the weighted difference between objective values and the corresponding goals, was used among other methods by Wilson and Macleod (1993), who also monitored the population for nondominated solutions. The use of multiple attribute utility analysis (MAUA) in conjunction with GAs has been suggested by Horn and Nafpliotis (1993), but without experimental results.

Handling constraints with penalty functions (Davis & Steenstrup, 1987; Goldberg, 1989) is yet another example of an additive aggregating function. The fact that penalty functions are generally problem dependent and, as a consequence, difficult to set (Richardson, Palmer, Liepins, & Hilliard, 1989) has prompted the development of alternative approaches based on ranking (Powell & Skolnick, 1993).

2.2   Population-Based Non-Pareto Approaches

Schaffer (1985, see also Schaffer & Grefenstette [1985]) was probably the first to recognize the possibility of exploiting EA populations to treat noncommensurable objectives separately and search for multiple nondominated solutions concurrently in a single EA run. In his approach, known as the Vector Evaluated Genetic Algorithm (VEGA), appropriate fractions of the next generation, or subpopulations, were selected from the whole of the old generation according to each of the objectives, separately. Crossover and mutation were applied as usual after shuffling all the subpopulations together. Nondominated individuals were identified by monitoring the population as it evolved, but this information was not used by the VEGA itself.

Shuffling and merging all subpopulations corresponds, however, to averaging the *normalized* fitness components associated with each of the objectives. In fact, the expected total number of offspring produced by each parent becomes the sum of the expected numbers of offspring produced by that parent according to each objective. Because Schaffer used proportional fitness assignment, these were, in turn, proportional to the objectives themselves. The resulting overall fitness corresponded, therefore, to a linear function of the objectives where the weights depended on the distribution of the population at each generation. This has previously been noted by Richardson et al. (1989) and confirmed by Schaffer (1993). As a consequence, different nondominated individuals were generally assigned different fitness values, in contrast with what the definition of nondominance would suggest.

The linear combination of the objectives implicitly performed by VEGA explains why the population tended to split into species particularly strong in each of the objectives in the case of concave trade-off surfaces, a phenomenon that Schaffer called *speciation*. In fact, points in concave regions of a trade-off surface cannot be found by optimizing a linear combination of the objectives, for *any* set of weights, as noted in Fleming and Pashkevich (1985).

Although VEGA, like the plain weighted-sum approach, is not well suited to address problems with concave trade-off surfaces, the weighting scheme it implicitly implements deserves closer attention. In VEGA, each objective is effectively weighted proportionally to the size of each subpopulation and, more importantly, proportionally to the inverse of the average fitness (in terms of that objective) of the whole population at each generation.

By doing so, and assuming that subpopulation sizes remain constant for each objective, VEGA selection adaptively attempts to balance improvement in the several objective dimensions, because more good performers in one objective cause the corresponding average performance to increase and that objective's weight to decrease accordingly. This is not unlike the way sharing techniques (Goldberg & Richardson, 1987, see below) promote the balanced exploitation of multiple optima in the search space. For the same reason, VEGA can, at least in some cases, maintain different species for many more generations than a GA optimizing a pure weighted sum of the same objectives with fixed weights would, due to genetic drift (Goldberg & Segrest, 1987). Unfortunately, the balance reached necessarily depends on the scaling of the objectives.

Fourman (1985) also addressed multiple objectives in a nonaggregating manner. Selection was performed by comparing pairs of individuals, each pair according to one of the objectives. In a first version of the algorithm, objectives were assigned different priorities by the user and individuals compared according to the objective with the highest priority. If this resulted in a tie, the objective with the second highest priority was used, and so on. This is known as the *lexicographic* ordering (Ben-Tal, 1980).

A second version, reported to work surprisingly well, consisted of randomly selecting the objective to be used in each comparison. Similarly to VEGA, this corresponds to averaging fitness across fitness components, each component being weighted by the probability of each objective being chosen to decide each tournament. However, the use of pairwise comparisons makes it essentially *different* from a linear combination of the objectives, because scale information is ignored. As tournaments constitute stochastic approximations to full ranking, the resulting fitness is closer to the ranking of the population according to each objective separately, and the consequent averaging of each individual's ranks. Thus, the population may still see as convex a trade-off surface actually concave, depending on its current distribution and, of course, on the problem.

Kursawe (1991) formulated a multiobjective version of evolution strategies (ESs). Once again, selection consisted of as many steps as there were objectives. At each step, one objective was selected randomly (with replacement) according to a probability vector, and used to dictate the deletion of an appropriate fraction of the current population. After selection, μ survivors became the parents of the next generation.

While Kursawe's implementation of multiobjective selection possesses a number of similarities to both VEGA and Fourman's second method, individuals in the extremes of the trade-off surface would appear to be likely to be eliminated as soon as any objective at which they perform poorly is selected to dictate deletion, whereas middling individuals seem to be more likely to survive. However, because objectives stand a certain chance of not taking part in selection at each generation, it is possible for some specialists to survive the

deletion process and generate offspring, although they may die immediately the generation after.

Kursawe (1991) notes that this deletion of individuals according to randomly chosen objectives creates a nonstationary environment in which the population, instead of converging, must try to adapt to constant change. As hinted above, different choices of objectives could result in significant changes in the cost landscape seen by the ES at each generation. Diploid individuals (Goldberg & Smith, 1987) were used for their improved ability to adapt to sudden environmental changes and, because the population was not expected to converge, a picture of the trade-off surface was produced from the points evaluated during the run.

Finally, and still based on the weighted-sum approach, Hajela and Lin (1992) exploited the explicit parallelism provided by a population-based search by explicitly including the weights in the chromosome and promoting their diversity in the population through fitness sharing. As a consequence, one family of individuals evolved for each weight combination, concurrently.

2.3 Pareto-Based Approaches

The methods of Schaffer, Fourman, Kursawe, and Hajela and Lin all attempt to promote the generation of multiple nondominated solutions, a goal at which they reportedly achieved a reasonable degree of success. However, none makes *direct* use of the actual definition of Pareto optimality. At most, the population is monitored for nondominated solutions, as in Schaffer (1985) and Kursawe (1991).

Pareto-based fitness assignment was first proposed by Goldberg (1989), as a means of assigning equal probability of reproduction to all nondominated individuals in the population. The method consisted of assigning rank 1 to the nondominated individuals and removing them from contention, then finding a new set of nondominated individuals, ranked 2, and so forth.

Fonseca and Fleming (1993) have proposed a slightly different scheme, whereby an individual's rank corresponds to the number of individuals in the current population by which it is dominated. Nondominated individuals are, therefore, all assigned the same rank, while dominated ones are penalized according to the population density in the corresponding region of the trade-off surface. The algorithm proceeds by sorting the population according to the multiobjective ranks previously determined. Fitness is assigned by interpolating, for instance, linearly, from the best to the worst individuals in the population, and then averaging it between individuals with the same multiobjective rank. Selection is performed with Baker's (1987) Stochastic Universal Sampling (SUS) algorithm. (Srinivas and Deb [1994] have implemented a similar sorting and fitness assignment procedure, but based on Goldberg's version of Pareto ranking.)

By combining Pareto dominance with partial preference information in the form of a goal vector, they have also provided a means of evolving only a given region of the trade-off surface. While the basic ranking scheme remains unaltered, the now Pareto-like comparison of the individuals selectively excludes those objectives that already satisfy their goals. Specifying fully unattainable goals causes objectives never to be excluded from comparison, which corresponds to the original Pareto ranking. Changing the goal values during the search alters the fitness landscape accordingly and allows the decision maker to direct the population to zoom in on a particular region of the trade-off surface.

Tournament selection based on Pareto dominance has also been proposed by Horn and Nafpliotis (1993, see also Horn, Nafpliotis, & Goldberg, 1994). In addition to the two individuals competing in each tournament, a number of other individuals in the *population were*

Figure 1. The concavity of the trade-off set is related to how the objectives are scaled.

used to help determine whether the competitors were dominated or not. In the case where both competitors were either dominated or nondominated, the result of the tournament was decided through sharing (see below).

Cieniawski (1993) and Ritzel, Eheart, and Ranjithan (1994) have implemented tournament selection based on Goldberg's Pareto-ranking scheme. In their approach, individual ranks were used to decide the winner of binary tournaments, which is in fact a stochastic approximation to the full sorting of the population, as performed by Fonseca and Fleming (1993) and Srinivas and Deb (1994).

The convexity of the trade-off surface depends on how the objectives are scaled. Nonlinearly rescaling the objective values may convert a concave surface into a convex one, and vice versa, as illustrated in Figure 1. The darker surface is the original, concave trade-off surface, corresponding to plotting $f_1(\mathbf{x})$ against $f_2(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x}$ denotes the vector of free variables. The lighter surfaces correspond to plotting $[f_1(\mathbf{x})]^\alpha$ against $[f_2(\mathbf{x})]^\alpha$, for $\alpha = 5$ and $\alpha = 9$, the latter being clearly convex. Nevertheless, all are formulations of the same minimization problem that admit exactly the same solution set in phenotypic space.

Because order is preserved by monotonic transformations such as these, Pareto ranking is blind to the convexity or the nonconvexity of the trade-off surface. This is not to say that Pareto ranking always precludes speciation. Speciation can still occur if certain regions of the trade-off are simply easier to find than others, but Pareto ranking does eliminate sensitivity to the possible nonconvexity of the trade-off.

A second possible advantage of Pareto ranking is that, because it rewards good performance in any objective dimension *regardless* of the others, solutions that exhibit good performance in many, if not all, objective dimensions are more likely to be produced by recombination. This argument also applies to an extent to the population-based methods described in Section 2.2, although they do not necessarily treat all nondominated individuals *equally*. The argument assumes some degree of independence between objectives, and was already hinted at by Schaffer in his VEGA work, and has been noted in more detail by Louis and Rawlins (1993). While Pareto-based selection may help find Utopian solutions if they

exist, that is rarely the case in multiobjective optimization. Also, the assumption of loosely coupled objectives is less likely to hold near the admissible region, but the argument may still be valid in the initial stages of the search.

2.4   Niche Induction Techniques

Pareto-based ranking correctly assigns all nondominated individuals the same fitness, but that, on its own, does not guarantee that the Pareto set be uniformly sampled. When presented with multiple equivalent optima, finite populations tend to converge to only one of them, due to stochastic errors in the selection process. This phenomenon, known as genetic drift (Goldberg & Segrest, 1987), has been observed in natural as well as in artificial evolution, and can also occur in Pareto-based evolutionary optimization.

The additional use of fitness sharing (Goldberg & Richardson, 1987; Deb & Goldberg, 1989) was proposed by Goldberg (1989) to prevent genetic drift and to promote the sampling of the whole Pareto set by the population. Fonseca and Fleming (1993) implemented fitness sharing in the objective domain and provided theory for estimating the necessary niche sizes based on the properties of the Pareto set. Horn and Nafpliotis (1993) also arrived at a form of fitness sharing in the objective domain. In addition, they suggested the use of a metric combining both the objective and the decision variable domains, leading to what they called nested sharing. Cieniawski (1993) performed sharing on a single-objective dimension, that in which diversity appeared to be more important. Srinivas and Deb (1994) performed sharing in the decision variable domain.

Although sharing has mainly been used together with Pareto ranking (Fonseca & Fleming, 1993; Cieniawski, 1993; Srinivas & Deb, 1994) and Pareto tournaments (Horn & Nafpliotis, 1993; Horn et al., 1994), it should be noted that Hajela and Lin (1992) had already implemented a form of sharing to stabilize the population around given regions of the trade-off surface. VEGA's selection has also been noted earlier in this work to implement a sort of sharing mechanism, well before "sharing" as such was introduced to GAs by Goldberg and Richardson (1987).

The viability of mating is another aspect that becomes relevant as the population distributes itself around multiple regions of optimality. Different regions of the trade-off surface may generally have very different genetic representations, which, to ensure viability, requires mating to happen only locally (Goldberg, 1989). So far, mating restriction has only been implemented based on the distance between individuals in the objective domain, either directly, by Fonseca and Fleming (1993), or indirectly, by Hajela and Lin (1992). Nevertheless, the use of mating restriction in multiobjective EAs does not appear to be widespread.

Both sharing and mating restriction in the objective domain necessarily combine objectives to produce a distance measure, which may appear to be in contradiction with the philosophy behind Pareto-based selection. However, the *uniform* sampling of the whole Pareto set is only a meaningful requirement for a given scaling of the objectives. Sharing in the phenotypic domain abandons this requirement and replaces it by the uniform sampling of the admissible set.

Sharing and Pareto selection should, ideally, have orthogonal effects: while Pareto selection promotes improvement by exerting a scale-independent selective pressure on the population in a direction normal to the trade-off surface, sharing should attempt to balance the distribution of the population along the front by applying a possibly scale-dependent, selective pressure tangentially to that surface.

Unfortunately, the possibility that sharing in the objective domain may, by concentrating search effort in some regions of the trade-off surface, favor improvement in those regions *to*

the detriment of others, cannot be discarded. Performing fitness sharing in decision variable space (Srinivas & Deb, 1994) would provide a selection mechanism truly independent from objective scaling, as long as guidelines for the setting of the sharing parameters in that domain in the multiobjective case could be developed.

Fortunately, such guidelines may be already available, although outside the EA community. In fact, if share count calculation in sharing is recognized to be no more than a form of *kernel density estimation* (Silverman, 1986) in n dimensions, well-studied heuristics for the setting of the corresponding smoothing parameter (read niche size) can suddenly be used. More advanced methods of density estimation, such as adaptive smoothing, also become available. Because those heuristics are based on the dimensionality of the space in which sharing is to be performed and on population statistics such as the sample covariance matrix, but not on the function to be optimized (such a function is outside the density estimation problem itself), they may well provide a much more general approach to niche size setting than the current one (Deb & Goldberg, 1989).

3. Discussion

The handling of multiple objectives strongly interacts with evolutionary computation on many fronts, raising issues that can generally be accommodated in one of two broad classes, fitness assignment and search strategies.

3.1 Fitness Assignment

The extension of evolutionary algorithms to the multiple objective case has mainly been concerned with multiobjective fitness assignment. According to how much preference information is incorporated in the fitness function, approaches range from complete preference information given, as when combining objective functions directly or prioritizing them, to no preference information given, as with Pareto-based ranking, and include the case where partial information is provided in order to restrict the search to only part of the Pareto set. Progressive refinement of partial preferences is also possible with EAs.

Independently of how much preference information is provided, the assigned fitness reflects a decision maker's understanding of the quality, or *utility*, of the points under assessment. Each selection step of an EA can be seen as a decision-making problem involving as many alternatives as there are individuals in the population.

