

CS5401 FS2018 Assignment 1d

William Lorey
wwlytc@mst.edu

Contents

Introduction	1
MOEA Overview	1
Impact of Initialization on MOEA Performance	2
Comparison of Parent Selection, Survival Strategy, and Survival Selection Strategies	2
BONUS #1: Impact of Increasing Number of Objectives on Number of Non-Domination and MOEA Performance	2

Introduction

Assignment 1d involved implementing a Multi-Objective Evolutionary Algorithm (MOEA) to more effectively solve Light Up puzzles by balancing the fulfillment of three objectives:

1. maximize the number of cells lit up (represented in this implementation as a ratio of lit cells to the total number of white cells)
2. minimize the number of bulbs shining on each other
3. minimize the number of black cell adjacency constraint violations

For BONUS #1, a fourth objective was added, namely minimizing the number of bulbs placed on the board.

This report outlines this solution's particular implementation of a MOEA, the impact of initialization strategies on the MOEA's performance, a comparison between parent selection, survival strategy, and survival selection strategies on MOEA performance, as well as the impact of increasing the number of objectives on non-domination and MOEA performance (BONUS #1).

MOEA Overview

The MOEA implemented in this assignment is based on the NSGA-II algorithm. It begins, similar to a standard evolutionary algorithm, by creating an initial population using either uniform random or validity enforced plus uniform random initialization, the settings for which

are specified in the algorithm configuration file. That population is evaluated and the subfitnesses are determined and assigned to each individual in the population.

The population is then evaluated on the basis of non-domination. A list of Pareto fronts is created from the initial population where all genotypes in a given front are not dominated by any other genotypes in that front while genotypes in higher level fronts are dominated by genotypes in lower level fronts. The 'best' genotypes, those in the best level of non-domination, are assigned to level number one. Subsequent levels increase in increments of one for other levels of non-domination.

The fitness of each genotype is then set to its level in the list of Pareto fronts, with individuals exhibiting a smaller fitness (level number) are more fit. A binary tournament selection is performed to choose breeding parents. Then offspring are created using an n-point crossover recombination (with n determined in the configuration file). Following that, mutation is performed, completing the child population.

For the standard NSGA-II configuration (exhibited in the deliverables configuration folder), the plus survival strategy is exhibited, combining the children and parent populations into one large population from which to choose the new population. Individuals are then selected for survival using a binary tournament selection and the process is repeated using the new population until the end of the experiment.

Impact of Initialization on MOEA Performance

The effect of Validity Enforced plus Uniform Random versus Uniform Random initialization was examined in this experiment. One would assume that an initialization method utilizing Validity Enforced initialization would outperform a solely Uniform Random initialization. After performing statistical analysis on the experiment data, it was concluded that there is no tangible difference between the initialization methods. Table 1 and Table 2 each display statistical analysis for this finding.

This statistical analysis consisted of performing an f-test, which determined if variances could be treated as equal. In both cases, the f-test yielded that unequal variances should be assumed. Follow int the f-test, the two-tailed t-test was performed assuming unequal variances. This test yielded (in both cases) that neither initialization method was better.

Comparison of Parent Selection, Survival Strategy, and Survival Selection Strategies

BONUS #1: Impact of Increasing Number of Objectives on Number of Non-Domination and MOEA Performance

TODO: need to create config files and run test for this

Table 1: Statistical Analysis performed on the Uniform Random and Validity Enforced Uniform Random Initialized, Randomly Generated Puzzle, EA configurations

	random_gen	random_gen_uniform_random_init
mean	1.10325284795678	1.0764116503308314
variance	0.04970344216568983	0.04355857958196582
standard deviation	0.22294268807406498	0.20870692269775296
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	1.141071234248146	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Unequal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	31	
t Stat	0.47331304656977363	
P two-tail	0.6377741699825987	
t Critical two-tail	2.0395	
Nether random_gen_uniform_random_init nor random_gen is statistically better		

