

# Evolutionary Algorithms for the Chance-Constrained Knapsack Problem

Yue Xie, Hiran Assimi, Aneta Neumann and Frank Neumann

Optimisation and Logistics, School of Computer Science,  
The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia

August 2, 2021

## Abstract

Evolutionary algorithms have been applied to a wide range of stochastic problems. Motivated by real-world problems where constraint violations have disruptive effects, this paper considers the chance-constrained knapsack problem (CCKP) which is a variance of the binary knapsack problem. The problem aims to maximize the profit of selected items under a constraint that the knapsack capacity bound is violated with a small probability. To tackle the chance constraint, we introduce how to construct surrogate functions by applying well-known deviation inequalities such as Chebyshev's inequality and Chernoff bounds. Furthermore, we investigate the performance of several deterministic approaches and introduce a single- and multi-objective evolutionary algorithm to solve the CCKP. In the experiment section, we evaluate and compare the deterministic approaches and evolutionary algorithms on a wide range of instances. Our experimental results show that a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm outperforms its single-objective formulation for all instances and performance better than deterministic approaches according to the computation time. Furthermore, our investigation points out in which circumstances to favour Chebyshev's inequality or the Chernoff bound when dealing with the CCKP.

## 1 Introduction

Evolutionary algorithms have demonstrated their success in the context of combinatorial optimisation problems. Moreover, evolutionary algorithms have been used for various stochastic problems such as the stochastic job shop problem [16], the stochastic chemical batch scheduling problem [41], and other dynamic and stochastic problems [32, 38]. Evolutionary algorithms can obtain good-quality solutions in most cases within a reasonable amount of time in most cases, and can easily apply them to the solution of stochastic problems. However, the mathematical model of the chance-constrained optimisation problem is so complex that it has received little attention in

the evolutionary computation literature. In this paper, we develop evolutionary algorithms for the chance-constrained knapsack problem (CCKP), which is a stochastic version of the traditional knapsack problem.

The binary knapsack problem [17] is one of the best-known NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems. The problem is given by a set of  $n$  items, each with a weight and a profit, and it objects to maximize the sum of profits of selected items and subjects to the sum of the weight of selected items is less than or equal to the capacity of the knapsack. Generally, in stochastic knapsack problem, the weight and profit of each item are stochastic variables, and the decision of selecting items must be made before any of the random data is realized. Dean et al. [7] proved that the stochastic knapsack problem is PSPACE-hard, and there is a significant amount of research on the stochastic knapsack problem in the literature. The general objective is to maximize the expected profit resulting from the assignment of items to the knapsack [20, 26]. Due to the difficulty of the stochastic knapsack problem, some researchers investigate approximation results [4, 7, 33]. The CCKP studied in this paper assumes the weights of item are stochastic variables conformed to a known continuous probability distribution. The goal of the CCKP is to find a set of items of maximal profit, subject to the condition that the probability with which the total weight will exceeds the capacity bound is less than or equal to a given threshold. Here, the threshold is a small value limiting the probability of the constraint violation.

Chance-constrained optimization problems [5, 27] whose resulting decision ensures the probability of complying with the constraints and the confidence level of being feasible to have received significant attention in the literature. For the general chance-constrained problem, Perkopa et al. [35, 36] proposed a dual-type algorithm, and they investigated the performance of their approaches and compared them with a primal simplex algorithm. Hillier et al. [15] used linear constraints to generate a procedure for tackling approximate chance constraints. Doerr et al. [8] investigated submodular optimization problems with chance constraints. They studied the approximation behaviour of greedy algorithms for submodular problems with chance constraints. Chance constraint programming has been widely applied in different disciplines for optimization under uncertainty [43]. For example, chance constraint programming has been applied in analogue integrated circuit design [24], mechanical engineering [25], and other disciplines [22, 34]. However, so far, chance constraint programming has received little attention in the evolutionary computation literature [23].

Several research papers that study the stochastic knapsack problem by using chance-constrained programming have been published in the literature. The chance-constrained knapsack problem aims to have a subset of items with maximize profit and remains feasible for the total weight of this set at an acceptable threshold probability [13, 14, 18, 19]. Kleinberg et al. [18] studied the problem with the weights of items that are only chosen from two possible options. Goel and Indyk [13] proposed an algorithm that relaxes the chance constraints by a factor of  $(1 + \epsilon)$  to solved instances where items have a Poisson distribution or an experimental distribution. Goyal and Ravi [14] investigated the problem where the weights of items conform to the Normal distribution. The proposed linear programming approach can satisfy the chance constraint strictly. Recently, Neumann and Sutton [30] investigated the runtime of the (1+1) EA for the CCKP and proved that even in the most simple case, it is possible to have local optimal

in the search space. Assimi et al. [1] studied the dynamic chance-constrained knapsack problem and proposed a second objective function to deal with the dynamic capacity of the knapsack. Xie et al. [46] investigated the performance of evolutionary algorithms combined with a heavy-tail mutation operator and a problem-specific crossover operator. They proposed a new multi-objective model for the chance-constrained knapsack problem, which leads to significant performance improvements of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms.

In this paper, for the CCKP, our objective is to find a maximum-value set of items such that the probability of the stochastic weights exceeding the capacity bound is at most  $\alpha$ . To evaluate a solution concerning the chance constraint, we make use of two inequalities – a Chebyshev’s inequality and a Chernoff bound – to calculate an upper bound on the probability of violating the capacity bound and as surrogate functions for the chance constraint. The probabilistic tools we employ allow us to estimate the probability of a constraint violation mathematically without the need for sampling. To find out conditions when to use either of these two inequalities, we carry out an investigation that shows the expected weights and the variances of a given instance affect the selection between the Chebyshev’s inequality and the Chernoff bound.

We first introduce deterministic approaches named Integer Linear programming (ILP), heuristic approach, and dynamic programming (DP) approach to solve CCKP. We then develop a single-objective approach and a multi-objective approach in terms of solving the CCKP. We consider a simple single-objective evolutionary algorithm named (1+1) EA and its multi-objective version, GSEMO, both algorithms have been investigated in various studies [12, 29, 31, 40] previously. One of the main contributions of our work is to estimate the probability that the total weight of a given solution exceeds the considered weight bound. Such estimation is crucial to determine whether a given solution meets the chance constraint and essential to guide the search of evolutionary computing techniques.