The fitness landscape associated with a multiobjective problem clearly depends on the fitness assignment strategy used. Consider the simple bi-objective problem of simultaneously minimizing

$$f_1(x_1, x_2) = 1 - \exp\left(-(x_1 - 1)^2 - (x_2 + 1)^2\right)$$
$$f_2(x_1, x_2) = 1 - \exp\left(-(x_1 + 1)^2 - (x_2 - 1)^2\right).$$

Surface plots of these two objectives are shown in Figure 2. Note that the z-axis is inverted to facilitate the visualization. The corresponding trade-off surface is the one shown earlier in Figure 1 for $\alpha = 1$.

If individuals are ranked according to how many members of the population outperform them (Fonseca & Fleming, 1993), the ranking of a large, uniformly distributed population, normalized by the population size, can be interpreted as an estimate of the fraction of the search space that outperforms each particular point considered. (Global optima should be ranked zero.) This applies equally to single-objective ranking.

Figure 2. Surface plots of functions f_1 and f_2.


Figure 3. The cost landscapes defined by ranking each objective separately (and contour plots of the corresponding objective functions).

Plotting the normalized ranks against the decision variables, x_1 and x_2 in this case, produces an antifitness, or cost, landscape, from which the actual fitness landscape can be inferred. Clearly, as the population evolves, its distribution is no longer uniform and the cost landscape it induces will change dynamically. Nevertheless, the "static" landscapes considered here do provide insight into the different *selection mechanisms*. Such surfaces may also help *explain* the behavior of EAs based on those selection mechanisms, but they cannot be expected to be predictive of EA performance when considered in isolation.

Static cost landscapes for the example above are shown in Figures 4–7, corresponding to four different fitness assignment strategies based on ranking. The cost landscapes induced by ranking each objective separately are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 4 illustrates the single-objective ranking of the sum of the two objectives. The two peaks arise due to the problem exhibiting a concave trade-off surface. More importantly, these peaks would remain present (but would no longer be symmetric) if the objectives were weighted differently.

Although the surface in Figure 4 can only be seen as a (scaled) representation of the cost landscape induced by VEGA selection on a uniformly distributed population (because, in this case, the average performance of the population would be the same for both objectives, f_1 and f_2), it clearly illustrates how trade-off surface concavities lead to peaks in the cost surface obtained by linearly combining the objectives. Speciation in VEGA corresponds to the population distributing itself by these "persistent" peaks, in a balanced way: *Objectives*

Figure 6. The cost landscape defined by ranking the maximum of the two objectives.


Figure 7. The cost landscape defined by Pareto ranking.

where g_i are goals for the design objectives f_i, and $w_i \geq 0$ are weights that must be specified beforehand by the designer.

Finally, in Figure 7, Pareto ranking is used. Note how the Pareto-optimal set defines a ridge-shaped plateau in the cost landscape. As desired, this plateau includes all admissible solutions and, thus, all possible optima produced by any coordinatewise monotonic function of the objectives (Steuer, 1986), of which the methods in Figures 4–6 are just examples.

3.2 Search Strategies

The ridges defined in the fitness landscape by Pareto ranking and/or minimax approaches may not be parallel to any of the decision variable axes, or even follow a straight line. Although ridges, or equivalently, valleys, need not occur in single-objective optimization (Mühlenbein & Schlierkamp-Voosen, 1993), they do appear in this context, and can certainly be expected in almost any multiobjective problem.

Ridge-shaped plateaus raise two problems already encountered with other types of multimodality. First, genetic drift may lead to the poor sampling of the solution set. Fitness sharing has proved useful in addressing this problem, although it requires that a good closeness measure be found. Second, mating of well-performing individuals very different from one another may not be viable, that is, lead to the production of unfit offspring. Mating restriction in the objective domain, or the absence of mating altogether, interprets the individuals populating the Pareto front as a continuum of species. It seeks to reduce the formation of lethals by encouraging the formation of offspring similar to their parents, which means a

less exploratory search. This is the nonrandom mating strategy adopted by Hajela and Lin (1992) and Fonseca and Fleming (1993).

The alternative interpretation of the Pareto set as a genetically similar and, therefore, reproductively viable family of points would require the search for a suitable genetic representation in addition to the solution itself, because the location of the optima is not known prior to optimization. A fixed genetic representation also produces a reproductively viable family of points, but it does not necessarily correspond to the Pareto set.

Ridges impose a second type of difficulty. Theoretical results by Wagner (1988) show that, under biologically reasonable assumptions, the rate of progression of unconstrained phenotypes on certain types of ridge-shaped landscapes is bounded, in which case it decreases rapidly as the number of decision variables increases. Fast progression cannot be achieved unless the genetic operators tend to produce individuals that stay inside the corridor. The self-adaptation of mutation variances and correlated mutations (Bäck, Hoffmeister, & Schwefel, 1991), as implemented in evolution strategies, addresses this same problem, but has not yet been tried in Pareto-based search. Binary mutation, as usually implemented in genetic algorithms, can be particularly destructive if the ridge expresses a strong correlation between a large number of decision variables. The same applies to the discrete recombination of decision variables, because it can only produce offspring at vertices of the hypercube defined by the mating parents. Similarly, single and two-point crossover of concatenated binary strings will change, at most, one or two decision variables. Uniform crossover (Syswerda, 1989) and shuffle crossover (Caruana, Eshelman, & Schaffer, 1989) are less biased in this respect, in that the value of all decision variables may be altered in a single recombination step.

Finally, multiobjective fitness landscapes become nonstationary once the DM is allowed to interact with the search process and change the current preferences, even if the objective functions themselves remain unchanged. Diploidy has already revealed its importance in handling nonstationary environments (Goldberg & Smith, 1987). Other relevant work is the combination of evolutionary and pure random search proposed by Grefenstette (1992).

4. Future Perspectives

As discussed in the previous section, the EA can be seen as a sequence of decision-making problems, each involving a finite number of alternatives. Current decision-making theory, therefore, can certainly provide many answers on how to perform multiobjective selection in the context of EAs.

On the other hand, progress in decision making has always been strongly dependent on the power of the numerical techniques available to support it. Certain decision models, although simple to formulate, do not necessarily lead to numerically easy optimization problems (Dinkelbach, 1980). By easing the numerical difficulties inherent to other optimization methods, evolutionary algorithms open the way to the development of simpler, if not new, decision-making approaches.

A very attractive aspect of the multiobjective evolutionary approach is the production of useful intermediate information that can be used by an intelligent DM to refine preferences and terminate the search upon satisfaction. In fact, the DM is not only asked to assess individual performance, but also to adjust the current preferences in the search for a compromise between the ideal and the possible in a limited amount of time. Goal setting, for example, is itself the object of study (Shi & Yu, 1989). This is an area where combinations of EAs and other learning paradigms may be particularly appropriate.

As far as the search strategy is concerned, much work has certainly yet to be done. In particular, the emergence of niches in structured populations (Davidor, 1991) suggests the study of such models in the multiobjective case. The development of adaptive representations capable of capturing and exploiting directional trends in the fitness landscape, well advanced in the context of ESs, and/or the corresponding operators, is another important avenue for research. Combinations of genetic search and local optimization resulting in either Lamarckian or developmental Baldwin learning (Gruau & Whitley, 1993) may also provide a means of addressing the difficulties imposed by ridge-shaped landscapes.

The question of which fitness assignment method is better remains largely open, although Pareto-based methods seem more promising for their lack of sensitivity to the possible concavity of the trade-off surface. In the few comparative studies of multiobjective EAs available to date (Wilson & Macleod, 1993; Cieniawski, 1993; Ritzel et al., 1994; Srinivas & Deb, 1994), VEGA has understandably been a strong point of reference, but the comparison has remained largely qualitative. No extensive, quantitative comparison of multiobjective EAs has been reported in the literature so far, which is, however, hardly surprising. Ideally, the quality of every point of the trade-off surface produced should be assessed, meaning that the performance of multiobjective EAs is itself a vector quantity. So, how should the trade-off surfaces produced by *sets of runs* of different EAs be compared, in a meaningful and, preferably, statistically sound way? Should the scaling of the objectives affect the comparison? These questions still need to be answered.

In any case, the time may be right for EA users and implementors to consider experimenting with some of the available multiobjective EA techniques on their real-world problems, while not losing sight of any alternative approaches. However, a cautionary word is due here. As noted independently by Horn and Nafpliotis (1993) and Fonseca and Fleming (1993), *pure* Pareto EAs cannot be expected to perform well on problems involving many competing objectives and may simply fail to produce satisfactory solutions due to the large dimensionality and size of the trade-off surface. As the number of actually competing objectives increases, more and more of the search space can be expected to conform to the definition of Pareto optimality, which makes the "theoretical" problem of finding nondominated solutions easier! Unfortunately, in the total absence of preference information, the EA will face the "impossible" task of finding a satisfactory compromise in the dark, which can only occur by pure chance. It was the observation of this fact on real-world, engineering problems that prompted Fonseca and Fleming (1993) to combine preference articulation and Pareto ranking.

Finally, a theory of multiobjective EAs is much needed, ideally incorporating single-objective EAs as a particular case. The study of the fitness assigned to large populations as proposed in the previous section, but considering also nonuniform distributions for the population, may well prove useful in understanding how different selection mechanisms work, and indeed, how EAs based on them may behave, provided that the effect of mutation, recombination, and any other operators used, on the distribution of the population can be modeled as well.

Acknowledgment

Carlos M. Fonseca and Peter J. Fleming

provided by the anonymous reviewers in the preparation of the final manuscript is greatly appreciated.

References

Bäck, T., Hoffmeister, F., & Schwefel, H.-P. (1991). A survey of evolution strategies. In R. K. Belew and L. B. Booker (Eds.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference* (pp. 2–9). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Baker, J. E. (1987). Reducing bias and inefficiency in the selection algorithm. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and Their Applications: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 14–21). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ben-Tal, A. (1980). Characterization of Pareto and lexicographic optimal solutions. In G. Fandel and T. Gal (Eds.), *Multiple criteria decision making theory and application*, Vol. 177: *Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems* (pp. 1–11). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Caruana, R. A., Eshelman, L. J., & Schaffer, J. D. (1989). Representation and hidden bias II: Eliminating defining length bias in genetic search via shuffle crossover. In N. S. Sridharan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 750–755). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Cieniawski, S. E. (1993). *An investigation of the ability of genetic algorithms to generate the tradeoff curve of a multi-objective groundwater monitoring problem*. Master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Davidor, Y. (1991). A naturally occurring niche and species phenomenon: The model and first results. In R. K. Belew and L. B. Booker (Eds.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference* (pp. 257–263). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Davis, L. & Steenstrup, M. (1987). Genetic algorithms and simulated annealing: An overview. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and Simulated Annealing*, Research Notes in Artificial Intelligence (pp. 1–11). London: Pitman.

Deb, K. & Goldberg, D. E. (1989). An investigation of niche and species formation in genetic function optimization. In J. D. Schaffer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 42–50). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Dinkelbach, W. (1980). Multicriteria decision models with specified goal levels. In G. Fandel and T. Gal (Eds.), *Multiple criteria decision making theory and application*, Vol. 177: *Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems* (pp. 52–59). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Fleming, P. J. & Pashkevich, A. P. (1985). Computer aided control system design using a multiobjective optimization approach. In *Proceedings of the IEE Control '85 Conference* (pp. 174–179). London, UK: IEE.

Fonseca, C. M. & Fleming, P. J. (1993). Genetic algorithms for multi-objective optimization: Formulation, discussion and generalization. In S. Forrest (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference* (pp. 416–423). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Fourman, M. P. (1985). Compaction of symbolic layout using genetic algorithms. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and Their Applications: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 141–153). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gembicki, F. W. (1974). *Vector optimization for control with performance and parameter sensitivity indices*. Ph.D. thesis, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH.

Goldberg, D. E. (1989). *Genetic algorithms in search, optimization and machine learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Goldberg, D. E., & Richardson, J. (1987). Genetic algorithms with sharing for multimodal function optimization. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and their Applications: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 41–49). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goldberg, D. E., & Segrest, P. (1987). Finite Markov chain analysis of genetic algorithms. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and their Applications: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 1–8). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goldberg, D. E., & Smith, R. E. (1987). Nonstationary function optimization using genetic algorithms with dominance and diploidy. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and their Applications: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 59–68). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grefenstette, J. J. (1992). Genetic algorithms for changing environments. In R. Männer and B. Manderick (Eds.), *Parallel problem solving from nature, 2* (pp. 137–144). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Gruau, F., & Whitley, D. (1993). Adding learning to the cellular development of neural networks: Evolution and the Baldwin effect. *Evolutionary Computation, 1*(3), 213–233.

Hajela, P., & Lin, C.-Y. (1992). Genetic search strategies in multicriterion optimal design. *Structural Optimization, 4*, 99–107.

Horn, J., & Nafpliotis, N. (1993). Multiobjective optimization using the niched Pareto genetic algorithm. IlliGAL Report 93005, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Horn, J., Nafpliotis, N., & Goldberg, D. E. (1994). A niched Pareto genetic algorithm for multiobjective optimization. In *Proceedings of the First IEEE Conference on Evolutionary Computation, IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence*, vol. 1 (pp. 82–87). New York: IEEE.

Jakob, W., Gorges-Schleuter, M., & Blume, C. (1992). Application of genetic algorithms to task planning and learning. In R. Männer and B. Manderick (Eds.), *Parallel problem solving from nature, 2* (pp. 291–300). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Jones, G., Brown, R. D., Clark, D. E., Willet, P., & Glen, R. C. (1993). Searching databases of two-dimensional and three-dimensional chemical structures using genetic algorithms. In S. Forrest (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference* (pp. 597–602). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Kursawe, F. (1991). A variant of evolution strategies for vector optimization. In H.-P. Schwefel and R. Männer (Eds.), *Parallel problem solving from nature, 1st workshop, proceedings*, volume 496 of *Lecture notes in computer science* (pp. 193–197). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Louis, S. J., & Rawlins, G. J. E. (1993). Pareto optimality, GA-easiness and deception. In S. Forrest (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference* (pp. 118–123). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Mühlenbein, H., & Schlierkamp-Voosen, D. (1993). Predictive models for the breeder genetic algorithm: I. Continuous parameter optimization. *Evolutionary Computation, 1*(1), 25–49.

Powell, D., & Skolnick, M. M. (1993). Using genetic algorithms in engineering design optimization with non-linear constraints. In S. Forrest (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference* (pp. 424–431). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Richardson, J. T., Palmer, M. R., Liepins, G., & Hilliard, M. (1989). Some guidelines for genetic algorithms with penalty functions. In J. D. Schaffer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 191–197). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Ritzel, B. J., Eheart, J. W., & Ranjithan, S. (1994). Using genetic algorithms to solve a multiple objective groundwater pollution containment problem. *Water Resources Research, 30*(5), 1589–1603.

