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Abstract—This is the supplementary material for Handling Imbalance Between Convergence and Diversity in the Decision Space in Evolutionary Multi-Modal Multi-Objective Optimization. This supplementary material provides the investigations on (1) the property of some existing MMOPs and (2) the behavior of CPDEA.

I. INVESTIGATION ON THE PROPERTY OF MMMOP1, OMNI-TEST PROBLEM, AND SYM-PART

In this section, we investigate the property of MMMOP1 [1], Omni-test problem [2], and SYM-PART [3] with two objectives and two decision variables. In SYM-PART, $a$, $b$, $c$ are set to 0.1, 1, 0.8, respectively.

MMMP1 has five equivalent Pareto optimal subsets. Omni-test problem and SYM-PART have nine equivalent Pareto optimal subsets. They are listed in Table I.

In Fig. 1, we show the fitness landscape based on Pareto rank of these problems, where each line segment is an equivalent Pareto optimal subset of the corresponding problem. We can see from Fig. 1 that for each problem, the pattern around each equivalent Pareto optimal subset is the same. This implies that the difficulties in finding equivalent Pareto optimal subsets are the same.

To check whether these problems meet the first condition in Definition 2, Fig. 2 shows the average Pareto rank of solutions close to each equivalent Pareto optimal subset, where $S_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, 5$ for MMMOP1, and $i = 1, \ldots, 9$ for Omni-test problem and SYM-PART) is the set of solutions whose distances to the $i$th equivalent Pareto optimal subset are smaller than $d_{i\delta}$. We can see from Fig. 2 that for each problem, the average Pareto rank of solutions close to each equivalent Pareto optimal subset is the same. Therefore, these problems do not satisfy the first condition.

To check the second condition, in Fig. 3, for each problem, we show the results of IGDX over 40 runs when DNEA was used to solve some new optimization problems, MOP$i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, 5$ for MMMOP1, and $i = 1, \ldots, 9$ for Omni-test problem and SYM-PART). The objective functions of MOP$i$ are the same to those of the original MMOP (i.e., MMMOP1, Omni-test problem, or SYM-PART). The bounds of $x_1$ and $x_2$ in each MOP are listed in Table I. The PS of MOP$i$ is the same to the $i$th equivalent Pareto optimal subset of the corresponding MMOP. We can see from Fig. 3 that for each problem, the curves of IGDX when solving these MOPs are almost the same. Therefore, the complexities of searching for the equivalent Pareto optimal subsets are the same, and the second condition is not met.

Based on the above results, we can see that MMMOP1, Omni-test problem, and SYM-PART are not MMOP-ICDs. The property of other MMOPs can be investigated in the same way, and most existing benchmark MMOPs are not MMOP-ICDs.

II. FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS ON THE BEHAVIOR OF CPDEA

We investigate two key parameters, $\eta$ and $p$, to observe their effects on the behavior of CPDEA and thus to provide guidelines for setting them. We show the results of CPDEA on IDMP-M2-T1. Similar results were obtained on other test problems while they are not shown here. In addition, we visualize the final population of CPDEA on different test problems for an intuitive understanding of the CPD method.