In experimental investigations, we analyze the results obtained by the proposed approaches dependent on a wide range of knapsack instances associated with confidence level and the uncertainty of the weights. We evaluate the presented deterministic approaches experimentally and compare their performance to the evolutionary algorithms. The considered ILP approach is not able to obtain high-quality solutions in a short time, while the dynamic programming approach requires significantly more computation time than the evolutionary algorithms in all size instances, and the heuristic approach is not being able to obtain solutions in several hours when solving large-scale instances. The proposed multi-objective evolutionary approach can obtain solutions that have a similar quality to the heuristic approach and the DP approach but within a remarkably shorter computation time. The comparison conclusion provides a reasonable justification for using evolutionary optimization when dealing with the chance-constrained knapsack problem.

Moreover, we compare the results obtained by applying different probability inequalities in the deterministic approaches and EAs. The experimental results show that if the threshold of the probability is small, then the performance of the approaches using the Chernoff bound is better than that of Chebyshev’s inequality for both single-objective and multi-objective algorithms. Moreover, the experimental results show that the performance of GSEMO is significantly better than (1+1) EA for all instances.

This paper is an extension of a conference paper published at GECCO 2019 [45]. The conference paper only studies the performance of a single-objective evolutionary algorithm and a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm on the chance-constrained knapsack problem. The extension consists of deterministic approaches presented in Section 3.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We introduce the formulation of the chance-constrained knapsack problem and the surrogate functions of the chance constraint in Section 2. In Section 3 and Section 4, we present the deterministic approaches and the evolutionary algorithms to solve the problem, respectively. Computational experiments and the investigation of the results are described in Section 5, followed by a conclusion in Section 6.

## 2 Problem formulation and surrogate functions of CCKP

In this section, we present the definition of the chance-constrained knapsack problem and the surrogate functions to replace the chance constraint. The surrogate functions are generated by using best-known probability tails Chebyshev’s inequality and Chernoff bounds to deal with the chance constraint. We also show the comparisons between these two estimated methods.

### 2.1 Problem Definition

We assume the weights of items are independent of each other, with each weight  $w_i$  corresponding to expected value  $a_i$  and standard variance  $\sigma_i$ , and a knapsack capacity  $C > 0$ . We encode a solution as a vector of 0-1 decision variables  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , where  $x_i = 1$  selects the  $i$ -th item. Let  $W(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i$  be the total weight of a given solution  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , with  $E[W(X)] = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$  denoting the expected weight of the solution derived by linearity of expectation. Furthermore,  $Var(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 x_i$  denotes the variance of the weight under the assumption that the variables of items are independent. The goal of the problem is to find a sub-set of items with maximized profit, and the probability of violating the capacity bound is less than or equal to a given threshold denoted as  $\alpha$ . The CCKP can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathbf{max} \quad P(X) = \sum_{i \in N} p_i x_i \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{s.t.} \quad P_r \left( \sum_{i \in N} w_i x_i \geq C \right) \leq \alpha \quad (2)$$

$$x_i \in \{0, 1\}^n \quad (3)$$

We then present the surrogate functions of the chance constraint (2), which are generated by using Chebyshev’s inequality and Chernoff bounds [37] to deal with the chance constraint.

## 2.2 Surrogate Functions

In this section, we use Chebyshev's inequality and Chernoff bounds [3] to construct the available surrogate that translates to a guarantee on the feasibility of the chance-constrained imposed by Equation (2).

### 2.2.1 Chebyshev's inequality

Firstly, we use the Chebyshev's inequality (4) to reformulate the chance constraint (2). The inequality has great utility for being applied to any probability distribution with known expectation and variance. The Chebyshev's inequality considers tails for upper bound and lower bounds. Since this paper only considers the violation of the capacity bound  $C$ , we use a one-side Chebyshev's inequality which is known as the Chebyshev-Cantelli inequality. To simplify the presentation, we still use the term Chebyshev's inequality in the following.

**Theorem 1** (Chebyshev's inequality). *Let  $X$  be a random variable with expectation  $E(X)$  and variance  $Var(X)$ . Then for any  $k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,*

$$Pr(X \geq E(X) + k) \leq \frac{Var(X)}{Var(X) + k^2}. \quad (4)$$

To match the expression of the Chebyshev's inequality, we set  $E[W(X)] + k = C$ , then we have a general formula to calculate the upper bound of the chance constraint as follows:

$$Pr(W(X) \geq C) \leq \frac{Var(X)}{Var(X) + (C - E[W(X)])^2}. \quad (5)$$

Hence, the constraint (2) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\frac{Var(X)}{Var(X) + (C - E[W(X)])^2} \leq \alpha. \quad (6)$$

**Definition 2.** *Given a solution  $X$  with stochastic weight  $W(X)$ , we call the  $E[W(X)] + \sqrt{Var(X) \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$  the surrogate weight of  $X$ , denoted by  $S(X)$ .*

**Theorem 3.** *If  $X$  is a solution vector with surrogate weight  $S(X) = E[W(X)] + \sqrt{Var(X) \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$ , then the chance constraint stated in Equation (2) is satisfied when  $S(X) \leq B$  according to Chebyshev's inequality, for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .*

Furthermore, we consider two special cases where each item in the first case has a uniform distribution and takes value in  $[a_i - \delta, a_i + \delta]$ , which is named the additive uniform distribution. In the second case, each item takes value in  $[(1-\beta)a_i, (1+\beta)a_i]$ , having a uniform distribution called the multiplicative uniform distribution. Here,  $\delta$  and  $\beta$  define the uncertainty of the weights of items. For the variable which has a uniform distribution on the interval  $[g, h]$ , the expectation of this variable is  $\mu = \frac{g+h}{2}$  and the

variance is  $\sigma^2 = \frac{(h-g)^2}{12}$ . Applying Chebyshev's inequality to the chance constraint, we require

$$P_r(W(X) \geq C) \leq \frac{\delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i}{\delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 3(C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \quad (7)$$

for the additive uniform distribution and

$$P_r(W(X) \geq C) \leq \frac{\beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i}{\beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 3(C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \quad (8)$$

for the multiplicative uniform distribution. When each weight  $w_i$  is chosen according to the Normal distribution  $N(a_i, \sigma_i^2)$  and are independent of each other, we get

$$P_r(W(X) \geq C) \leq \frac{\sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i}{\sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i + (C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \quad (9)$$

### 2.2.2 Chernoff bounds

Chernoff bounds provide sharper tails with exponential decay behavior, those bounds are sharper than other known tail bounds such as Markov inequality and Chebyshev's inequality. Chernoff bounds assume that variables are independent and take on values in  $[0, 1]$ . There are several types of Chernoff bounds, and we use the following one, which can be found in [3].