Schaffer, J. D. (1985). Multiple objective optimization with vector evaluated genetic algorithms. In J. J. Grefenstette (Ed.), *Genetic Algorithms and Their Applications: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 93–100). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schaffer, J. D. (1993). Personal communication.

Schaffer, J. D., & Grefenstette, J. J. (1985). Multi-objective learning via genetic algorithms. In A. Joshi (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 593–595). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Carlos M. Fonseca and Peter J. Fleming

Shi, Y., & Yu, P. L. (1989). Goal setting and compromise solutions. In B. Karpak and S. Zionts (Eds.), *Multiple criteria decision making and risk analysis using microcomputers*, vol. 56 of *NATO ASI series F: Computer and systems sciences* (pp. 165–204). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Silverman, B. W. (1986). *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*, vol. 26 of *Monographs on statistics and applied probability*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Srinivas, N., & Deb, K. (1994). Multiobjective optimization using nondominated sorting in genetic algorithms. *Evolutionary Computation*, 2(3), 221–248.

Steuer, R. E. (1986). *Multiple criteria optimization: Theory, computation, and application*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Syswerda, G. (1989). Uniform crossover in genetic algorithms. In J. D. Schaffer (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms* (pp. 2–9). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Syswerda, G., & Palmucci, J. (1991). The application of genetic algorithms to resource scheduling. In R. K. Belew and L. B. Booker (Eds.), *Genetic Algorithms: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference* (pp. 502–508). San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Wagner, G. P. (1988). The influence of variation and of developmental constraints on the rate of multivariate phenotypic evolution. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 1(1), 45–66.

Wienke, D., Lucasius, C., & Kateman, G. (1992). Multicriteria target vector optimization of analytical procedures using a genetic algorithm. Part I. Theory, numerical simulations and application to atomic emission spectroscopy. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 265(2), 211–225.

Wilson, P. B., & Macleod, M. D. (1993). Low implementation cost IIR digital filter design using genetic algorithms. In *IEE/IEEE Workshop on Natural Algorithms in Signal Processing*, vol. 1 (pp. 4/1–4/8). Chelmsford, UK: IEE.

This article has been cited by:

1. Indranil Pan, Saptarshi Das. 2013. Frequency domain design of fractional order PID controller for AVR system using chaotic multi-objective optimization. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* **51**, 106-118. [CrossRef]

2. Marco Campenní, Federico Cecconi. 2013. Quasi-PSO Algorithm for Modeling Foraging Dynamics in Social Mammals. *International Journal of Agent Technologies and Systems* **3**:1, 27-38. [CrossRef]

3. Qiuzhen Lin, Jianyong Chen. 2013. A novel micro-population immune multiobjective optimization algorithm. *Computers & Operations Research* **40**:6, 1590-1601. [CrossRef]

4. Elson Agastra, Giuseppe Pelosi, Stefano Selleri, Ruggero Taddei. 2013. Taguchi's method for multi-objective optimization problems. *International Journal of RF and Microwave Computer-Aided Engineering* **23**:3, 357-366. [CrossRef]

5. Michael M. Joly, Tom Verstraete, Guillermo Paniagua. 2013. Differential evolution based soft optimization to attenuate vane–rotor shock interaction in high-pressure turbines. *Applied Soft Computing* **13**:4, 1882-1891. [CrossRef]

6. Tina Comes, Niek Wijngaards, Frank SchultmannDesigning Distributed Multi-Criteria Decision Support Systems for Complex and Uncertain Situations 45-76. [CrossRef]

7. Vui Ann Shim, Kay Chen Tan, Jun Yong Chia, Abdullah Al Mamun. 2013. Multi-Objective Optimization with Estimation of Distribution Algorithm in a Noisy Environment. *Evolutionary Computation* **21**:1, 149-177. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

8. Khin Lwin, Rong Qu. 2013. A hybrid algorithm for constrained portfolio selection problems. *Applied Intelligence* . [CrossRef]

9. Ashkan Shokri, Omid Bozorg Haddad, Miguel A. Mariño. 2013. Algorithm for Increasing the Speed of Evolutionary Optimization and its Accuracy in Multi-objective Problems. *Water Resources Management* . [CrossRef]

10. Carlos R. García-Alonso, Pilar Campoy-Muñoz, Melania Salazar Ordoñez. 2013. A Multi-Objective Evolutionary Algorithm for enhancing Bayesian Networks hybrid-based modeling. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* . [CrossRef]

11. Sivakumar Ramakrishnan, Yahya Abu Hasan. 2013. Fuzzy preference-based multi-objective optimization method. *Artificial Intelligence Review* **39**:2, 165-181. [CrossRef]

12. Mohammad Reza Ghasemi, Amir Behshad. 2013. An Element-Free Galerkin-Based Multi-objective Optimization of Laminated Composite Plates. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **156**:2, 330-344. [CrossRef]

13. Xiang Li, Gang Du. 2013. BSTBGA: A hybrid genetic algorithm for constrained multi-objective optimization problems. *Computers & Operations Research* **40**:1, 282-302. [CrossRef]

14. Houssem Ben Aribia, Nizar Derbel, Hsan Hadj Abdallah. 2013. The active–reactive – Complete dispatch of an electrical network. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* **44**:1, 236-248. [CrossRef]

15. P.M. Reed, D. Hadka, J.D. Herman, J.R. Kasprzyk, J.B. Kollat. 2013. Evolutionary multiobjective optimization in water resources: The past, present, and future. *Advances in Water Resources* **51**, 438-456. [CrossRef]

16. C. A. Gilkeson, V. V. Toropov, H. M. Thompson, M. C.T. Wilson, N. A. Foxley, P. H. Gaskell. 2012. Multi-objective aerodynamic shape optimization of small livestock trailers. *Engineering Optimization* 1-22. [CrossRef]

17. Kwan-Soon Park, Seung-Yong Ok. 2012. Optimal design of actively controlled adjacent structures for balancing the mutually conflicting objectives in design preference aspects. *Engineering Structures* **45**, 213-222. [CrossRef]

18. F. Parvaresh, S.M. Moattar Husseini, S.A. Hashemi Golpayegany, B. Karimi. 2012. Hub network design problem in the presence of disruptions. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* . [CrossRef]

19. Dipankar Dutta, Jaya SilEvolution of Genetic Algorithms in Classification Rule Mining 328-363. [CrossRef]

20. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Jiaying Liang, András Bárdossy. 2012. Improving the calibration strategy of the physically-based model WaSiM-ETH using critical events. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* **57**:8, 1487-1505. [CrossRef]

21. Bibliography 273-283. [CrossRef]

22. G. Capi, K. Mitobe. 2012. Application of Evolutionary Algorithms for Humanoid Robot Motion Planning. *Journal of Information Technology Research* **3**:4, 21-33. [CrossRef]

23. A. Garcia-Piquer, A. Fornells, A. Orriols-Puig, G. Corral, E. Golobardes. 2012. Data classification through an evolutionary approach based on multiple criteria. *Knowledge and Information Systems* **33**:1, 35-56. [CrossRef]

24. Robert Carrese, Hadi Winarto, Xiaodong Li, András Sóbester, Samuel Ebenezer. 2012. A comprehensive preference-based optimization framework with application to high-lift aerodynamic design. *Engineering Optimization* **44**:10, 1209-1227. [CrossRef]

25. Luciana P. Assis, André L. Maravilha, Alessandro Vivas, Felipe Campelo, Jaime A. Ramírez. 2012. Multiobjective vehicle routing problem with fixed delivery and optional collections. *Optimization Letters* . [CrossRef]

26. Giuseppe Aiello, Giada La Scalia, Mario Enea. 2012. A multi objective genetic algorithm for the facility layout problem based upon slicing structure encoding. *Expert Systems with Applications* **39**:12, 10352-10358. [CrossRef]

27. P. Bieupoude, Y. Azoumah, P. Neveu. 2012. Optimization of drinking water distribution networks: Computer-based methods and constructal design. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **36**:5, 434-444. [CrossRef]

28. R. Narmatha Banu, D. Devaraj. 2012. Multi-objective GA with fuzzy decision making for security enhancement in power system. *Applied Soft Computing* **12**:9, 2756-2764. [CrossRef]

29. Simon Taylor. 2012. The ranking of negative-cost emissions reduction measures. *Energy Policy* **48**, 430-438. [CrossRef]

30. M. KanthababuMulti-Objective Optimization of Manufacturing Processes Using Evolutionary Algorithms 352-376. [CrossRef]

31. Young-Jin Cha, Yeesock KimComparative Study on Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms for Seismic Response Controls of Structures 333-358. [CrossRef]

32. Maxime Tye-Gingras, Louis Gosselin. 2012. Comfort and energy consumption of hydronic heating radiant ceilings and walls based on CFD analysis. *Building and Environment* **54**, 1-13. [CrossRef]

33. 2012. Ordered Incremental Multi-Objective Problem Solving Based on Genetic Algorithms. *International Journal of Applied Evolutionary Computation* **1**:2. . [CrossRef]

34. Francisco Ruiz, Mariano Luque, Kaisa Miettinen. 2012. Improving the computational efficiency in a global formulation (GLIDE) for interactive multiobjective optimization. *Annals of Operations Research* **197**:1, 47-70. [CrossRef]

35. Antanas Žilinskas. 2012. A statistical model-based algorithm for 'black-box' multi-objective optimisation. *International Journal of Systems Science* 1-12. [CrossRef]

36. Wenting Mo, Sheng-Uei Guan, Sadasivan PuthusserypadyOrdered Incremental Multi-Objective Problem Solving Based on Genetic Algorithms 72-98. [CrossRef]

37. M. A. Abido, N. A. Al-Ali. 2012. Multi-Objective Optimal Power Flow Using Differential Evolution. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering* **37**:4, 991-1005. [CrossRef]

38. G. V. Prasanna Kumar, H. Raheman. 2012. IDENTIFICATION OF OPTIMUM COMBINATION OF PROPORTION OF VERMICOMPOST IN THE SOIL-BASED POTTING MIX AND POT VOLUME FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PAPER POT SEEDLINGS OF VEGETABLES. *Journal of Plant Nutrition* **35**:9, 1277-1289. [CrossRef]

39. Marco Campenní, Federico CecconiQuasi-PSO Algorithm for Modeling Foraging Dynamics in Social Mammals 276-288. [CrossRef]

40. R. Cela, M.H. Bollaín. 2012. New cluster mapping tools for the graphical assessment of non-dominated solutions in multi-objective optimization. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **114**, 72-86. [CrossRef]

41. Ricardo Simpson, Alik AbakarovThermal Food Processing Optimization: Single and Multi-Objective Optimization Case Studies 167-189. [CrossRef]

42. Joanna Kołodziej, Samee Ullah Khan, Lizhe Wang, Albert Y. Zomaya. 2012. Energy efficient genetic-based schedulers in computational grids. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

43. Scott F. Page, Sheng Chen, Chris J. Harris, Neil M. White. 2012. Repeated weighted boosting search for discrete or mixed search space and multiple-objective optimisation. *Applied Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

44. Chin Wei Bong, Hong Yoong Lam, Ahamad Tajudin Khader, Hamzah Kamarulzaman. 2012. Adaptive multi-objective archive-based hybrid scatter search for segmentation in lung computed tomography imaging. *Engineering Optimization* **44**:3, 327-350. [CrossRef]

45. H. Chehade, A. Dolgui, F. Dugardin, L. Makdessian, F. Yalaoui. 2012. Multi-Objective Approach for Production Line Equipment Selection. *Management and Production Engineering Review* **3**:1, 4-17. [CrossRef]

46. M. KanthababuMulti-Objective Optimization of Manufacturing Processes Using Evolutionary Algorithms 44-66. [CrossRef]

47. Helon Vicente Hultmann Ayala, Leandro dos Santos Coelho. 2012. Tuning of PID controller based on a multiobjective genetic algorithm applied to a robotic manipulator. *Expert Systems with Applications* . [CrossRef]

48. Amani Bensghaier, Lotfi Romdhane, Fethi Benouezdou. 2012. Multi-objective optimization to predict muscle tensions in a pinch function using genetic algorithm. *Comptes Rendus Mécanique* . [CrossRef]

49. Abdullah Konak, Sadan Kulturel-Konak, Gregory Levitin. 2012. Multi-objective optimization of linear multi-state multiple sliding window system. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **98**:1, 24-34. [CrossRef]

50. C.W. Bong, M. Rajeswari. 2012. Multiobjective clustering with metaheuristic: current trends and methods in image segmentation. *IET Image Processing* **6**:1, 1. [CrossRef]

51. Genci Capi, Zulkifli Mohamed. 2012. Multiple Robots Formation–A Multiobjctive Evolution Approach. *Procedia Engineering* **41**, 156-162. [CrossRef]

52. Ian Tseng, Jonathan Cagan, Kenneth Kotovsky. 2012. Concurrent Optimization of Computationally Learned Stylistic Form and Functional Goals. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **134**:11, 111006. [CrossRef]

53. Cameron James Rye, Ian Willis, Neil Stuart Arnold, Jack Kohler. 2012. On the need for Automated Multi-Objective Optimization and Uncertainty Estimation of Glacier Mass Balance Models. *Journal of Geophysical Research* . [CrossRef]

54. B. Kadri, M. Brahimi, I. Elawady, I.K. Bousserhane, M. Bousahla, F.T. Bendimerad, S.M. Meriah. 2012. Fuzzy Genetic Versus PSO Algorithms for the Synthesis of Linear Antenna Array. *Procedia Engineering* **50**, 817-826. [CrossRef]

55. F. R. B. Cruz, G. Kendall, L. While, A. R. Duarte, N. L. C. Brito. 2012. Throughput Maximization of Queueing Networks with Simultaneous Minimization of Service Rates and Buffers. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering* **2012**, 1-19. [CrossRef]

56. Gürsel A. Süer, Arkopaul Sarkar, Aslican Arinsoy, Philip Appiah Kubi, Kevin Plis, Melih Altun. 2012. Evaluation of Feedback among Multiple Scheduler Profiles in Fuzzy Genetic Scheduling. *Procedia Computer Science* **12**, 129-134. [CrossRef]

57. Juan José Valera García, Vicente Gómez Garay, Eloy Irigoyen Gordo, Fernando Artaza Fano, Mikel Larrea Sukia. 2011. Intelligent Multi-Objective Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (iMO-NMPC): Towards the 'on-line' optimization of highly complex control problems. *Expert Systems with Applications* . [CrossRef]