A. Sensitivity Analysis of $\eta$

We applied CPDEA to IDMP-M2-T1 with different settings of $\eta$ ($\eta = 1, \ldots, 10$). The average IGDX and IGDM values over 40 runs are shown in Fig. 4. Note that $p$ is set to 1 to avoid using the second reproduction operator. We can see from Fig. 4...
TABLE I
THE EQUIVALENT PARETO OPTIMAL SUBSETS OF MMMOP1, OMNI-TEST PROBLEM, AND SYM-PART. THE BOUNDS OF $x_1$ AND $x_2$ IN THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM, MOPi, WHOSE PS IS THE SAME TO THE CORRESPONDING EQUIVALENT PARETO OPTIMAL SUBSET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$i$ th equivalent Pareto optimal subset</th>
<th>Bound of $x_1$ in MOPi</th>
<th>Bound of $x_2$ in MOPi</th>
<th>$i$ th equivalent Pareto optimal subset</th>
<th>Bound of $x_1$ in MOPi</th>
<th>Bound of $x_2$ in MOPi</th>
<th>$i$ th equivalent Pareto optimal subset</th>
<th>Bound of $x_1$ in MOPi</th>
<th>Bound of $x_2$ in MOPi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$x_1 = 0.1$</td>
<td>[0.1, 1]</td>
<td>[0.1, 0.2]</td>
<td>$x_1 = 0.2, x_1 \in [1, 1.5]$</td>
<td>[0.2]</td>
<td>[0.2]</td>
<td>$x_2 = -1, x_2 \in [-1.1, 0.9]$</td>
<td>[1.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[-1.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0.3$</td>
<td>[0.3, 1]</td>
<td>[0.2, 0.4]</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_2 + 3, x_1 \in [3, 3.5]$</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>$x_2 = -1, x_2 \in [0.1, 0.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[-1.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$x_3 = 0.5$</td>
<td>[0.3, 1]</td>
<td>[0.4, 0.6]</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_3 + 2, x_1 \in [5.5, 6]$</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>$x_2 = -1, x_2 \in [0.9, 1.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[-1.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$x_4 = 0.7$</td>
<td>[0.1, 0.3]</td>
<td>[0.6, 0.8]</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_4 + 1, x_1 \in [1.1, 1.5]$</td>
<td>[2.1]</td>
<td>[2.1]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [-1.1, 0.9]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$x_5 = 0.9$</td>
<td>[0.1, 0.3]</td>
<td>[0.8, 1]</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_5 + 2, x_1 \in [3, 3.5]$</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [-0.1, 0.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_6 + 3, x_1 \in [5.5, 6]$</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [0.9, 1.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_7 + 4, x_1 \in [1.1, 1.5]$</td>
<td>[2.1]</td>
<td>[2.1]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [-1.1, 0.9]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_8 + 2, x_1 \in [3, 3.5]$</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>[2.4]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [-0.1, 0.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>$x_1 = x_9 + 3, x_1 \in [5.5, 6]$</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>[4.6]</td>
<td>$x_2 = 0, x_2 \in [0.9, 1.1]$</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
<td>[0.5, 0.5]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. The fitness landscapes based on Pareto rank of MMMOP1, Omni-test problem, and SYM-PART. For each problem, 10, 201 ($101 \times 101$) solutions are uniformly sampled in the entire decision space. They are in different colors based on their Pareto ranks. A brighter (warmer) tone corresponds to a lower Pareto rank. Each line segment is an equivalent Pareto optimal subset.

Fig. 2. The average Pareto rank of solutions close to each equivalent Pareto optimal subset based on Fig. 1. $S_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, 5$ for MMMOP1, and $i = 1, \ldots, 9$ for Omni-test problem and SYM-PART) is the solutions whose distances to the $i$th equivalent Pareto optimal subset is smaller than $d_{\alpha}$. 

(a) MMMOP1 
(b) Omni-test problem 
(c) SYM-PART
that all the IGDX and IGDM values under different settings of $\eta$ are quite good, and the differences among the IGDX (or IGDM) values are very small. This means that CPDEA shows a robust performance under different settings of $\eta$.

B. Sensitivity Analysis of $p$

We used IDMP-M2-T1 with $\alpha = 10$ to investigate the effect of $p$. We set $\alpha$ to such a large value to increase the difficulty in finding EPS2, so that the effect of $p$ can be easily observed. In Fig. 5, we show the average IGDX value over 40 runs with respect to the number of evaluated solutions, which were obtained by CPDEA with different settings of $p$, i.e., $p = 1$, 0.5, and $1 \sim 0.5$. We set $p = 1$ before the number of evaluated solutions reached 9,000 and $p = 0.5$ after that. We can see from Fig. 5 that when $p = 0.5$ through the entire evolution, the convergence rate according to IGDX is much slower than the case of $p = 0$. We also observed that (which are not shown here) almost no solution close to EPS2 had been found by setting $p = 0.5$. This indicates that executing the second reproduction operator will reduce the efficiency of searching for an EPS when no solution close to it has been found. When $p = 1$, the solutions close to each EPS had been found before the number of evaluated solutions reached 9,000. Then changing $p$ to 0.5 further decreased the IGDX value. This suggests that the second reproduction operator can enhance the algorithm’s exploitation ability under such a situation. Note that for different optimization problems, the difficulty in finding each EPS is different. Therefore, it may be needed to develop a method to adaptively tune $p$, which is an interesting future research topic.

C. Visualization of the Final Population of CPDEA

Fig. 6 shows the final population of DNEA on two-objective IDMPs, IDMP-M3-T1 and IDMP-M4-T1, in a single run. This particular run is associated with the result which is the closest to the mean IGDX value in Table III in the main body of the paper. The results on three- and four-objective IDMPs in Types 2, 3, and 4 are similar to those in Type1. We can see from Fig. 6 that the solutions are dense in the regions where the EPSs locate and sparse in the other regions. It is interesting to note that the patterns of solutions in Fig. 6 (a)-(d) are similar to the corresponding fitness landscapes in Fig. 3 in the main body of the paper.

REFERENCES


Fig. 6. The final population of DNEA on different test problems in a single run. This particular run is associated with the result which is the closest to the mean IGDX value in Table III in the main body of the paper.