**Theorem 4** (Chernoff bound). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random variables taking values in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $X = \sum_{i \in N} X_i$ . Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Then*

$$P_r(X \geq (1 + \epsilon)E(X)) \leq \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1 + \epsilon)^{(1 + \epsilon)}} \right)^{E(X)}. \quad (10)$$

Function (10) can be used in the case that all random variables are independent and have their value in  $[0, 1]$ . The Chernoff bound is used to calculate the probability of violating the constraint incorporate with a surrogate function.

**Theorem 5.** *Let the stochastic weights  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  be independent variables with expected values  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ , respectively. Let  $C > 0$  be the capacity of the knapsack,  $\sum_{i \in N} w_i x_i$  denotes the total weight of a solution  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ , and  $E[W(X)] = \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i$  be the expected weight of the solution, Furthermore, let  $\delta \geq 0$  be the uncertainty of the stochastic weights. Then we have the following function.*

$$P_r\left(\sum_{i \in N} w_i x_i \geq C\right) \leq \left( \frac{e^{\frac{C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}}}{\left(\frac{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i + C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}\right)^{\frac{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i + C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in N} x_i} \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* In the chance-constrained knapsack problem, we can apply the Chernoff bound in a unique setting that lets  $w_i \in [a_i - \delta, a_i + \delta]$  and conform to a uniform distribution. All random variables have the same uncertainty  $\delta$  but different initial and final boundaries. We than normalize the stochastic weights to make them chosen values in  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore, we set

$$y_i = \frac{w_i - (a_i - \delta)}{2\delta} \in [0, 1], Y(X) = \sum_{i \in N} y_i x_i.$$

Then we have,

$$E_W(y_i) = \frac{a_i - (a_i - \delta)}{2\delta} = \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$E_W[Y(X)] = \frac{E[W(X)] - (\sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i - \sum_{i \in N} \delta x_i)}{2\delta} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in N} x_i.$$

We introduce  $Y(X)$  in the Chernoff bound and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{(1+\epsilon)}} \right)^{E_W[Y(X)]} &\geq Pr [Y(X) \geq (1+\epsilon)E_W[Y(X)]] \\ &= Pr \left[ \sum_{i \in N} \frac{w_i - (a_i - \delta)}{2\delta} x_i \geq (1+\epsilon) \frac{\sum_{i \in N} x_i}{2} \right] \\ &= Pr \left[ \sum_{i \in N} w_i x_i - \sum_{i \in N} (a_i - \delta) x_i \geq (1+\epsilon) \delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i \right] \\ &= Pr \left[ \sum_{i \in N} w_i x_i \geq \epsilon \delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let  $C = \epsilon \delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i$ , we have  $\epsilon = \frac{C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}$ . We substitute  $C$  and  $\epsilon$  into the last expression, which completes the proof.  $\square$

The proof can be distinguished by the following two characteristics. On the one hand, we study the random variable  $Y$  rather than  $W$ , on the other hand, the interval lengths we discussed are the same for all stochastic weights. We reformulate the chance constraint by using the Chernoff bound to estimate the upper bound of the probability of violating the capacity. It should be noted that the interval of all weights should be the equivalent. The surrogate function of the chance constraint is as follows:

$$Pr(W(X) \geq C) \leq \left( \frac{e^{-\frac{C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}}}{\left( \frac{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i + C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in N} x_i}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in N} x_i} \leq \alpha \quad (12)$$

**Theorem 6.** *If  $X$  is a solution vector with surrogate weight*

$$S'(X) = E[W(X)] + \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha} \delta \sqrt{\sum_{i \in N} x_i},$$

then the chance constraint stated in Equation (2) is satisfied when  $S'(X) \leq B$  according to Chernoff bound, and let  $w_i \in [a_i - \delta, a_i + \delta]$ , for all  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon = \frac{C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i} \geq 0$ , by Theorem 5, this is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{(1+\epsilon)}} \right)^{\frac{\sum_{i \in N} x_i}{2}} \leq \alpha \\
& \iff \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{(1+\epsilon)}} \leq (\alpha)^{\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i}} \\
& \iff e^\epsilon \leq (1+\epsilon)^{(1+\epsilon)} (\alpha)^{\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i}} \\
& \iff \epsilon \leq \frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha + (1+\epsilon) \ln(1+\epsilon) \\
& \iff \epsilon - (1+\epsilon) \ln(1+\epsilon) \leq \frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha \\
& \implies \epsilon - (1+\epsilon)\epsilon \leq \frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha \\
& \iff -\epsilon^2 \leq \frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha \\
& \iff \epsilon^2 \geq -\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha \\
& \iff \epsilon \geq \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have  $\frac{C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i} \geq \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha}$ , and  $C \geq E[W(X)] + \sqrt{-\frac{2}{\sum_{i \in N} x_i} \ln \alpha} \delta \sqrt{\sum_{i \in N} x_i}$  where we have used the claimed surrogate weight.  $\square$

### 2.2.3 Comparison of tail inequalities

Next, we theoretically investigate the effectiveness of Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound on tackling the chance constraint. The goal of this analysis is to examine which estimation method outperforms the other under various conditions. Let  $p_{\text{Cher}}(X)$  denotes the probability obtained by the Chernoff bound and  $p_{\text{Cheb}}(X)$  be the probability calculated by the Chebyshev's inequality. The following theorem states a condition under which one inequality should be preferred over the other.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $X$  be a solution with the expected weight  $E[W(X)]$  and the variance of weight  $\text{Var}(X)$ , let  $\epsilon = \frac{C - E[W(X)]}{\delta \sum_{i \in N} x_i}$ . We have  $p_{\text{Cher}}(X) \leq p_{\text{Cheb}}(X)$  if and only if*

$$\frac{\left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} (\epsilon E[W(X)])^2}{1 - \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]}} \leq \text{Var}(X). \quad (13)$$