58. Constantin Brif, Raj Chakrabarti, Herschel RabitzControl of Quantum Phenomena 1-76. [CrossRef]

59. Jei-Zheng Wu, Chen-Fu Chien, Mitsuo Gen. 2011. Coordinating strategic outsourcing decisions for semiconductor assembly using a bi-objective genetic algorithm. *International Journal of Production Research* 1-26. [CrossRef]

60. Ferrante Neri, Carlos Cotta. 2011. Memetic algorithms and memetic computing optimization: A literature review. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* . [CrossRef]

61. Taher Niknam, Mohammad rasool Narimani, Masoud Jabbari, Ahmad Reza Malekpour. 2011. A modified shuffle frog leaping algorithm for multi-objective optimal power flow. *Energy* . [CrossRef]

62. Bingqun Ren, Weizhou Zhong. 2011. Multi-objective Optimization using Chaos Based PSO. *Information Technology Journal* **10**:10, 1908-1916. [CrossRef]

63. D. Mokeddem, A. Khellaf. 2011. Optimal feeding profile for a fuzzy logic controller in a bioreactors using genetic algorithm. *Nonlinear Dynamics* . [CrossRef]

64. Musrrat Ali, P. Siarry, Millie Pant. 2011. An Efficient Differential Evolution Based Algorithm for Solving Multi-Objective Optimization Problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* . [CrossRef]

65. Gerard Briscoe, Suzanne Sadedin, Philippe Wilde. 2011. Digital Ecosystems: Ecosystem-Oriented Architectures. *Natural Computing* . [CrossRef]

66. Linzhong Liu, Haibo Mu, Xinfeng Yang, Ruichun He, Yinzhen Li. 2011. An oriented spanning tree based genetic algorithm for multi-criteria shortest path problems. *Applied Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

67. Arnaud Zinflou, Caroline Gagné, Marc Gravel. 2011. GISMOO: A new hybrid genetic/immune strategy for multiple-objective optimization. *Computers & Operations Research* . [CrossRef]

68. Parames Chutima, Palida Chimklai. 2011. Multi-objective two-sided mixed-model assembly line balancing using particle swarm optimisation with negative knowledge. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* . [CrossRef]

69. Monjur Mourshed, Shariful Shikder, Andrew D.F. Price. 2011. Phi-array: A novel method for fitness visualization and decision making in evolutionary design optimization. *Advanced Engineering Informatics* . [CrossRef]

70. Sandip Bhattacharya, Kamal Pal, Surjya K. Pal. 2011. Multi-sensor based prediction of metal deposition in pulsed gas metal arc welding using various soft computing models. *Applied Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

71. H.A. Mosalman Yazdi, N.H. Ramli Sulong. 2011. Genetic algorithm in locating the optimum mid-connection of Off-Centre braced system. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 1-10. [CrossRef]

72. David O. Olukanni, Joel J. Ducoste. 2011. Optimization of waste stabilization pond design for developing nations using computational fluid dynamics. *Ecological Engineering* . [CrossRef]

73. Chien-Ho Ko, Shu-Fan Wang. 2011. Precast production scheduling using multi-objective genetic algorithms. *Expert Systems with Applications* **38**:7, 8293-8302. [CrossRef]

74. Sun-Young Lee, Wonsuk Park, Seung-Yong Ok, Hyun-Moo Koh. 2011. Preference-based maintenance planning for deteriorating bridges under multi-objective optimisation framework. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* **7**:7, 633-644. [CrossRef]

75. E. Zio, G. Viadana. 2011. Optimization of the inspection intervals of a safety system in a nuclear power plant by Multi-Objective Differential Evolution (MODE). *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* . [CrossRef]

76. Dedi Liu, Shenglian Guo, Xiaohong Chen, Quanxi Shao, Qihua Ran, Xingyuan Song, Zhaoli Wang. 2011. A macro-evolutionary multi-objective immune algorithm with application to optimal allocation of water resources in Dongjiang River basins, South China. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* . [CrossRef]

77. Yumi Han, Changhyup Park, Joe M. Kang. 2011. Prediction of nonlinear production performance in waterflooding project using a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm. *Energy, Exploration & Exploitation* **29**:2, 129-142. [CrossRef]

78. Bo Liu, Ling Wang, Ying Liu, Shouyang Wang. 2011. A unified framework for population-based metaheuristics. *Annals of Operations Research* . [CrossRef]

79. P. Paul Pandian, S. Saravana Sankar, S. G. Ponnambalam, S. Bathrinath. 2011. Secondary population implementation in multi-objective evolutionary algorithm for scheduling of FMS. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* . [CrossRef]

80. Oliver Chikumbo, Ian Nicholas. 2011. Efficient thinning regimes for Eucalyptus fastigata: Multi-objective stand-level optimisation using the island model genetic algorithm. *Ecological Modelling* **222**:10, 1683-1695. [CrossRef]

81. Hang-Min Cho, Suk-Joo Bae, Jungwuk Kim, In-Jae Jeong. 2011. Bi-objective scheduling for reentrant hybrid flow shop using Pareto genetic algorithm. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* . [CrossRef]

82. SOUMIK CHOWHURY, P. V. VARDE. 2011. SURVEILLANCE TEST INTERVAL OPTIMIZATION FOR NUCLEAR PLANTS USING MULTI OBJECTIVE REAL PARAMETER GENETIC ALGORITHMS. *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering* **18**:02, 159-177. [CrossRef]

83. Kamal Pal, Sandip Bhattacharya, Surjya Pal. 2011. Optimisation of weld deposition efficiency in pulsed MIG welding using hybrid neuro-based techniques. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing* **24**:3, 198-210. [CrossRef]

84. Aimin Zhou, Bo-Yang Qu, Hui Li, Shi-Zheng Zhao, Ponnuthurai Nagaratnam Suganthan, Qingfu Zhang. 2011. Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: A survey of the state of the art. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* . [CrossRef]

85. D. Gladwin, P. Stewart, J. Stewart. 2011. Internal combustion engine control for series hybrid electric vehicles by parallel and distributed genetic programming/multiobjective genetic algorithms. *International Journal of Systems Science* **42**:2, 249-261. [CrossRef]

86. Yu Shi, Liming Yao, Jiuping Xu. 2011. A probability maximization model based on rough approximation and its application to the inventory problem. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **52**:2, 261-280. [CrossRef]

87. J. Y. Zhu, Steve P. Verrill, Hao Liu, Victoria L. Herian, Xuejun Pan, Donald L. Rockwood. 2011. On Polydispersity of Plant Biomass Recalcitrance and Its Effects on Pretreatment Optimization for Sugar Production. *BioEnergy Research* . [CrossRef]

88. Chin-Wei Bong, Mandava Rajeswari. 2011. Multi-objective nature-inspired clustering and classification techniques for image segmentation. *Applied Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

89. Oscar Altuzarra, C. Pinto, B. Sandru, A. Hernandez. 2011. Optimal Dimensioning for Parallel Manipulators: Workspace, Dexterity, and Energy. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **133**:4, 041007. [CrossRef]

90. Daniel S Himmelstein, Casey S Greene, Jason H Moore. 2011. Evolving hard problems: Generating human genetics datasets with a complex etiology. *BioData Mining* **4**:1, 21. [CrossRef]

91. Hossein Ghiasi, Damiano Pasini, Larry Lessard. 2011. A non-dominated sorting hybrid algorithm for multi-objective optimization of engineering problems. *Engineering Optimization* **43**:1, 39-59. [CrossRef]

92. Zhuhong Zhang, Shuqu Qian. 2010. Artificial immune system in dynamic environments solving time-varying non-linear constrained multi-objective problems. *Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

93. D. MOKEDDEM, A. KHELLAF. 2010. MULTICRITERIA OPTIMIZATION OF MULTIPRODUCT BATCH CHEMICAL PROCESS USING GENETIC ALGORITHM. *Journal of Food Process Engineering* **33**:6, 979-991. [CrossRef]

94. Kazuhiro Maeda, Yuya Fukano, Shunsuke Yamamichi, Daichi Nitta, Hiroyuki Kurata. 2010. An integrative and practical evolutionary optimization for a complex, dynamic model of biological networks. *Bioprocess and Biosystems Engineering* . [CrossRef]

95. Marta Carvalho, Jorge Ambrósio, Peter Eberhard. 2010. Identification of validated multibody vehicle models for crash analysis using a hybrid optimization procedure. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* . [CrossRef]

96. Luis A. Aguirre, Bruno H.G. Barbosa, Antônio P. Braga. 2010. Prediction and simulation errors in parameter estimation for nonlinear systems. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **24**:8, 2855-2867. [CrossRef]

97. Jianyong Chen, Qiuzhen Lin, Zhen Ji. 2010. Chaos-based multi-objective immune algorithm with a fine-grained selection mechanism. *Soft Computing* . [CrossRef]

98. Balram Suman, Nazish Hoda, Shweta Jha. 2010. Orthogonal simulated annealing for multiobjective optimization. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **34**:10, 1618-1631. [CrossRef]

99. Murat Koksalan, İbrahim Karahan. 2010. An Interactive Territory Defining Evolutionary Algorithm: iTDEA. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **14**:5, 702-722. [CrossRef]

100. Marta Carvalho, Jorge Ambrósio. 2010. Identification of multibody vehicle models for crash analysis using an optimization methodology. *Multibody System Dynamics* **24**:3, 325-345. [CrossRef]

101. Chuang-Kai Chiou, Judy C.R. Tseng, Gwo-Jen Hwang, Shelly Heller. 2010. An adaptive navigation support system for conducting context-aware ubiquitous learning in museums. *Computers & Education* **55**:2, 834-845. [CrossRef]

102. Ana Moura, Rui Rijo, Pedro Silva, Sidónio Crespo. 2010. A multi-objective genetic algorithm applied to autonomous underwater vehicles for sewage outfall plume dispersion observations. *Applied Soft Computing* **10**:4, 1119-1126. [CrossRef]

103. Pantelis G. Nikolakopoulos, Christos I. Papadopoulos, Lambros Kaiktsis. 2010. Elastohydrodynamic analysis and Pareto optimization of intact, worn and misaligned journal bearings. *Meccanica* . [CrossRef]

104. İbrahim Karahan, Murat Koksalan. 2010. A Territory Defining Multiobjective Evolutionary Algorithms and Preference Incorporation. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **14**:4, 636-664. [CrossRef]

105. Lily Rachmawati, Dipti Srinivasan. 2010. Incorporating the Notion of Relative Importance of Objectives in Evolutionary Multiobjective Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **14**:4, 530-546. [CrossRef]

106. Weiliang Zeng, Zhaocheng He, Ningning ChenA Multi-Objective Optimization Model and a Decision-Making Method for Traffic Signal Control 1507-1517. [CrossRef]

107. Jianyong Chen, Qiuzhen Lin, Zhen Ji. 2010. A hybrid immune multiobjective optimization algorithm. *European Journal of Operational Research* **204**:2, 294-302. [CrossRef]

108. Eugene Y. C. Wong, Henry Y. K. Lau, K. L. Mak. 2010. Immunity-based evolutionary algorithm for optimal global container repositioning in liner shipping. *OR Spectrum* **32**:3, 739-763. [CrossRef]

109. Multiobjective Optimization 231-246. [CrossRef]

110. Joao Zeferino, Antonio Antunes, Maria Cunha. 2010. Multi-objective model for regional wastewater systems planning. *Civil Engineering and Environmental Systems* **27**:2, 95-106. [CrossRef]

111. F.R.B. Cruz, T. Van Woensel, J. MacGregor Smith. 2010. Buffer and throughput trade-offs in M/G/1/ K queueing networks: A bi-criteria approach. *International Journal of Production Economics* **125**:2, 224-234. [CrossRef]

112. Ivanoe De Falco, Umberto Scafuri, Ernesto Tarantino. 2010. An adaptive multisite mapping for computationally intensive grid applications. *Future Generation Computer Systems* **26**:6, 857-867. [CrossRef]

113. Asish Kumar Sharma, Kyung Hyun Son, Bo Yong Han, Kee-Sun Sohn. 2010. Simultaneous Optimization of Luminance and Color Chromaticity of Phosphors Using a Nondominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm. *Advanced Functional Materials* n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

114. Sedat Şişbot, Özgü Turgut, Murat Tunç, Ünal Çamdalı. 2010. Optimal positioning of wind turbines on Gökçeada using multi-objective genetic algorithm. *Wind Energy* **13**:4, 297-306. [CrossRef]

115. Andrew Kusiak, Mingyang Li. 2010. Reheat optimization of the variable-air-volume box. *Energy* **35**:5, 1997-2005. [CrossRef]

116. Sean Ekins, J. Dana Honeycutt, James T. MetzMultiobjective Optimization for Drug Discovery . [CrossRef]

117. O. Yogev, A.A. Shapiro, E.K. Antonsson. 2010. Computational Evolutionary Embryogeny. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **14**:2, 301-325. [CrossRef]

118. Zhi-Hua Hu. 2010. A multiobjective immune algorithm based on a multiple-affinity model. *European Journal of Operational Research* **202**:1, 60-72. [CrossRef]

119. B. Soylu, M. Koksalan. 2010. A Favorable Weight-Based Evolutionary Algorithm for Multiple Criteria Problems. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **14**:2, 191-205. [CrossRef]

120. Chuan Shi, Zhenyu Yan, Zhongzhi Shi, Lei Zhang. 2010. A fast multi-objective evolutionary algorithm based on a tree structure. *Applied Soft Computing* **10**:2, 468-480. [CrossRef]

121. F. Cadini, E. Zio, C.A. Petrescu. 2010. Optimal expansion of an existing electrical power transmission network by multi-objective genetic algorithms#. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **95**:3, 173-181. [CrossRef]

122. Brandon K. Eames, Sandeep K. Neema, Rohit Saraswat. 2010. DesertFD: a finite-domain constraint based tool for design space exploration. *Design Automation for Embedded Systems* **14**:1, 43-74. [CrossRef]

123. Jiuping Xu, Lihui Zhao. 2010. A multi-objective decision-making model with fuzzy rough coefficients and its application to the inventory problem. *Information Sciences* **180**:5, 679-696. [CrossRef]

124. Yao-Nan Wang, Liang-Hong Wu, Xiao-Fang Yuan. 2010. Multi-objective self-adaptive differential evolution with elitist archive and crowding entropy-based diversity measure. *Soft Computing* **14**:3, 193-209. [CrossRef]

125. Junzhou Huo, Wei Sun, Jing Chen, Pengcheng Su, Liying Deng. 2010. Optimal disc cutters plane layout design of the full-face rock tunnel boring machine (tbm) based on a multi-objective genetic algorithm. *Journal of Mechanical Science and Technology* **24**:2, 521-528. [CrossRef]