Table 2: Statistical Analysis performed on the Uniform Random and Validity Enforced Uniform Random Initialized, Provided Puzzle, EA configurations

	website_puzzle	website_puzzle_uniform_random_init
mean	0.8031737242867948	0.7959489651519909
variance	0.000603666878279215	0.00058947613524421
standard deviation	0.024569633254878164	0.02427912962287178
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	1.02407348183676	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Unequal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	31	
t Stat	1.1263571505364551	
P two-tail	0.26465388827990055	
t Critical two-tail	2.0395	
Nether website_puzzle_uniform_random_init nor website_puzzle is statistically better		

Table 3: Statistical Analysis performed on the Fitness Proportional Parent & Survival Selection Configuration vs Tournament Parent & Survival Selection Configuration, Randomly Generated Puzzle, Plus Survival Strategy

	random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_plus	random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_plus
mean	0.971290263331009	1.162150278718004
variance	0.0537967579756281	0.06133086851040603
standard deviation	0.23194128308165132	0.2476688686744784
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	0.8770276184787856	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Equal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	28	
t Stat	-3.029051236570584	
P two-tail	0.0036590951523001046	
t Critical two-tail	2.0417	
random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_plus is statistically better than random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_plus		

Table 4: Statistical Analysis performed on the Fitness Proportional Parent & Survival Selection Configuration vs Tournament Parent & Survival Selection Configuration, Randomly Generated Puzzle, Comma Survival Strategy

	random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_comma	random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_comma
mean	1.0292821828716079	1.053450949371725
variance	0.036008620889199365	0.026268301489784093
standard deviation	0.18975837628796993	0.16207498724289351
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	1.3708012641473353	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Equal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	58	
t Stat	-0.5215427512917932	
P two-tail	0.6039746747540546	
t Critical two-tail	2.0017	
Neither random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_comma nor random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_comma is statistically better		

Table 5: Statistical Analysis performed on the Fitness Proportional Parent Selection & Tournament Survival Selection Configuration vs Tournament Parent Selection & Fitness Proportional Survival Selection Configuration, Randomly Generated Puzzle, Plus Survival Strategy

	random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_tournament_survival_plus	random_gen_tournament_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_plus
mean	1.1900153275106078	0.922274963618831
variance	0.06049225931153966	0.02800444270133593
standard deviation	0.245965000911699	0.1673512554525294
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	2.160190556022379	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Unequal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	31	
t Stat	4.846489025268326	
P two-tail	1.211796592920821e-05	
t Critical two-tail	2.0395	
random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_tournament_survival_plus is statistically better than random_gen_tournament_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_plus		

Table 6: Statistical Analysis performed on the Fitness Proportional Parent Selection & Tournament Survival Selection Configuration vs Tournament Parent Selection & Fitness Proportional Survival Selection, Randomly Generated Puzzle, Comma Survival Strategy

	random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_tournament_survival_comma	random_gen_tournament_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_comma
mean	1.1186544987668476	1.057988630231476
variance	0.04925392618449863	0.027554956293447713
standard deviation	0.22193225584510834	0.16599685627579733
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	1.787479742662873	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Unequal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	31	
t Stat	1.221342582229864	
P two-tail	0.22729007385576178	
t Critical two-tail	2.0395	
Neither random_gen_tournament_parent_fitness_proportional_survival_comma nor random_gen_fitness_proportional_parent_tournament_survival_comma is statistically better		

Table 7: Statistical Analysis performed on the Tournament Parent & Survival Selection (Comma Survival Strategy) vs Tournament Parent & Survival Selection (Plus Selection Strategy), Randomly Generated Puzzle

	random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_comma	random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_plus
mean	1.053450949371725	1.1621500278718004
variance	0.026268301489784093	0.06133986851049603
standard deviation	0.16207498724289351	0.2476688686744784
observations	30	30
df	29	29
F	0.42824189434460097	
F critical	0.5373999648406917	
Unequal variances assumed		
observations	30	
df	31	
t Stat	-1.9776642228780876	
P two-tail	0.05349296004844127	
t Critical two-tail	2.0395	
Neither random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_plus nor random_gen_tournament_parent_tournament_survival_comma is statistically better		