Figure 1: The relationship between  $E[W(X)]$  and  $Var(X)$  based on different values of  $\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Using the variable  $\epsilon$  from the Chernoff bound, we set  $k = \epsilon E[W(X)]$  in the Chebyshev's inequality. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} \leq \frac{Var(X)}{Var(X) + (\epsilon E[W(X)])^2} \\
\iff & \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} (Var(X) + (\epsilon E[W(X)])^2) \leq Var(X) \\
\iff & \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} (\epsilon E[W(X)])^2 \leq Var(X) \left( 1 - \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} \right) \\
\iff & \frac{\left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]} (\epsilon E[W(X)])^2}{1 - \left( \frac{e^\epsilon}{(1+\epsilon)^{1+\epsilon}} \right)^{E[W(X)]}} \leq Var(X)
\end{aligned}$$

which shows our claim.  $\square$

We now further investigate the relationship between Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound. In Theorem 7, the three parameters:  $\epsilon$ ,  $E[W(X)]$  and  $Var(X)$  establish the relationship between Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound. Among the parameters,  $\epsilon$  indicates the deviation from the expected value. After fixing the value of  $\epsilon$ , for any instance, the relationship between  $E[W(X)]$  and  $Var(X)$  can determine which inequality is more suitable for the purpose of solving the instance. As shown in Figure 1, the values of  $\epsilon$  set independently at  $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$ . The figure is based on a test instance with 100 items, and the weights of items are chosen uniformly at random in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Every curve in Figure 1 corresponds to a fixed value of  $\epsilon$ . When the tuple of  $(E[W(X)], Var(X))$  is located on the curve, the probability of the constraint violation calculated by Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound

are the same. For the situation where a tuple of  $(E[W(X)], Var(X))$  is located above the curve, the Chernoff bound gives a better estimate, and if it is located below the curve, Chebyshev's inequality provides a better upper bound on the probability of the constraint violation. As can be seen from the figure, the greater the value of  $\epsilon$ , the more suitable the Chernoff bound is for obtaining a superior bound.

### 3 Deterministic Approaches

In this section, we consider several deterministic approaches to solving the chance-constrained knapsack problem. We present Integer Linear Programming (ILP), a heuristic approach based on Nemhauser Ullmann algorithm (NU-base) and dynamic programming (DP) in the following subsections.

#### 3.1 Integer Linear Programming

Firstly, we linearise the surrogate functions which replace the chance constraint in the CCKP, then we apply Integer Linear Programming (ILP) to solve the problem. We consider Chebyshev's inequality and provide the linear approximation that characterises the ILP approach. The surrogate functions in Section 2.2.1 can be replaced by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i}{\delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 3(C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \\
& \Leftrightarrow \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i \leq \alpha \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 3\alpha \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i \leq \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i \leq C^2 - 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i + \left( \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i \leq C^2 - 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j x_i x_j \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

for the additive uniform distribution (7). Then, we replace the term  $x_i x_j$  in the right hand side in Equation (14) by a new added variable  $y_{ij}$  with domain  $\{0, 1\}$  and define linear constraints for  $y_{ij}$  as follows:

$$2y_{ij} \leq x_i + x_j \leq 1 + y_{ij}. \quad (15)$$

The chance constraint can be reformulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i \leq C^2 - 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j y_{ij} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i - \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i - 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j y_{ij} \leq C^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For the chance-constrained knapsack problem, any feasible solution should subject to Equation (14) which indicate regardless of whether the value of  $x_i x_j$  is equal to 0 or 1, setting  $y_{ij}$  will not make the feasible solution infeasible. For example, if a solution  $X$  is a feasible solution, it should submit to Equation (14), assume there exist some  $x_i x_j = 0$  and we set the corresponding  $y_{ij}$  to 1. So, we have  $\sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j x_i x_j \leq \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j y_{ij}$  of the solution  $X$  which does not make the solution infeasible. Therefore, we can remove the right part of Equation (15). We then formulate the ILP model of the chance-constrained knapsack problem with weights conforming to the additive uniform distribution as follows:

$$\mathbf{max} \quad \sum_{i \in N} p_i x_i \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{s.t.} \quad \frac{1-\alpha}{3\alpha} \delta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i - \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i - 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j y_{ij} \leq C^2 \quad (18)$$

$$2y_{ij} \leq x_i + x_j \quad (19)$$

$$x_i, y_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}^n \quad (20)$$

Similarly, for multiplicative uniform distribution (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i}{\beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 3(C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \\ \Leftrightarrow & \beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i \leq \alpha \beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} x_i + 3\alpha \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{(1-\alpha)}{3\alpha} \beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i \leq \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{(1-\alpha)}{3\alpha} \beta^2 \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i \leq C^2 - 2C \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j x_i x_j \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and for the case that each weight of item is chosen according to the Normal distribution

$N(a_i, \sigma_i^2)$  (9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i}{\sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i + (C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i)^2} \leq \alpha \\
& \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i \leq \alpha \sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i + \alpha \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{(1 - \alpha)}{\alpha} \sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i \leq \left( C - \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i \right)^2 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{(1 - \alpha)}{\alpha} \sum_{i \in N} \sigma_i^2 x_i \leq C^2 - 2C \sum_{i \in N} a_i x_i + \sum_{i \in N} a_i^2 x_i + 2 \sum_{i < j: i, j \in N} a_i a_j x_i x_j.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Replacing the terms  $x_i x_j$  in Equations (21) and (22) with the added variables  $y_{ij}$ , we can obtain the ILP models which take into account different surrogate constraints.

### 3.2 Heuristic approach

We now introduce a heuristic approach (see Algorithm 1) adapted from the Nemhauser-Ullmann algorithm (NU algorithm) proposed by Nemhauser and Ullmann [28]. The NU algorithm can be viewed as a sparse dynamic programming approach [2], and it computes a list of all dominating sets in an iterative manner, adding one item after the other. For  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $L_i$  denote the list of Pareto-optimal points with considering item 1 to  $i$ . The solutions in  $L_i$  are assumed to be listed in increasing order of weight (profit).

In the heuristic approach, we use surrogate weights obtained using Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound to replace the exact weights of the solution used to find the Pareto front in the NU algorithm. The heuristic approach starts with the empty set and then add items one by one until it finally obtains the set of Pareto-optimal packing for all  $n$  items.  $L_i$  can be computed using  $L_{i-1}$  and the item  $m$  as follows: first generate  $L'_{i-1}$ , add item  $i$  to each element in  $L_{i-1}$  if the new solution is feasible, and inset it to  $L'_{i-1}$ . Then, we merge the two lists  $L_{i-1}$  and  $L'_{i-1}$  according to the surrogate weight and the profit of the solutions. Finally, we obtain an order sequence  $L_i$  of dominating solutions over the items  $1, \dots, i$ . The resulting list  $L_n$  contains all Pareto-optimal points for  $n$  items. For this list, we choose the point with maximal profit, and the packing belonging to this result is the approximate optimal solution.