126. Deyan Luan, Fania Szlam, Kenichi A. Tanaka, Philip S. Barie, Jeffrey D. Varner. 2010. Ensembles of uncertain mathematical models can identify network response to therapeutic interventions. *Molecular BioSystems* **6**:11, 2272. [CrossRef]

127. R. S. Gad, J. S. Parab, G. M. Naik. 2010. Note: Multivariate system spectroscopic model using Lorentz oscillators and partial least squares regression analysis. *Review of Scientific Instruments* **81**:11, 116103. [CrossRef]

128. Jesica de Armas, Coromoto Leon, Gara Miranda, Carlos Segura. 2010. Optimisation of a multi-objective two-dimensional strip packing problem based on evolutionary algorithms. *International Journal of Production Research* **48**:7, 2011-2028. [CrossRef]

129. Jiaquan Gao, Jun Wang. 2010. WBMOAIS: A novel artificial immune system for multiobjective optimization. *Computers & Operations Research* **37**:1, 50-61. [CrossRef]

130. D. Mokeddem, A. Khellaf. 2010. Optimal feeding profile in fed-batch bioreactors using a genetic algorithm. *International Journal of Production Research* **48**:20, 6125-6135. [CrossRef]

131. Yu-Tai Lee, Vineet Ahuja, Ashvin Hosangadi, Michael Ebert. 2010. Shape Optimization of a Multi-Element Foil Using an Evolutionary Algorithm. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **132**:5, 051401. [CrossRef]

132. Tansel Özyer, Reda Alhajj. 2009. Parallel clustering of high dimensional data by integrating multi-objective genetic algorithm with divide and conquer. *Applied Intelligence* **31**:3, 318-331. [CrossRef]

133. H. Mosalman Yazdi, N.H. Ramli Sulong. 2009. Eccentricity Optimization of NGB System by using Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm. *Journal of Applied Sciences* **9**:19, 3502-3512. [CrossRef]

134. A. Abakarov, Y. Sushkov, S. Almonacid, R. Simpson. 2009. Multiobjective Optimization Approach: Thermal Food Processing. *Journal of Food Science* **74**:9, E471-E487. [CrossRef]

135. Zhe Wei, Dandan Yang, Xiaoyi Wang, Jinlong Wang. 2009. Multi-objectives optimal model of heavy equipment using improved Strength Pareto Evolutionary Algorithm. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **45**:3-4, 389-396. [CrossRef]

136. Avijit Maji, Manoj K. Jha. 2009. Multi-objective highway alignment optimization using a genetic algorithm. *Journal of Advanced Transportation* **43**:4, 481-504. [CrossRef]

137. Dimitrios Tzimeas, Eleni Mangina. 2009. Dynamic Techniques for Genetic Algorithm–Based Music Systems. *Computer Music Journal* **33**:3, 45-60. [Citation] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

138. Andy J Keane, Don R Jones, Jamshid A Samareh, Andrew J Booker, A A Giunta, M Emmerich. 2009. Comparison of Several Optimization Strategies for Robust Turbine Blade Design. *Journal of Propulsion and Power* **25**:5, 1092-1099. [CrossRef]

139. Q Li, J-C Zhao, B Zhao, X-S Zhu. 2009. Parameter optimization of a hydraulic engine mount based on a genetic neural network. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering* **223**:9, 1109-1117. [CrossRef]

140. Joshua S. Petko, Douglas H. Werner. 2009. Interleaved Ultrawideband Antenna Arrays Based on Optimized Polyfractal Tree Structures. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* **57**:9, 2622-2632. [CrossRef]

141. G. Georgiou, S. Natsiavas. 2009. Optimal selection of suspension parameters in large scale vehicle models. *Vehicle System Dynamics* **47**:9, 1147-1166. [CrossRef]

142. K. Tesch, M. A. Atherton, T. G. Karayiannis, M. W. Collins, P. Edwards. 2009. Determining heat transfer coefficients using evolutionary algorithms. *Engineering Optimization* **41**:9, 855-870. [CrossRef]

143. Jiuping Xu, Xiaoyang Zhou. 2009. A class of multi-objective expected value decision-making model with birandom coefficients and its application to flow shop scheduling problem. *Information Sciences* **179**:17, 2997-3017. [CrossRef]

144. COROMOTO LEÓN, GARA MIRANDA, CARLOS SEGURA. 2009. METCO: A PARALLEL PLUGIN-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR MULTI-OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools* **18**:04, 569-588. [CrossRef]

145. Jiuping Xu, Liming Yao. 2009. A class of expected value multi-objective programming problems with random rough coefficients. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* **50**:1-2, 141-158. [CrossRef]

146. Asish Kumar Sharma, Chandramouli Kulshreshtha, Kee-Sun Sohn. 2009. Discovery of New Green Phosphors and Minimization of Experimental Inconsistency Using a Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm-Assisted Combinatorial Method. *Advanced Functional Materials* **19**:11, 1705-1712. [CrossRef]

147. E CHEN, L LEE. 2009. A multi-objective selection procedure of determining a Pareto set. *Computers & Operations Research* **36**:6, 1872-1879. [CrossRef]

148. Jose Antonio Martin H., Javier de Lope. 2009. A model for the dynamic coordination of multiple competing goals. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence* **21**:2, 123-136. [CrossRef]

149. Dimo Brockhoff, Tobias Friedrich, Nils Hebbinghaus, Christian Klein, Frank Neumann, Eckart Zitzler. 2009. On the Effects of Adding Objectives to Plateau Functions. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **13**:3, 591-603. [CrossRef]

150. H Park, N-S Kwak, J Lee. 2009. A method of multiobjective optimization using a genetic algorithm and an artificial immune system. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part C: Journal of Mechanical Engineering Science* **223**:5, 1243-1252. [CrossRef]

151. Michael J. Watts. 2009. A Decade of Kasabov's Evolving Connectionist Systems: A Review. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)* **39**:3, 253-269. [CrossRef]

152. Avinash Unnikrishnan, Varunraj Valsaraj, Ivan Damnjanovic, S. Travis Waller. 2009. Design and Management Strategies for Mixed Public Private Transportation Networks: A Meta-Heuristic Approach. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering* **24**:4, 266-279. [CrossRef]

153. Louis Gosselin, Maxime Tye-Gingras, François Mathieu-Potvin. 2009. Review of utilization of genetic algorithms in heat transfer problems. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* **52**:9-10, 2169-2188. [CrossRef]

154. Hong-Zhong Huang, Jian Qu, Ming Zuo. 2009. Genetic-algorithm-based optimal apportionment of reliability and redundancy under multiple objectives. *IIE Transactions* **41**:4, 287-298. [CrossRef]

155. Ekaterina J. Vladislavleva, Guido F. Smits, Dick den Hertog. 2009. Order of Nonlinearity as a Complexity Measure for Models Generated by Symbolic Regression via Pareto Genetic Programming. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **13**:2, 333-349. [CrossRef]

156. R PERERA, S FANG, C HUERTA. 2009. Structural crack detection without updated baseline model by single and multiobjective optimization. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing* **23**:3, 752-768. [CrossRef]

157. Minqiang Li, Liu Liu, Dan Lin. 2009. A fast steady-state ε-dominance multi-objective evolutionary algorithm. *Computational Optimization and Applications* . [CrossRef]

158. S. Ramabalan, R. Saravanan, C. Balamurugan. 2009. Multi-objective dynamic optimal trajectory planning of robot manipulators in the presence of obstacles. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **41**:5-6, 580-594. [CrossRef]

159. E ZIO, P BARALDI, N PEDRONI. 2009. Optimal power system generation scheduling by multi-objective genetic algorithms with preferences. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **94**:2, 432-444. [CrossRef]

160. Jie Hu, Yinghong Peng, Guangleng Xiong. 2009. Robust decision and optimisation for collaborative parameter design. *International Journal of Computer Applications in Technology* **36**:3/4, 172. [CrossRef]

161. Diab Mokeddem, Abdelhafid Khellaf. 2009. Optimal Solutions of Multiproduct Batch Chemical Process Using Multiobjective Genetic Algorithm with Expert Decision System. *Journal of Automated Methods and Management in Chemistry* **2009**, 1-9. [CrossRef]

162. Textile product design analysis and modeling 112-162. [CrossRef]

163. Vincent Beltrani, Pritha Ghosh, Herschel Rabitz. 2009. Exploring the capabilities of quantum optimal dynamic discrimination. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **130**:16, 164112. [CrossRef]

164. O. Feyzioglu, H. Pierreval. 2009. Hybrid organization of functional departments and manufacturing cells in the presence of imprecise data. *International Journal of Production Research* **47**:2, 343-368. [CrossRef]

165. Ngai M. Kwok, Q. P. Ha, Dikai Liu, Gu Fang. 2009. Contrast Enhancement and Intensity Preservation for Gray-Level Images Using Multiobjective Particle Swarm Optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering* **6**:1, 145-155. [CrossRef]

166. Amit Dolev, Yohay Carmel. 2009. Distribution of threatened-unprotected vertebrates as a basis for conservation planning. *Israel Journal of Ecology & Evolution* **55**:2, 117-132. [CrossRef]

167. Yi Ping Du, Yukihiro Ozaki, Katsuhiko Maruo, Hideyuki Shinzawa, Ilya FineIn Vivo Nondestructive Measurement of Blood Glucose by Near-Infrared Diffuse-Reflectance Spectroscopy **20082359**, 205-236. [CrossRef]

168. C MENCAR, A FANELLI. 2008. Interpretability constraints for fuzzy information granulation. *Information Sciences* **178**:24, 4585-4618. [CrossRef]

169. L PODOFILLINI, E ZIO. 2008. Designing a risk-informed balanced system by genetic algorithms: Comparison of different balancing criteria. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **93**:12, 1842-1852. [CrossRef]

170. S. Agrawal, B.K. Panigrahi, M.K. Tiwari. 2008. Multiobjective Particle Swarm Algorithm With Fuzzy Clustering for Electrical Power Dispatch. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **12**:5, 529-541. [CrossRef]

171. P. Koduru, Zhanshan Dong, S. Das, S.M. Welch, J.L. Roe, E. Charbit. 2008. A Multiobjective Evolutionary-Simplex Hybrid Approach for the Optimization of Differential Equation Models of Gene Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **12**:5, 572-590. [CrossRef]

172. L LEE, E CHEW, S TENG, Y CHEN. 2008. Multi-objective simulation-based evolutionary algorithm for an aircraft spare parts allocation problem. *European Journal of Operational Research* **189**:2, 476-491. [CrossRef]

173. Seung-Yong Ok, Junho Song, Kwan-Soon Park. 2008. Optimal performance design of bi-Tuned Mass Damper systems using multi-objective optimization. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering* **12**:5, 313-322. [CrossRef]

174. E. Zio, P. Baraldi, G. Gola. 2008. Feature-based classifier ensembles for diagnosing multiple faults in rotating machinery. *Applied Soft Computing* **8**:4, 1365-1380. [CrossRef]

175. Lina Perelman, Avi Ostfeld, Elad Salomons. 2008. Cross Entropy multiobjective optimization for water distribution systems design. *Water Resources Research* **44**:9, n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

176. Ivan Blecic, Arnaldo Cecchini, Clara Pusceddu. 2008. Constructing strategies in strategic planning: a decision support evaluation model. *Operational Research* **8**:2, 153-166. [CrossRef]

177. MaoGuo Gong, LiCheng Jiao, WenPing Ma, HaiFeng Du. 2008. Multiobjective optimization using an immunodominance and clonal selection inspired algorithm. *Science in China Series F: Information Sciences* **51**:8, 1064-1082. [CrossRef]

178. Arnaud Zinflou, Caroline Gagné, Marc Gravel, Wilson L. Price. 2008. Pareto memetic algorithm for multiple objective optimization with an industrial application. *Journal of Heuristics* **14**:4, 313-333. [CrossRef]

179. Jagu Rao, Rajiv Tiwari. 2008. Optimum Design and Analysis of Thrust Magnetic Bearings Using Multi Objective Genetic Algorithms. *International Journal for Computational Methods in Engineering Science and Mechanics* **9**:4, 223-245. [CrossRef]

180. H ISHIBUCHI, K NARUKAWA, N TSUKAMOTO, Y NOJIMA. 2008. An empirical study on similarity-based mating for evolutionary multiobjective combinatorial optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research* **188**:1, 57-75. [CrossRef]

181. Mitsuo Gen, Lin LinGenetic Algorithms . [CrossRef]

182. Maoguo Gong, Licheng Jiao, Haifeng Du, Liefeng Bo. 2008. Multiobjective Immune Algorithm with Nondominated Neighbor-Based Selection. *Evolutionary Computation* **16**:2, 225-255. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

183. Elizabeth F. Wanner, Frederico G. Guimarães, Ricardo H. C. Takahashi, Peter J. Fleming. 2008. Local Search with Quadratic Approximations into Memetic Algorithms for Optimization with Multiple Criteria. *Evolutionary Computation* **16**:2, 185-224. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

184. Elizabeth F. Wanner, Frederico G. Guimares, Ricardo H. C. Takahashi, David A. Lowther, Jaime A. Ramirez. 2008. Multiobjective Memetic Algorithms With Quadratic Approximation-Based Local Search for Expensive Optimization in Electromagnetics. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **44**:6, 1126-1129. [CrossRef]

185. Essia Znouda, Nadia Ghrab-Morcos, Atidel B Hadj-Alouane. 2008. Multiobjective Optimization of Mediterranean Building Design. *Journal of Decision System* **17**:2, 245-268. [CrossRef]

186. 2008. Multi-Objective Integrated Optimal Design of Hybrid Structure-Damper System Satisfying Target Reliability. *Journal of the Earthquake Engineering Society of Korea* **12**:2, 9-22. [CrossRef]

187. Lina Makdessian, Farouk Alaoui, Alexandre Dolgui. 2008. Optimisation de lignes de production. Partie II. Une approche multicritère. *Journal of Decision System* **17**:3, 337-368. [CrossRef]

188. Taohong Zhang, Linxin Li, Fujun Liang, Bingru Yang. 2008. Parameter optimization of laser die-surface hardening using the particle swarm optimization technique. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **36**:11-12, 1104-1112. [CrossRef]

189. M KILIC, G ULUSOY, F SERIFOGLU. 2008. A bi-objective genetic algorithm approach to risk mitigation in project scheduling. *International Journal of Production Economics* **112**:1, 202-216. [CrossRef]