In the merging step, both lists are sorted according to the surrogate weights. Thus, this task can be completely by scanning only once through both of these lists. However, this heuristic approach is effective in solving the knapsack problem where the weights of items are deterministic in value. In the chance-constrained knapsack problem, the weights of items are stochastic variables. Using the surrogate weights and the profits of solutions to find the Pareto front does not guarantee that the optimal solution to the problem will be found. Therefore, we introduce dynamic programming for the chance-constrained knapsack problem in the next subsection.

---

**Algorithm 1** Heuristic approach for the CCKP

---

```
1: Input:  $n$  items with  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  and  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  which are the expected weights
   and the variances of the weights of items, and  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  which are the profits of
   the items. Knapsack capacity  $C$ .
2: let lists  $L_1, \dots, L_n$ .
3: Initialize  $L_0 = \{(0, 0)\}$ .
4: for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
5:    $L'_{i-1} = L_{i-1}$ ;
6:   for each solution  $K \in L'_{i-1}$  do
7:     add item  $i$  to  $K$  to generate a new solution  $K' = K \cup \{i\}$ ,
8:     if solution  $K'$  is feasible then
9:       replace  $K$  with  $K'$ .
10:    else
11:      delete  $K$  from  $L'_{i-1}$ .
12:    end if
13:  end for
14:  let  $P_{max} = -1$ ,  $E = \{\}$ 
15:  while true do
16:    Let  $k \in L_{i-1}$  be the first one with  $p_k > P_{max}$ ,
17:    let  $k' \in L'_{i-1}$  be the first one with  $p_{k'} > P_{max}$ ,
18:    if can not find  $k$  then
19:      insert remaining points from  $L'_{i-1}$  into  $E$ ,
20:      break.
21:    end if
22:    if can not find  $k'$  then
23:      insert remaining points from  $L_{i-1}$  into  $E$ ,
24:      break.
25:    end if
26:    if  $S(k) < S(k')$  or  $(S(k) = S(k')$  and  $p_k > p_{k'})$  then
27:      insert  $k$  into  $E$ , and set  $P_{max} = p_k$ ,
28:    else
29:      insert  $k'$  into  $E$ , and set  $P_{max} = p_{k'}$ ,
30:    end if
31:  end while
32: end for
33: return  $L_n$ .
```

---

### 3.3 Dynamic programming

We now introduce a dynamic programming approach to solve the chance-constrained knapsack problem. Dynamic programming is one of the traditional approaches for the classical binary knapsack problems [42]. In the DP approach, items are processed in the order according to their index, from 1 to  $n$ .

The key idea behind the DP approach is to assume the weights of items are random variables with corresponding expected weights and variances. The approach is applied in a similar manner to the process which is undertaken for the classical binary knapsack problem. The program table of the chance-constrained knapsack problem consists of  $n + 1$  rows and  $C + 1$  columns which are used to compute the optimal solution. Each cell  $M_{ij}$  consists of a set of feasible solutions which selected items from the items set  $\{1, \dots, i\}$  and knapsack capacity  $j$ , and those solutions are not dominated by each

---

**Algorithm 2** Dynamic programming for the CCKP

---

- 1: **Input:**  $n$  items with  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  and  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  which are the expected weights and the variances of the weights of items, and  $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  which are the profits of the items. Knapsack capacity  $C$ .
  - 2: let  $M[0, \dots, n][0, \dots, C]$  be a new table, each cell  $M_{ij}$  stores a set of solutions.
  - 3: Initialize  $M_{00} = \{\emptyset\}$ .
  - 4: **for**  $i = 1$  to  $n$  **do**
  - 5:     **for**  $j = 0$  to  $C$  **do**
  - 6:          $M_{ij} = M_{(i-1)j}$ ;
  - 7:         **if**  $a_i \leq j$  **then**
  - 8:             **for** each solution  $S \in M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$  **do**
  - 9:                 add item  $i$  to  $S$  to generate a new solution  $S' = S \cup \{i\}$ ,
  - 10:                 **if** solution  $S'$  is feasible and not dominated by any solution in  $M_{ij}$  **then**
  - 11:                     remove solutions in  $M_{ij}$  which are dominated by  $S'$ .
  - 12:                     add  $S'$  to  $M_{ij}$ .
  - 13:                 **end if**
  - 14:             **end for**
  - 15:         **end if**
  - 16:     **end for**
  - 17:      $M_{ij}$  stores all feasible and no-dominate to each other solutions.
  - 18: **end for**
- 

other. Here we choose to use the surrogate function according to the setting of the problem to tackle the chance constraint. To initialise the program table, we set the first cell as  $M_{00} = \{\emptyset\}$  which only contains an empty set of items.

It can be observed of the surrogate functions obtained by Chebyshev's inequality (6) and Chernoff bound (12) that for a solution, not only its expected weight but also its variance affect the probability with which it will violate the knapsack bound. With a fixed expected weight, when the value of the variance decrease, the probability of the chance constraint will decrease. Similarly, with a fixed variance, a decrease in the expected weight leads to a decrease in probability that the chance constraint will decrease. The smaller the value of this probability, the higher the capability to insert items into the knapsack. Therefore, we say that solution  $S$  dominates solution  $S'$ , denoted by  $S \succeq S'$ , iff  $w(S) < w(S')$ ,  $v(S) < v(S')$  and  $p(S) > p(S')$ , where  $w(S)$  denotes the expected weight of solution  $S$ ,  $v(S)$  denotes the variance of solution  $S$  and  $p(S)$  denotes the profit of solution  $S$ .

Let item  $(i-1)$  be the predecessor of item  $i$  and  $a_i \leq j$ . Based on the set of feasible solutions in  $M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$  we compute  $M_{ij}$  where  $a_i$  denotes the expected weight of item  $i$ , and giving us  $a_i \leq j$ . We calculate  $M_{ij}$  by adding item  $i$  using the following steps. Firstly, all elements from  $M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$  are copied to  $M_{ij}$ . Secondly, for every solution  $S$  in  $M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$ , item  $i$  is added to the set of items. If the new set of items  $S \cup \{i\}$  is feasible and not dominated by any solution in  $M_{ij}$ , we remove solutions from  $M_{ij}$  which are dominated by  $S \cup \{i\}$  and add  $S \cup \{i\}$  to  $M_{ij}$ . For the resulting algorithm (Algorithm 2), we can state the following theorem:

**Theorem 8.** For each set of item  $\{1, \dots, i\}$ ,  $M_{ij}$  stores a set of feasible solutions which are not dominated each other with considering all subset of  $\{1, \dots, i\}$  and knapsack capacity  $j$ , and the optimal solution is among them. In particular,  $M_{nC}$  contains the optimal solution with considering all items, which can be obtained via DP approach.

*Proof.* The statement is true for the first item as there are only two options: choosing or not choosing the first item. So  $M_{00}$  stores the solution:  $(\emptyset)$ . Now we assume that  $M_{(i-1)j}$  stores all feasible solutions which are not dominated by each other with respect to all subsets of  $\{1, \dots, i-1\}$  with capacity  $j$ .

Now, we contract  $M_{ij}$  by first adding all subsets in  $M_{(i-1)j}$ . Then, if  $a_i > j$ , item  $i$  is not able to add in any solution in  $M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$  and  $M_{ij} = M_{(i-1)j}$ . Otherwise, adding item  $i$  to a subset  $S' \in M_{(i-1)(j-a_i)}$ , if the new set of items is still feasible according to capacity  $j$ , then the expected weight of this solution is  $w(S' \cup \{i\}) = w(S') + a_i$ , the variance of this solution is  $v(S' \cup \{i\}) = v(S') + \sigma_i^2$  and the profit is  $p(S' \cup \{i\}) = p(S') + p_i$ . Then, if the new solution is not dominated by any solution in  $M_{ij}$ , we insert this solution into  $M_{ij}$ , removing all solutions in  $M_{ij}$  which are dominated by this solution.

Therefore,  $M_{ij}$  stores all feasible solutions which are not dominated by each other, and we can pick the optimal solution in  $M_{nC}$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

We now investigate the runtime for this dynamic program. The feasible solutions in the cell  $M_{ij}$  have been calculated by considering all possible combinations of variances and expected weights from the set  $\{1, \dots, i\}$ , in which  $2^i$  denotes the number of different expected weights and variances in the worst case. We then give the upper bound of the computation time that DP takes to calculate all possible combinations of the variances and expected weights of  $M_{ij}$  as  $O(2^{2i})$ . Therefore, the time until the DP approach calculates the optimal solution to the chance-constrained knapsack problem instance is the summary of  $O(nC2^{2n})$ . However, in the case that the weights of items conform to a uniform distribution and take values in  $[a_i - \delta, a_i + \delta]$ , then the variance of items are the same. So for the set  $\{1, \dots, i\}$ , the possible combinations of the variance is  $O(i)$ , and the runtime of the instances, in this case, is bounded by  $O(Cn^22^n)$ . In the case that the weights of items conform to the uniform distribution  $[(1 - \beta)a_i, (1 + \beta)a_i]$  or the Normal distribution  $N(a_i, a_i\beta)$ , the variance of an item is equal to the expected weight of this item time the uncertainty  $\beta$ . Therefore, when tackling those cases, the DP does not need to incorporate the variance of solutions into the domination comparison, and the runtime of the approach is bounded by  $O(Cn2^n)$ .

## 4 Evolutionary algorithms for the CCKP

Evolutionary algorithms are bio-inspired randomized techniques, and they can obtain solutions with good quality in acceptable computation time. In this section, we discuss the use of evolutionary algorithms to solve the CCKP. We begin by designing standard fitness functions for a single-objective approach and a multi-objective approach. Next, we investigate the effectiveness of the simplest single-objective evolutionary algorithm

---

**Algorithm 3** (1+1) EA

---

- 1: Choose  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random.
  - 2: **while** *stopping criterion not met* **do**
  - 3:    $y \leftarrow$  flip each bit of  $x$  independently with probability of  $\frac{1}{n}$ ;
  - 4:   **if**  $f(y) \geq f(x)$  **then**
  - 5:      $x \leftarrow y$ ;
  - 6:   **end if**
  - 7: **end while**
- 

(the (1+1) EA) and its multi-objective version (GSEMO) to solve the problem using an experimental study.

### 4.1 Single-Objectives Approach

We start by considering a single-objective approach and design a fitness function that can be used in single-objective evolutionary algorithms. The fitness function  $f$  for the approach needs to take into account the profit of the selected items and the requirement to meet the chance constraint. We define the fitness of a solution  $X \in \{0, 1\}^n$  as:

$$f(X) = (u(X), v(X), P(X)) \quad (23)$$

where  $u(X) = \max\{\sum_{i \in n} a_i x_i - c, 0\}$ ,  $v(X) = \max\{Pr\{\sum_{i \in n} w_i x_i > c\} - \alpha, 0\}$ . For this fitness function,  $u(X)$  and  $v(X)$  need to be minimized while  $P(X)$  need to be maximized, and we optimize  $f$  in lexicographic order. The fitness function takes into account two types of infeasible solutions: (1) the expected weight of the solution exceeds the bound of capacity, (2) the probability that the total weight of the solution violating the capacity is greater than  $\alpha$ . Note that  $\alpha$  is usually a small value, and throughout this paper, we work with  $\alpha \leq 0.1$ . The reason for having the first type of infeasible solutions is that we can not use the inequalities to guide the search, if the expected weight of a solution is below the given capacity bound. Furthermore, the first type of infeasible solutions violates the chance constraint with a probability at least 1/2 for all probability distributions studied in the experimental part of this paper.

Among solutions that meet the chance constraint, we maximize the profit  $P(X)$ . Formally, we have the following relation between two search points  $x$  and  $y$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) \succeq f(y) \\ \iff (u(x) < u(y)) \text{ or } (u(x) = u(y) \wedge v(x) < v(y)) \\ \text{or } (u(x) = u(y) \wedge v(x) = v(y) \wedge P(x) > P(y)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

When comparing solutions, a feasible solution is preferred in a comparison between any infeasible and this feasible solution. Between two feasible solutions, the one with better profit is preferred. When comparing two infeasible solutions, the one with a lower degree of constraint violation is better than the other.

The fitness function can be used in any single-objective evolutionary algorithm. In this paper, we investigate the performance of the classical (1+1) EA (see Algorithm 3).



---

**Algorithm 4** GSEMO

---

- 1: Choose  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random
  - 2:  $S \leftarrow \{x\}$ ;
  - 3: **while** stopping criterion not met **do**
  - 4:   choose  $x \in S$  uniformly at random;
  - 5:    $y \leftarrow$  flip each bit of  $x$  independently with probability of  $\frac{1}{n}$ ;
  - 6:   **if** ( $\nexists w \in S : w \succeq_{GSEMO} y$ ) **then**
  - 7:      $S \leftarrow (S \cup \{y\}) \setminus \{z \in S | y \succeq_{GSEMO} z\}$  ;
  - 8:   **end if**
  - 9: **end while**
- 

We generate the initial solution with items chosen uniformly at random for the algorithm, and then the (1+1) EA flips each bit of the current solution with a probability of  $1/n$  in the mutation step. In the selection step, the algorithm accepts the offspring if it is at least as good as the parent according to the fitness function  $f$ .