190. Luiz Duczmal, André L. F Cançado, Ricardo H. C Takahashi. 2008. Delineation of Irregularly Shaped Disease Clusters Through Multiobjective Optimization. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **17**:1, 243-262. [CrossRef]

191. E Zio, L Podofillini. 2008. Integrated optimization of system design and spare parts allocation by means of multiobjective genetic algorithms and Monte Carlo simulation. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part O: Journal of Risk and Reliability* **221**:1, 67-84. [CrossRef]

192. G. S. Dulikravich, R. J. Moral, Achille Messac, Marcelo Colaco, William Annicchiarico, Igor N. Egorov, Shigeru Obayashi. 2008. Multi-Objective Hybrid Evolutionary Optimization with Automatic Switching Among Constituent Algorithms. *AIAA Journal* **46**:3, 673-681. [CrossRef]

193. Mohammed Khabzaoui, Clarisse Dhaenens, El-Ghazali Talbi. 2008. Combining evolutionary algorithms and exact approaches for multi-objective knowledge discovery. *Operations Research* **42**:1, 69-83. [CrossRef]

194. Luisa Caldas. 2008. Generation of energy-efficient architecture solutions applying GENE_ARCH: An evolution-based generative design system. *Advanced Engineering Informatics* **22**:1, 59-70. [CrossRef]

195. B. Huang, P. Fery, L. Xue, Y. Wang. 2008. Seeking the Pareto front for multiobjective spatial optimization problems. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* **22**:5, 507-526. [CrossRef]

196. S.R. Yadav, Yogesh Dashora, Ravi Shankar, Felix. T.S. Chan, M.K. Tiwari. 2008. An interactive particle swarm optimisation for selecting a product family and designing its supply chain. *International Journal of Computer Applications in Technology* **31**:3/4, 168. [CrossRef]

197. Ami Preis, Avi Ostfeld. 2008. Multiobjective Contaminant Sensor Network Design for Water Distribution Systems. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* **134**:4, 366. [CrossRef]

198. Valceres V.R. Silva, Peter J. Fleming, Jungiro Sugimoto, Ryuichi Yokoyama. 2008. Multiobjective optimization using variable complexity modelling for control system design. *Applied Soft Computing* **8**:1, 392-401. [CrossRef]

199. A DIETZ, A AGUILARLASSERRE, C AZZAROPANTEL, L PIBOULEAU, S DOMENECH. 2008. A fuzzy multiobjective algorithm for multiproduct batch plant: Application to protein production. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **32**:1-2, 292-306. [CrossRef]

200. Joshua S. Petko, Douglas H. Werner. 2008. The Pareto Optimization of Ultrawideband Polyfractal Arrays. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* **56**:1, 97-107. [CrossRef]

201. Sanjoy Das, Balasubramaniam Natarajan, Daniel Stevens, Praveen Koduru. 2008. Multi-objective and constrained optimization for DS-CDMA code design based on the clonal selection principle. *Applied Soft Computing* **8**:1, 788-797. [CrossRef]

202. Genci Capi. 2007. Multiobjective Evolution of Neural Controllers and Task Complexity. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics* **23**:6, 1225-1234. [CrossRef]

203. Tim R. Newman, Brett A. Barker, Alexander M. Wyglinski, Arvin Agah, Joseph B. Evans, Gary J. Minden. 2007. Cognitive engine implementation for wireless multicarrier transceivers. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* **7**:9, 1129-1142. [CrossRef]

204. Peter J. Fleming, Maksim A. Pashkevich. 2007. Optimal Advertising Campaign Generation for Multiple Brands Using MOGA. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)* **37**:6, 1190-1201. [CrossRef]

205. A.J Keane, J.P Scanlan. 2007. Design search and optimization in aerospace engineering. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **365**:1859, 2501-2529. [CrossRef]

206. F GUIMARAES, R PALHARES, F CAMPELO, H IGARASHI. 2007. Design of mixed H2/H∞ control systems using algorithms inspired by the immune system. *Information Sciences* **177**:20, 4368-4386. [CrossRef]

207. E ZIO, L PODOFILLINI. 2007. Importance measures and genetic algorithms for designing a risk-informed optimally balanced system. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **92**:10, 1435-1447. [CrossRef]

208. H SATO, H AGUIRRE, K TANAKA. 2007. Local dominance and local recombination in MOEAs on 0/1 multiobjective knapsack problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* **181**:3, 1708-1723. [CrossRef]

209. Andrew Kusiak, Filippo A. Salustri. 2007. Computational Intelligence in Product Design Engineering: Review and Trends. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)* **37**:5, 766-778. [CrossRef]

210. L. N. Pattanaik, P. K. Jain, N. K. Mehta. 2007. Cell formation in the presence of reconfigurable machines. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **34**:3-4, 335-345. [CrossRef]

211. Fabio Giudice, Giovanna Fargione. 2007. Disassembly planning of mechanical systems for service and recovery: a genetic algorithms based approach. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* **18**:3, 313-329. [CrossRef]

212. Yandra, Hiroyuki Tamura. 2007. A new multiobjective genetic algorithm with heterogeneous population for solving flowshop scheduling problems. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing* **20**:5, 465-477. [CrossRef]

213. A. T. Machwe, I. C. Parmee. 2007. Multi-objective analysis of a component-based representation within an interactive evolutionary design system. *Engineering Optimization* **39**:5, 591-613. [CrossRef]

214. Cesar Sanin, Edward Szczerbicki. 2007. GENETIC ALGORITHMS FOR DECISIONAL DNA: SOLVING SETS OF EXPERIENCE KNOWLEDGE STRUCTURE. *Cybernetics and Systems* **38**:5, 475-494. [CrossRef]

215. Z ZHANG. 2007. Immune optimization algorithm for constrained nonlinear multiobjective optimization problems. *Applied Soft Computing* **7**:3, 840-857. [CrossRef]

216. B. Sirinaovakul, T. Limudomsuk. 2007. Maximum weight matching and genetic algorithm for fixed-shape facility layout problem. *International Journal of Production Research* **45**:12, 2655-2672. [CrossRef]

217. E PIRES, P DEMOURAOLIVEIRA, J MACHADO. 2007. Manipulator trajectory planning using a MOEA. *Applied Soft Computing* **7**:3, 659-667. [CrossRef]

218. Marco Cococcioni, Pietro Ducange, Beatrice Lazzerini, Francesco Marcelloni. 2007. A Pareto-based multi-objective evolutionary approach to the identification of Mamdani fuzzy systems. *Soft Computing* **11**:11, 1013-1031. [CrossRef]

219. L CHEN, J MCPHEE, W YEH. 2007. A diversified multiobjective GA for optimizing reservoir rule curves. *Advances in Water Resources* **30**:5, 1082-1093. [CrossRef]

220. S. Besset, L. Jézéquel. 2007. Optimization of structural dynamic behaviour based on effective modal parameters. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **70**:5, 523-542. [CrossRef]

221. S ELAOUD, T LOUKIL, J TEGHEM. 2007. The Pareto fitness genetic algorithm: Test function study. *European Journal of Operational Research* **177**:3, 1703-1719. [CrossRef]

222. G QUAN, G GREENWOOD, D LIU, S HU. 2007. Searching for multiobjective preventive maintenance schedules: Combining preferences with evolutionary algorithms. *European Journal of Operational Research* **177**:3, 1969-1984. [CrossRef]

223. Ivan Blecic, Arnaldo Cecchini, Giuseppe A. Trunfio. 2007. A decision support tool coupling a causal model and a multi-objective genetic algorithm. *Applied Intelligence* **26**:2, 125-137. [CrossRef]

224. Pushpen Biswas, Purnendu Bose, Vinod Tare. 2007. Optimal choice of wastewater treatment train by multi-objective optimization. *Engineering Optimization* **39**:2, 125-145. [CrossRef]

225. T HANNE. 2007. A multiobjective evolutionary algorithm for approximating the efficient set. *European Journal of Operational Research* **176**:3, 1723-1734. [CrossRef]

226. I TOROSLU, Y ARSLANOGLU. 2007. Genetic algorithm for the personnel assignment problem with multiple objectives. *Information Sciences* **177**:3, 787-803. [CrossRef]

227. Brian J. Ross, Eduardo Zuviria. 2007. Evolving dynamic Bayesian networks with Multi-objective genetic algorithms. *Applied Intelligence* **26**:1, 13-23. [CrossRef]

228. Antonio J. Nebro, Enrique Alba, Francisco Luna. 2007. Multi-Objective Optimization using Grid Computing. *Soft Computing* **11**:6, 531-540. [CrossRef]

229. M K Pandey, M K Tiwari, M J Zuo. 2007. Interactive enhanced particle swarm optimization: a multi-objective reliability application. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part O: Journal of Risk and Reliability* **221**:3, 177-191. [CrossRef]

230. A. R. Rao, J. P. Scanlan, A. J. Keane. 2007. Applying Multiobjective Cost and Weight Optimization to the Initial Design of Turbine Disks. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **129**:12, 1303. [CrossRef]

231. G. Georgiou, G. Verros, S. Natsiavas. 2007. Multi-objective optimization of quarter-car models with a passive or semi-active suspension system. *Vehicle System Dynamics* **45**:1, 77-92. [CrossRef]

232. P. K. Mashood, C. S. Krishnamoorthy, K. Ramamurthy. 2007. KB-GA-Based Hybrid System for Layout Planning of Multistory Buildings. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering* **21**:4, 229. [CrossRef]

233. Lin Liu, Han-yu Gu, Yu-geng Xi. 2006. Robust and stable scheduling of a single machine with random machine breakdowns. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **31**:7-8, 645-654. [CrossRef]

234. Fabio Freschi, Maurizio Repetto. 2006. VIS: An artificial immune network for multi-objective optimization. *Engineering Optimization* **38**:8, 975-996. [CrossRef]

235. ASHWIN GURNANI, SCOTT FERGUSON, KEMPER LEWIS, JOSEPH DONNDELINGER. 2006. A constraint-based approach to feasibility assessment in preliminary design. *AI EDAM* **20**:04. . [CrossRef]

236. M. Janga Reddy, D. Nagesh Kumar. 2006. Optimal Reservoir Operation Using Multi-Objective Evolutionary Algorithm. *Water Resources Management* **20**:6, 861-878. [CrossRef]

237. Carlo Meloni, David Naso, Biagio Turchiano. 2006. Setup coordination between two stages of a production system: A multi-objective evolutionary approach. *Annals of Operations Research* **147**:1, 175-198. [CrossRef]

238. Johannes Jahn. 2006. Multiobjective Search Algorithm with Subdivision Technique. *Computational Optimization and Applications* **35**:2, 161-175. [CrossRef]

239. S. Saravana Sankar, S. G. Ponnambalam, M. Gurumarimuthu. 2006. Scheduling flexible manufacturing systems using parallelization of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* **30**:3-4, 279-285. [CrossRef]

240. Y. S. R. Murty, S. Murty Bhallamudi, K. Srinivasan. 2006. Non-Uniform Flow Effect on Optimal Waste Load Allocation in Rivers. *Water Resources Management* **20**:4, 509-530. [CrossRef]

241. Michalis Fragiadakis, Nikos D. Lagaros, Manolis Papadrakakis. 2006. Performance-based multiobjective optimum design of steel structures considering life-cycle cost. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **32**:1, 1-11. [CrossRef]

242. M. Kashif Gill, Yasir H. Kaheil, Abedalrazq Khalil, Mac McKee, Luis Bastidas. 2006. Multiobjective particle swarm optimization for parameter estimation in hydrology. *Water Resources Research* **42**:7, n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

243. J KOLLAT, P REED. 2006. Comparing state-of-the-art evolutionary multi-objective algorithms for long-term groundwater monitoring design. *Advances in Water Resources* **29**:6, 792-807. [CrossRef]

244. S. R. Yandamuri, K. Srinivasan, S. Murty Bhallamudi. 2006. Multiobjective Optimal Waste Load Allocation Models for Rivers Using Nondominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm-II. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* **132**:3, 133-143. [CrossRef]

245. Benjamin Ivorra, David E. Hertzog, Bijan Mohammadi, Juan G. Santiago. 2006. Semi-deterministic and genetic algorithms for global optimization of microfluidic protein-folding devices. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **66**:2, 319-333. [CrossRef]

246. E.G. Carrano, L.A.E. Soares, R.H.C. Takahashi, R.R. Saldanha, O.M. Neto. 2006. Electric Distribution Network Multiobjective Design Using a Problem-Specific Genetic Algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* **21**:2, 995-1005. [CrossRef]

247. Andy J. Keane. 2006. Statistical Improvement Criteria for Use in Multiobjective Design Optimization. *AIAA Journal* **44**:4, 879-891. [CrossRef]

248. S KULTURELKONAK, A SMITH, B NORMAN. 2006. Multi-objective tabu search using a multinomial probability mass function. *European Journal of Operational Research* **169**:3, 918-931. [CrossRef]

249. A DIETZ, C AZZAROPANTEL, L PIBOULEAU, S DOMENECH. 2006. Multiobjective optimization for multiproduct batch plant design under economic and environmental considerations. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **30**:4, 599-613. [CrossRef]

250. I. Y. Kim, O. L. Weck. 2006. Adaptive weighted sum method for multiobjective optimization: a new method for Pareto front generation. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization* **31**:2, 105-116. [CrossRef]

251. Beatrice Ombuki, Brian J. Ross, Franklin Hanshar. 2006. Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms for Vehicle Routing Problem with Time Windows. *Applied Intelligence* **24**:1, 17-30. [CrossRef]

252. Ken Harada, Kokolo Ikeda, Jun Sakuma, Isao Ono, Shigenobu Kobayashi. 2006. Hybridization of Genetic Algorithm with Local Search in Multiobjective Function Optimization: Recommendation of GA then LS. *Transactions of the Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence* **21**, 482-492. [CrossRef]

253. O. Tanneau, J. B. Casimir, P. Lamary. 2006. Optimization of multilayered panels with poroelastic components for an acoustical transmission objective. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **120**:3, 1227. [CrossRef]

254. K MATTHEWS, K BUCHAN, A SIBBALD, S CRAW. 2006. Combining deliberative and computer-based methods for multi-objective land-use planning. *Agricultural Systems* **87**:1, 18-37. [CrossRef]

255. T HANNE, S NICKEL. 2005. A multiobjective evolutionary algorithm for scheduling and inspection planning in software development projects. *European Journal of Operational Research* **167**:3, 663-678. [CrossRef]

256. Chen Jian Ken Lee, Tomonari Furukawa, Shinobu Yoshimura. 2005. A human-like numerical technique for design of engineering systems. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* **64**:14, 1915-1943. [CrossRef]