## 4.2 Multi-Objective Approach

Now we consider a multi-objective approach where each search point  $X$  is a two-dimensional point in the objective space. We use the following fitness functions:

$$g_1(X) = \begin{cases} P_r(W(X) \geq C) & E[W(X)] < C \\ 1 + (E[W(X)] - C) & E[W(X)] \geq C \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

$$g_2(X) = \begin{cases} P(X) & g_1(X) \leq \alpha \\ -1 & g_1(X) > \alpha \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

where  $W(X)$  denotes the weight of the solution  $X$ ,  $E[W(X)]$  denotes the expected weight of the solution. We say solution  $Y$  weak-dominates solution  $X$  denoted by  $Y \succeq X$ , iff  $g_1(Y) \leq g_1(X) \wedge g_2(Y) \geq g_2(X)$ . Comparing two solutions, the objective function  $g_1$  guarantees that a feasible solution dominates all infeasible solutions. The objective function  $g_2$  ensures that the search process is guided towards feasible solutions and that trade-offs in terms of confidence level and profit are computed for feasible solutions.

The multi-objective algorithm we consider here is the Global Simple Evolutionary Multi-Objective Optimizer (GSEMO) (see Algorithm 4), which is a simple multi-objective evolutionary algorithm (SEMO) that searches globally. Laumanns et al., [21] investigated and analyzed a SEMO which starts with an initial solution and stores all non-dominated solutions in each population. In each step, it uniformly chooses a search point from the population and flips one bit of this search point to obtain a new search point. The new population contains search points corresponding to all non-dominated fitness vectors. Giel and Wegener [12] investigated a GSEMO due to [21], this GSEMO works like the SEMO but different in mutation step. In the mutation step, each bit of the search point is flipped independently of the others with probability  $\frac{1}{n}$ . When GSEMO

applied to a single-objective optimization problem, it equals the (1+1) EA, for both algorithms use the same mutation operator and keep at each time, and any solution does not dominate each other found so far in the optimization process.

## 5 Experiments

In this section, we first compare the results obtained by using deterministic approaches, (1+1) EA and GSEMO, and investigate the performance of these approaches with different surrogate functions of the chance constraint. We describe the experimental design and the chance-constrained knapsack problem instances in the next subsection.

### 5.1 Experimental Setup

Firstly, we describe the experimental design and the chance-constrained knapsack problem instances. In this chapter, all experiments were performed using Java (version 11.0.1) on a MacBook with a 2.3 GHz Intel Core i5 CPU. The benchmark we used is from the literature [39], which was created following the approach in [44]. We choose two types of instances from the benchmark: *uncorrelated* and *bounded strongly correlated*. The weights and profits of items in the uncorrelated instances are integers that are chosen uniformly at random within  $[1, 1000]$ . The bounded strongly correlated instances have the tightest bound knapsack among all type of instances where the weights of items are chosen uniformly at random within  $[1, 1000]$ , and the values of profits are set by the weights.

We adapt the above instances to the chance-constrained knapsack problem by randomising the weights. Since the weights of items must be positive, we add a value  $\gamma$  to every deterministic weight from the benchmark and take it as the expected weight of this item to ensure we can factor in more uncertainty in all instances. Since we change the weights of items, we need to adjust the considered constraint bound. However, shifting the knapsack bound is challenging, as it is necessary to ensure that a solution remains feasible after bound has been changed. Moreover, increasing the knapsack’s capacity expands the feasible search space and may introduce additional feasible solutions. Hence, when shifting the capacity of the knapsack, one should consider keeping the feasibility of original solutions and the size of the new feasible search space adaptive.

We adjust the original knapsack problem instances from the benchmark set as follows. First, we sort the weights of items in ascending order. Then, the first  $k$  items with smaller weights are chosen to be added to the knapsack until the original capacity is exceeded. Hence, this number of items  $k$  represents the largest number of items that any feasible solution may include. We adapt the capacity bound according to this and set:

$$C' \leftarrow C + k\gamma. \tag{27}$$

We set  $\gamma = 100$  and apply it to the initial benchmark. In this section, we consider three instance categories: (1) instances in which every item weight conforms to the

additive uniform distribution and takes the value in  $[a_i - \delta, a_i + \delta]$ ; (2) instances in which every item weight conforms to the multiplicative uniform distribution and takes the value in  $[(1 - \beta)a_i, (1 + \beta)a_i]$ ; (3) instances in which every item weight conforms to the Normal distribution  $N \sim (a_i, a_i\beta)$ . The tuples  $(\alpha, \delta, \beta)$  are the combinations of the elements from the sets  $\alpha = [0.001, 0.01, 0.1]$ ,  $\delta = [25, 50]$  and  $\beta = [0.01, 0.05, 0.1]$ . Based on this arrangement, we compare the performance of all the algorithms on the chance-constrained knapsack problem. Since (1+1) EA and GSEMO are bio-inspired algorithms, they cannot produce exact optimal solutions, and the solutions are different in independent runs. Statistical comparisons (comparing each pair of algorithms with surrogate functions) are carried out using the Kruskal-Wallis test (with a 95% confidence interval) integrated with the Wilcoxon sum rank test (with a 95% confidence level). For more detailed descriptions of these statistical tests, we refer the reader to [10, 9, 11, 6].

In the next subsection, we compare the performance of all proposed algorithms for instances of different types and sizes. Then, we highlight the differences between the algorithms using Chebyshev’s inequality and the Chernoff bound as the surrogate functions of the chance constraint.

## 5.2 Experimental Results

We benchmark our approach with the combinations from the experimental setting described above. Table 1 and Table 2 list the results obtained from the two types of instances which contain 100 items. The weights of items conform to an additive uniform distribution, and the best solutions among all approaches are emphasised in bold. For each instance, we investigate different settings together with different levels of uncertainty determined by  $\delta$  and the requirement on the chance constraint determined by  $\alpha$ . We apply Chebyshev’s inequality to ILP by fixing running time  $\{2mins, 6mins, 10mins\}$  for all instances; the results are listed in Table 1. We use both chance-constrained estimation methods to tackle the chance constraint when using the heuristic approach and the DP approaches. Under the heuristic approach and the DP headings, the *profit* denotes the object value of each approach, and the *time(ms)* denotes the computation time associated with each approach. The computation time associate with DP is one or orders of magnitude longer than for other approaches, for all instances. Where units are presented in double inverted commas (“ – ”), this means that the run time for DP to solve these instances is longer than ten hours. For (1+1) EA and GSEMO, we provide the results from 30 independent runs with  $10^6$  generations for all instances. In these cases, *profit* denotes the average profit associated with the 30 runs, and *time(ms)* denotes the average running time associated with the 30 runs.