257. C SORZANO, R MARABINI, G HERMAN, J CARAZO. 2005. Multiobjective algorithm parameter optimization using multivariate statistics in three-dimensional electron microscopy reconstruction. *Pattern Recognition* **38**:12, 2587-2601. [CrossRef]

258. Johan ölvander. 2005. Robustness considerations in multi-objective optimal design. *Journal of Engineering Design* **16**:5, 511-523. [CrossRef]

259. I PACKHAM, M RAFIQ, M BORTHWICK, S DENHAM. 2005. Interactive visualisation for decision support and evaluation of robustness—in theory and in practice. *Advanced Engineering Informatics* **19**:4, 263-280. [CrossRef]

260. A LINDINGER, A MERLI, M PLEWICKI, F VETTER, S WEBER, L WOSTE. 2005. Optimal control of isotope selective fragmentation. *Chemical Physics Letters* **413**:4-6, 315-320. [CrossRef]

261. Nadia Nedjah, Luiza Macedo Mourelle. 2005. Secure evolvable hardware for public-key cryptosystems. *New Generation Computing* **23**:3, 259-275. [CrossRef]

262. Ed Nash, Andy Cope, Phil James, David Parker. 2005. Cycle Network Planning: Towards a Holistic Approach Using Temporal Topology. *Transportation Planning and Technology* **28**:4, 251-271. [CrossRef]

263. Jacinto Martín, Concha Bielza, David Ríos Insua. 2005. Approximating nondominated sets in continuous multiobjective optimization problems. *Naval Research Logistics* **52**:5, 469-480. [CrossRef]

264. L. LoBello, G.A. Kaczynski, O. Mirabella. 2005. Improving the Real-Time Behavior of Ethernet Networks Using Traffic Smoothing. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* **1**:3, 151-161. [CrossRef]

265. Mehran Yazdia, Luc Gingras, Luc Beaulieu. 2005. An adaptive approach to metal artifact reduction in helical computed tomography for radiation therapy treatment planning: Experimental and clinical studies. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics* **62**:4, 1224-1231. [CrossRef]

266. Mohamed Baccouche, Jaouad Boukachour, Abdelattif Benabdelhafid. 2005. Hybrid Genetic Algorithm for the Generalised Assignment Problem. *Journal of Decision System* **14**:1-2, 83-107. [CrossRef]

267. M. Marseguerra, E. Zio, L. Podofillini, D.W. Coit. 2005. Optimal Design of Reliable Network Systems in Presence of Uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* **54**:2, 243-253. [CrossRef]

268. Yiannis Haralampidis, Costas Papadimitriou, Maria Pavlidou. 2005. Multi-objective framework for structural model identification. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **34**:6, 665-685. [CrossRef]

269. F.A. Chacra, P. Bastard, G. Fleury, R. Clavreul. 2005. Impact of Energy Storage Costs on Economical Performance in a Distribution Substation. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* **20**:2, 684-691. [CrossRef]

270. B SUMAN. 2005. Study of self-stopping PDMOSA and performance measure in multiobjective optimization. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **29**:5, 1131-1147. [CrossRef]

271. C PAPADIMITRIOU. 2005. Pareto optimal sensor locations for structural identification. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **194**:12-16, 1655-1673. [CrossRef]

272. ANDOJO ONGKODJOJO ONG, FRANCIS E. H. TAY. 2005. PARETO SIMULATED ANNEALING (SA)-BASED MULTI-OBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION FOR MEMS DESIGN AND APPLICATION. *International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering* **15**:02, 455-460. [CrossRef]

273. S.R. Anderson, V. Kadirkamanathan, A. Chipperfield, V. Sharifi, J. Swithenbank. 2005. Multi-objective optimization of operational variables in a waste incineration plant. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **29**:5, 1121-1130. [CrossRef]

274. J.E. Fieldsend, S. Singh. 2005. Pareto Evolutionary Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **16**:2, 338-354. [CrossRef]

275. M MARSEGUERRA, E ZIO, L PODOFILLINI. 2005. Multiobjective spare part allocation by means of genetic algorithms and Monte Carlo simulation. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **87**:3, 325-335. [CrossRef]

276. Peter A. Graf, Kwiseon Kim, Wesley B. Jones, Gus L. W. Hart. 2005. Direct enumeration of alloy configurations for electronic structural properties. *Applied Physics Letters* **87**:24, 243111. [CrossRef]

277. Chang-Sei Kim, Keum-Shik Hong, Yong-Seop Han. 2005. PC-based off-line programming in the shipbuilding industry: open architecture. *Advanced Robotics* **19**:4, 435-458. [CrossRef]

278. Albrecht Lindinger, Stefan Weber, Cosmin Lupulescu, Franziska Vetter, Mateusz Plewicki, Andrea Merli, Ludger Wöste, Andreas Bartelt, Herschel Rabitz. 2005. Revealing spectral field features and mechanistic insights by control pulse cleaning. *Physical Review A* **71**:1. . [CrossRef]

279. Olivier C.L. Haas, Colin R. Reeves24 Genetic algorithms in radiotherapy **3**, 447-482. [CrossRef]

280. Daisuke Sasaki, Shigeru Obayashi. 2005. Efficient Search for Trade-Offs by Adaptive Range Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms. *Journal of Aerospace Computing, Information, and Communication* **2**:1, 44-64. [CrossRef]

281. L CHENG, E SUBRAHMANIAN, A WESTERBERG. 2004. A comparison of optimal control and stochastic programming from a formulation and computation perspective. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **29**:1, 149-164. [CrossRef]

282. Kwee-Bo Sim, Ji-Yoon Kim. 2004. Solution of multiobjective optimization problems: coevolutionary algorithm based on evolutionary game theory. *Artificial Life and Robotics* **8**:2, 174-185. [CrossRef]

283. T STEWART. 2004. A genetic algorithm approach to multiobjective land use planning*1. *Computers & Operations Research* **31**:14, 2293-2313. [CrossRef]

284. I ALBERTO, P MATEO. 2004. Representation and management of MOEA populations based on graphs. *European Journal of Operational Research* **159**:1, 52-65. [CrossRef]

285. E DUCHEYNE, R DEWULF, B DEBAETS. 2004. Single versus multiple objective genetic algorithms for solving the even-flow forest management problem. *Forest Ecology and Management* **201**:2-3, 259-273. [CrossRef]

286. Brian J. Ross, Han Zhu. 2004. Procedural texture evolution using multi-objective optimization. *New Generation Computing* **22**:3, 271-293. [CrossRef]

287. M. Marseguerra, E. Zio, L. Podofillini. 2004. Optimal Reliability/Availability of Uncertain Systems via Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* **53**:3, 424-434. [CrossRef]

288. B SUMAN. 2004. Study of simulated annealing based algorithms for multiobjective optimization of a constrained problem. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **28**:9, 1849-1871. [CrossRef]

289. G. Ascia, V. Catania, M. Palesi. 2004. A GA-Based Design Space Exploration Framework for Parameterized System-On-A-Chip Platforms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **8**:4, 329-346. [CrossRef]

290. Edwin D. de Jong, Jordan B. Pollack. 2004. Ideal Evaluation from Coevolution. *Evolutionary Computation* **12**:2, 159-192. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

291. Kwee-Bo Sim, Ji-Yoon Kim. 2004. Solution of multiobjective optimization problems: revolutionary algorithm based on evolutionary game theory. *Artificial Life and Robotics* **8**:2, 174-185. [CrossRef]

292. A GHOSH. 2004. Multi-objective rule mining using genetic algorithms. *Information Sciences* **163**:1-3, 123-133. [CrossRef]

293. Matthias Ehrgott, Xavier Gandibleux. 2004. Approximative solution methods for multiobjective combinatorial optimization. *Top* **12**:1, 1-63. [CrossRef]

294. Abdullah Konak, Alice Smith. 2004. Capacitated network design considering survivability: an evolutionary approach. *Engineering Optimization* **36**:2, 189-205. [CrossRef]

295. Maghsud Solimanpur, Prem Vrat, Ravi Shankar. 2004. A multi-objective genetic algorithm approach to the design of cellular manufacturing systems. *International Journal of Production Research* **42**:7, 1419-1441. [CrossRef]

296. Marzio Marseguerra, Enrico Zio, Luca Podofillini. 2004. A multiobjective genetic algorithm approach to the optimization of the technical specifications of a nuclear safety system. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **84**:1, 87-99. [CrossRef]

297. A. S. Ahlawat, A. Ramaswamy. 2004. Multiobjective Optimal Fuzzy Logic Control System for Response Control of Wind-Excited Tall Buildings. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* **130**:4, 524-530. [CrossRef]

298. Franck Viguier, Henri Pierreval. 2004. An approach to the design of a hybrid organization of workshops into functional layout and group technology cells. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing* **17**:2, 108-116. [CrossRef]

299. Pierre M. Grignon, Georges M. Fadel. 2004. A GA Based Configuration Design Optimization Method. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **126**:1, 6. [CrossRef]

300. Anders Angantyr, Jan Olov Aidanpää. 2004. A Pareto-Based Genetic Algorithm Search Approach to Handle Damped Natural Frequency Constraints in Turbo Generator Rotor System Design. *Journal of Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power* **126**:3, 619. [CrossRef]

301. S. Gunawan, A. Farhang-Mehr, S. Azarm. 2004. On Maximizing Solution Diversity in a Multiobjective Multidisciplinary Genetic Algorithm for Design Optimization. *Mechanics Based Design of Structures and Machines* **32**:4, 491-514. [CrossRef]

302. Oscar H. Sendin, Carmen G. Moles, Antonio A. Alonso, Julio R. BangaChapter D4 Multi-objective integrated design and control using stochastic global optimization methods **17**, 555-581. [CrossRef]

303. KESHAV DAHAL, STUART GALLOWAY, GRAEME BURT, JIM MCDONALD, IAN HOPKINS. 2003. A PORT SYSTEM SIMULATION FACILITY WITH AN OPTIMIZATION CAPABILITY. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence and Applications* **03**:04, 395-410. [CrossRef]

304. T. Kiyota, Y. Tsuji, E. Kondo. 2003. Unsatisfying functions and multiobjective fuzzy satisficing design using genetic algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)* **33**:6, 889-897. [CrossRef]

305. C Elegbede. 2003. Availability allocation to repairable systems with genetic algorithms: a multi-objective formulation. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **82**:3, 319-330. [CrossRef]

306. BENOIT LEBLANC, BERTRAND BRAUNSCHWEIG, HERVE TOULHOAT, EVELYNE LUTTON. 2003. Improving the sampling efficiency of Monte Carlo molecular simulations: an evolutionary approach. *Molecular Physics* **101**:22, 3293-3308. [CrossRef]

307. MIKE ROSENMAN, ROB SAUNDERS. 2003. Self-regulatory hierarchical coevolution. *AI EDAM* **17**:04. . [CrossRef]

308. P Bergey. 2003. A decision support system for the electrical power districting problem. *Decision Support Systems* **36**:1, 1-17. [CrossRef]

309. Gary G. Yen, Haiming Lu. 2003. Hierarchical Rank Density Genetic Algorithm for Radial-Basis Function Neural Network Design. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence and Applications* **03**:03, 213-232. [CrossRef]

310. A Medaglia. 2003. A genetic-based framework for solving (multi-criteria) weighted matching problems. *European Journal of Operational Research* **149**:1, 77-101. [CrossRef]

311. Haiming Lu, G.G. Yen. 2003. Rank-density-based multiobjective genetic algorithm and benchmark test function study. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **7**:4, 325-343. [CrossRef]

312. Jasper A. Vrugt, Hoshin V. Gupta, Luis A. Bastidas, Willem Bouten, Soroosh Sorooshian. 2003. Effective and efficient algorithm for multiobjective optimization of hydrologic models. *Water Resources Research* **39**:8, n/a-n/a. [CrossRef]

313. G.G. Yen, Haiming Lu. 2003. Dynamic multiobjective evolutionary algorithm: adaptive cell-based rank and density estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **7**:3, 253-274. [CrossRef]

314. J.E. Fieldsend, R.M. Everson, S. Singh. 2003. Using unconstrained elite archives for multiobjective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **7**:3, 305-323. [CrossRef]

315. Guan-Chun Luh, Chung-Huei Chueh, Wei-Wen Liu. 2003. MOIA: Multi-objective immune algorithm. *Engineering Optimization* **35**:2, 143-164. [CrossRef]

316. P.A.N. Bosman, D. Thierens. 2003. The balance between proximity and diversity in multiobjective evolutionary algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **7**:2, 174-188. [CrossRef]

317. Tomonari Furukawa, Shinobu Yoshimura, Yasunari MimuraA human-like optimization method for constrained parametric design 147-156. [CrossRef]

318. L Reis, I Carrijo, P CheungMulti-objective optimization to the rehabilitation of a water distribution network . [CrossRef]

319. B. Galvan, D. Greiner, J. Périaux, M. Sefrioui, G. WinterParallel evolutionary computation for solving complex CFD optimization problems 573-604. [CrossRef]

320. V. K. Jayaraman, B. D. Kulkarni, P. S. Shelokar. 2003. Multiobjective Optimization of Reactor–Regenerator System Using Ant Algorithm. *Petroleum Science and Technology* **21**:7-8, 1167-1184. [CrossRef]

321. A. S. Ahlawat, A. Ramaswamy. 2002. Multiobjective optimal FLC driven hybrid mass damper system for torsionally coupled, seismically excited structures. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **31**:12, 2121-2139. [CrossRef]

322. N García-Pedrajas, C Hervás-Martínez, J Muñoz-Pérez. 2002. Multi-objective cooperative coevolution of artificial neural networks (multi-objective cooperative networks). *Neural Networks* **15**:10, 1259-1278. [CrossRef]

323. P Fleming. 2002. Evolutionary algorithms in control systems engineering: a survey. *Control Engineering Practice* **10**:11, 1223-1241. [CrossRef]

324. P Bosman. 2002. Multi-objective optimization with diversity preserving mixture-based iterated density estimation evolutionary algorithms. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **31**:3, 259-289. [CrossRef]

325. Prakash S. Shelokar, V. K. Jayaraman, B. D. Kulkarni. 2002. Ant algorithm for single and multiobjective reliability optimization problems. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International* **18**:6, 497-514. [CrossRef]

326. V Summanwar. 2002. Solution of constrained optimization problems by multi-objective genetic algorithm. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **26**:10, 1481-1492. [CrossRef]

327. A. Jaszkiewicz. 2002. On the performance of multiple-objective genetic local search on the 0/1 knapsack problem - a comparative experiment. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **6**:4, 402-412. [CrossRef]

328. B. Rubenstein-Montano, R.A. Malaga. 2002. A weighted sum genetic algorithm to support multiple-party multiple-objective negotiations. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **6**:4, 366-377. [CrossRef]

329. Marzio Marseguerra, Enrico Zio, Luca Podofillini. 2002. Condition-based maintenance optimization by means of genetic algorithms and Monte Carlo simulation. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **77**:2, 151-165. [CrossRef]

330. C CoelloCoello. 2002. Constraint-handling in genetic algorithms through the use of dominance-based tournament selection. *Advanced Engineering Informatics* **16**:3, 193-203. [CrossRef]

331. A. S. Ahlawat, A. Ramaswamy. 2002. Multi-objective optimal design of FLC driven hybrid mass damper for seismically excited structures. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* **31**:7, 1459-1479. [CrossRef]

332. R Sarker. 2002. A new multiobjective evolutionary algorithm. *European Journal of Operational Research* **140**:1, 12-23. [CrossRef]

333. A.J. Chipperfield, B. Bica, P.J. Fleming. 2002. Fuzzy scheduling control of a gas turbine aero-engine: a multiobjective approach. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* **49**:3, 536-548. [CrossRef]

334. A Tiwari. 2002. Evolutionary-based techniques for real-life optimisation: development and testing. *Applied Soft Computing* **1**:4, 301-329. [CrossRef]

335. J Loetamonphong. 2002. Multi-objective optimization problems with fuzzy relation equation constraints. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **127**:2, 141-164. [CrossRef]

336. Henri Pierreval, Franck Viguier. 2002. Structuration d'ateliers hybrides. *Journal of Decision System* **11**:1, 53-72. [CrossRef]

337. Jingwen Xu, Lianjun Liu, Youdong Mao, Beiwen Li. 2002. The Realization of a Fast and Effective Optimization Method on Atomic Structure. *Journal of the Physics Society Japan* **71**:3, 762-766. [CrossRef]

338. V. Magnin, L. Giraudet, J. Harari, J. Decobert, P. Pagnot, E. Boucherez, D. Decoster. 2002. Design, optimization, and fabrication of side-illuminated p-i-n photodetectors with high responsivity and high alignment tolerance for 1.3and 1.55-μm wavelength use. *Journal of Lightwave Technology* **20**:3, 477-488. [CrossRef]

339. A Jaszkiewicz. 2002. Genetic local search for multi-objective combinatorial optimization. *European Journal of Operational Research* **137**:1, 50-71. [CrossRef]

340. D. Cvetkovic, I.C. Parmee. 2002. Preferences and their application in evolutionary multiobjective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **6**:1, 42-57. [CrossRef]

341. K.C. Giannakoglou. 2002. Design of optimal aerodynamic shapes using stochastic optimization methods and computational intelligence. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences* **38**:1, 43-76. [CrossRef]

342. B. Rekiek, P. De Lit, A. Delchambre. 2002. Hybrid assembly line design and user's preferences. *International Journal of Production Research* **40**:5, 1095-1111. [CrossRef]

343. S. Wakao, A. Yamashita, Y. Fujishima, T. Yamamura. 2002. Design optimization of electric machines based on the estimation of permeability distribution. *Journal of Applied Physics* **91**:10, 8302. [CrossRef]

344. C COELLOCOELLO. 2002. Theoretical and numerical constraint-handling techniques used with evolutionary algorithms: a survey of the state of the art. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **191**:11-12, 1245-1287. [CrossRef]

345. Manolis Papadrakakis, Nikos Lagaros, Vagelis Plevris. 2002. Multi-objective optimization of skeletal structures under static and seismic loading conditions. *Engineering Optimization* **34**:6, 645-669. [CrossRef]

346. Peter J. Bentley, David W. CorneAn introduction to Creative Evolutionary Systems 1-75. [CrossRef]

347. Tomonari Furukawa, M.W.M.G. Dissanayake, Shinobu YoshimuraGeneral optimiser for continuous inverse analysis 281-290. [CrossRef]

348. Johan Andersson, David Wallace. 2002. Pareto optimization using the struggle genetic crowding algorithm. *Engineering Optimization* **34**:6, 623-643. [CrossRef]

349. Mun-Bo Shim, Myung-Won Suh. 2002. A Study on Multiobjective Optimization Technique for Inverse and Crack Identification Problems. *Inverse Problems in Science and Engineering* **10**:5, 441-465. [CrossRef]

350. Tapabrata Ray, Pankaj Saini. 2001. ENGINEERING DESIGN OPTIMIZATION USING A SWARM WITH AN INTELLIGENT INFORMATION SHARING AMONG INDIVIDUALS. *Engineering Optimization* **33**:6, 735-748. [CrossRef]

351. Helena R. Louren#o, Jos# P. Paix#o, Rita Portugal. 2001. Multiobjective Metaheuristics for the Bus Driver Scheduling Problem. *Transportation Science* **35**:3, 331-343. [CrossRef]

352. K.C. Tan, T.H. Lee, D. Khoo, E.F. Khor. 2001. A multiobjective evolutionary algorithm toolbox for computer-aided multiobjective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)* **31**:4, 537-556. [CrossRef]

353. Dongkyung Nam, Yun Deuk Seo, Lae-Jeong Park, Cheol Hoon Park, Burnsup Kim. 2001. Parameter optimization of an on-chip voltage reference circuit using evolutionary programming. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **5**:4, 414-421. [CrossRef]

354. A Keane. 2001. Problem solving environments in aerospace design. *Advances in Engineering Software* **32**:6, 477-487. [CrossRef]

355. C. Hocaoglu, A.C. Sanderson. 2001. Planning multiple paths with evolutionary speciation. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **5**:3, 169-191. [CrossRef]

356. I Parmee. 2001. Introducing prototype interactive evolutionary systems for ill-defined, multi-objective design environments. *Advances in Engineering Software* **32**:6, 429-441. [CrossRef]

357. G. Levitin. 2001. Optimal unit grouping in weighted voting systems. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **72**:2, 179-191. [CrossRef]

358. Tapabrata Ray, Kang Tai, Kin Chye Seow. 2001. MULTIOBJECTIVE DESIGN OPTIMIZATION BY AN EVOLUTIONARY ALGORITHM. *Engineering Optimization* **33**:4, 399-424. [CrossRef]

359. P Busacca. 2001. Multiobjective optimization by genetic algorithms: application to safety systems. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **72**:1, 59-74. [CrossRef]

360. Reza Farshadnia .. 2001. Genetic Algorithms in Optimization and Computer Aided Design. *Journal of Applied Sciences* **1**:3, 289-294. [CrossRef]

361. F Herrera. 2001. A linguistic decision model for personnel management solved with a linguistic biobjective genetic algorithm. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **118**:1, 47-64. [CrossRef]

362. Pierre De Lit, Patrice Latinne, Brahim Rekiek, Alain Delchambre. 2001. Assembly planning with an ordering genetic algorithm. *International Journal of Production Research* **39**:16, 3623-3640. [CrossRef]

363. Liu Lian-jun, Xu Jing-wen, Mao You-dong, Li Yuan-xiang. 2000. Cell evolutionary algorithm: a new optimization method on ground-state energy of the atomic. *Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences* **5**:4, 425-430. [CrossRef]

364. A. Suppapitnarm, K. A. Seffen, G. T. Parks, P. J. Clarkson. 2000. A SIMULATED ANNEALING ALGORITHM FOR MULTIOBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION. *Engineering Optimization* **33**:1, 59-85. [CrossRef]

365. Adrian Thompson, Christoph Wasshuber. 2000. Design of single-electron systems through artificial evolution. *International Journal of Circuit Theory and Applications* **28**:6, 585-599. [CrossRef]

366. Carlos A. Coello Coello. 2000. CONSTRAINT-HANDLING USING AN EVOLUTIONARY MULTIOBJECTIVE OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUE. *Civil Engineering and Environmental Systems* **17**:4, 319-346. [CrossRef]

367. RAJEEV KUMAR. 2000. ANCHOR — A CONNECTIONIST ARCHITECTURE FOR PARTITIONING FEATURE SPACES AND HIERARCHICAL NESTING OF NEURAL NETS. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools* **09**:03, 397-416. [CrossRef]

368. Yuping Wang, Yiu-Wing Leung. 2000. Multiobjective programming using uniform design and genetic algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)* **30**:3, 293-304. [CrossRef]

369. I Ono. 2000. Optimal lens design by real-coded genetic algorithms using UNDX. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **186**:2-4, 483-497. [CrossRef]

370. Filippo Menczer, Melania Degeratu, W. Nick Street. 2000. Efficient and Scalable Pareto Optimization by Evolutionary Local Selection Algorithms. *Evolutionary Computation* **8**:2, 223-247. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

371. David A. Van Veldhuizen, Gary B. Lamont. 2000. Multiobjective Evolutionary Algorithms: Analyzing the State-of-the-Art. *Evolutionary Computation* **8**:2, 125-147. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

372. L. Sanchez. 2000. Interval-valued GA-P algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **4**:1, 64-72. [CrossRef]

373. Ricardo S. Zebulum, Marley Vellasco, Marco Aurélio Pacheco. 2000. Variable Length Representation in Evolutionary Electronics. *Evolutionary Computation* **8**:1, 93-120. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

374. Jing Gu, Dianxun Shuai. 2000. The faster higher-order cellular automaton for hyper-parallel undistorted data compression. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* **15**:2, 126-135. [CrossRef]

375. Carlos A. Coello Coello. 2000. TREATING CONSTRAINTS AS OBJECTIVES FOR SINGLE-OBJECTIVE EVOLUTIONARY OPTIMIZATION. *Engineering Optimization* **32**:3, 275-308. [CrossRef]

376. Matthew I. Campbell, Jonathan Cagan, Kenneth Kotovsky. 2000. Agent-Based Synthesis of Electromechanical Design Configurations. *Journal of Mechanical Design* **122**:1, 61. [CrossRef]

377. N. Femia, G. Spagnuolo. 1999. Genetic optimization of interval arithmetic-based worst case circuit tolerance analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications* **46**:12, 1441-1456. [CrossRef]

378. E. Zitzler, L. Thiele. 1999. Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: a comparative case study and the strength Pareto approach. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **3**:4, 257-271. [CrossRef]

379. Jing Gu, Dianxun Shuai. 1999. A new parallel-by-cell approach to undistorted data compression based on cellular automaton and genetic algorithm. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology* **14**:6, 572-579. [CrossRef]

380. T Hanne. 1999. On the convergence of multiobjective evolutionary algorithms. *European Journal of Operational Research* **117**:3, 553-564. [CrossRef]

381. Kalyanmoy Deb. 1999. Multi-objective Genetic Algorithms: Problem Difficulties and Construction of Test Problems. *Evolutionary Computation* **7**:3, 205-230. [Abstract] [PDF] [PDF Plus]

382. A. Thompson, P. Layzell, R.S. Zebulum. 1999. Explorations in design space: unconventional electronics design through artificial evolution. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **3**:3, 167-196. [CrossRef]

383. M.A. Kupinski, M.A. Anastasio. 1999. Multiobjective genetic optimization of diagnostic classifiers with implications for generating receiver operating characteristic curves. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **18**:8, 675-685. [CrossRef]

384. R. Tappeta, J. Renaud. 1999. Interactive Multiobjective Optimization Procedure. *AIAA Journal* **37**:7, 881-889. [CrossRef]

385. E.L. Ulungu, J. Teghem, P.H. Fortemps, D. Tuyttens. 1999. MOSA method: a tool for solving multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis* **8**:4, 221-236. [CrossRef]

386. W Rauch, P Harremoës. 1999. On the potential of genetic algorithms in urban drainage modeling. *Urban Water* **1**:1, 79-89. [CrossRef]

387. William A. Crossley, Andrea M. Cook, David W. Fanjoy. 1999. Using the Two-Branch Tournament Genetic Algorithm for Multiobjective Design. *AIAA Journal* **37**:2, 261-267. [CrossRef]

388. M. Lahanas, D. Baltas, N. Zamboglou. 1999. Anatomy-based three-dimensional dose optimization in brachytherapy using multiobjective genetic algorithms. *Medical Physics* **26**:9, 1904. [CrossRef]

389. M.A. Anastasio, M.A. Kupinski, R.M. Nishikawa. 1998. Optimization and FROC analysis of rule-based detection schemes using a multiobjective approach. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **17**:6, 1089-1093. [CrossRef]

390. S.P. Harris, E.C. Ifeachor. 1998. Automatic design of frequency sampling filters by hybrid genetic algorithm techniques. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **46**:12, 3304-3314. [CrossRef]

391. R. Kumar, P. Rockett. 1998. Multiobjective genetic algorithm partitioning for hierarchical learning of high-dimensional pattern spaces: a learning-follows-decomposition strategy. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **9**:5, 822-830. [CrossRef]

392. H. Ishibuchi, T. Murata. 1998. A multi-objective genetic local search algorithm and its application to flowshop scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)* **28**:3, 392-403. [CrossRef]

393. P Corcoran. 1998. Optimal configuration of a thermally cycled gas sensor array with neural network pattern recognition. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical* **48**:1-3, 448-455. [CrossRef]

394. S. A. Billings, K. Z. Mao. 1998. Structure detection for nonlinear rational models using genetic algorithms. *International Journal of Systems Science* **29**:3, 223-231. [CrossRef]

395. X. Hu, G. Greenwood. 1998. Evolutionary approach to hardware/software partitioning. *IEE Proceedings - Computers and Digital Techniques* **145**:3, 203. [CrossRef]

396. H. Pierreval, M-F. Plaquin. 1998. An Evolutionary Approach of Multicriteria Manufacturing Cell Formation. *International Transactions in Operational Research* **5**:1, 13-25. [CrossRef]

397. C.M. Fonseca, P.J. Fleming. 1998. Multiobjective optimization and multiple constraint handling with evolutionary algorithms. I. A unified formulation. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics - Part A: Systems and Humans* **28**:1, 26-37. [CrossRef]

398. V. Schnecke, O. Vornberger. 1997. Hybrid genetic algorithms for constrained placement problems. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **1**:4, 266-277. [CrossRef]

399. J. Lienig. 1997. A parallel genetic algorithm for performance-driven VLSI routing. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **1**:1, 29-39. [CrossRef]

400. T. Back, U. Hammel, H.-P. Schwefel. 1997. Evolutionary computation: comments on the history and current state. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* **1**:1, 3-17. [CrossRef]

401. N V Dakev, J F Whidborne, A J Chipperfield, P J Fleming. 1997. Evolutionary <i>H_{infin;}</i> design of an electromagnetic suspension control system for a maglev vehicle. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering* **211**:5, 345-355. [CrossRef]