The first insight from Table 1 and Table 2 is according to the deterministic approaches, the objective values obtained by the DP are at least as good as the results obtained by heuristic approach and ILP. When using Chebyshev’s inequality to estimate the probability of violating the capacity, the heuristic approach performs at least as well as ILP. In observing the values listed in the *Heuristic approach* and *GSEMO* columns in Table 1, we find that, in most of the instances, the results obtained using the heuristic approach are better than those obtained using GSEMO. Furthermore, the computation time associated with the heuristic approach is shorter than that associated

Table 1: Statistical results for instances with 100 items based on additive uniform distribution and using Chebyshev’s inequality

	Capacity	$\delta$	$\alpha$	ILP			Heuristic approach		DP		(1+1)EA		GSEMO		
				2mins	6mins	10mins	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profits	time(ms)	
bou-s-c 1	11775	25	0.001	13701	13701	13701	<b>13707</b>	261	–	–	13614.8	1200.521	<b>13707</b>	21090.318	
			0.01	<b>15252</b>	<b>15252</b>	<b>15252</b>	<b>15252</b>	303	–	–	15150.47	1207.292	<b>15252</b>	19888.28	
			0.1	15768	15775	15775	<b>15782</b>	492	–	–	15680.87	1206.771	<b>15782</b>	26239.498	
			50	0.001	11757	11793	11795	<b>11900</b>	517	–	–	11756.27	1195.313	11888.1	11637.863
				0.01	14503	<b>14505</b>	<b>14505</b>	<b>14505</b>	691	–	–	14416.8	1203.125	<b>14505</b>	16181.898
				0.1	<b>15585</b>	<b>15585</b>	<b>15585</b>	<b>15585</b>	304	–	–	15431.37	1208.854	<b>15585</b>	18520.158
bou-s-c 2	31027	25	0.001	35045	35045	35045	<b>35069</b>	2015	–	–	34874.8	1226.042	35068.933	51648.881	
			0.01	37005	37005	37005	<b>37027</b>	2287	–	–	36850.73	1232.813	37019.133	61361.251	
			0.1	37647	37647	37657	<b>37673</b>	5056	–	–	37467.43	1233.854	37670.367	64439.556	
			50	0.001	32096	32270	32357	32547	2092	–	–	32332.97	1220.833	<b>32552.733</b>	42825.912
				0.01	36019	36033	36061	<b>36131</b>	2172	–	–	35937.9	1228.125	36121.667	58301.656
				0.1	37391	37391	37391	<b>37406</b>	2857	–	–	37202.63	1235.938	37370.9	62496.325
bou-s-c 3	58455	25	0.001	64190	64175	64265	<b>64389</b>	8042	–	–	64185.73	1250	64387.067	203302.72	
			0.01	66630	66630	66630	<b>66641</b>	10749	–	–	66404.37	1253.125	66639.9	154383.75	
			0.1	67339	67339	67339	<b>67357</b>	31192	–	–	67164.5	1256.771	67356.733	162281.6	
			50	0.001	61111	61111	61111	61155	8374	–	–	61007.6	1242.709	<b>61220.2</b>	168099.53
				0.01	65478	65496	65491	<b>65603</b>	8420	–	–	65372.4	1250.521	65601.8	200503.73
				0.1	66953	67001	66953	<b>67059</b>	17751	–	–	66859.37	1254.688	67057.3	213127.4
uncorr 1	7715	25	0.001	<b>14354</b>	<b>14354</b>	<b>14354</b>	<b>14354</b>	128	<b>14354</b>	12605162	14273.6	1205.729	<b>14354</b>	11479.932	
			0.01	<b>16481</b>	<b>16481</b>	<b>16481</b>	<b>16481</b>	120	<b>16481</b>	23461453	16433.1	1213.021	<b>16481</b>	13291.141	
			0.1	<b>17247</b>	<b>17247</b>	<b>17247</b>	<b>17247</b>	153	<b>17247</b>	49890459	17176.57	1213.021	<b>17247</b>	13480.268	
			50	0.001	<b>11599</b>	<b>11599</b>	<b>11599</b>	<b>11599</b>	53	<b>11599</b>	33147184	11478.83	1196.875	<b>11599</b>	11852.237
				0.01	<b>15504</b>	<b>15504</b>	<b>15504</b>	<b>15504</b>	188	<b>15504</b>	205023878	15424.1	1207.292	<b>15504</b>	16188.438
				0.1	<b>16890</b>	<b>16890</b>	<b>16890</b>	<b>16890</b>	134	<b>16890</b>	36045784	16814.53	1214.583	<b>16890</b>	14843.431
uncorr 2	19545	25	0.001	27027	27027	27027	<b>27029</b>	601	–	–	26932.67	1232.292	<b>27029</b>	38636.347	
			0.01	28786	<b>28825</b>	<b>28825</b>	<b>28825</b>	879	–	–	28724.13	1238.021	<b>28825</b>	54770.144	
			0.1	<b>29415</b>	<b>29415</b>	<b>29415</b>	<b>29415</b>	853	–	–	29315.6	1241.667	<b>29415</b>	56148.136	
			50	0.001	24561	24561	24561	<b>24565</b>	625	–	–	24449.3	1228.125	<b>24565</b>	32166.648
				0.01	27962	27962	27962	<b>27985</b>	504	–	–	27918.43	1237.5	<b>27985</b>	40521.42
				0.1	<b>29165</b>	<b>29165</b>	<b>29165</b>	<b>29165</b>	648	–	–	29091.97	1238.542	<b>29165</b>	43018.24
uncorr 3	36091	25	0.001	39181	39182	39182	<b>39245</b>	1150	–	–	39192.53	1258.333	<b>39245</b>	32204.292	
			0.01	<b>40581</b>	<b>40581</b>	<b>40581</b>	<b>40581</b>	998	–	–	40530.27	1261.458	<b>40581</b>	46855.019	
			0.1	<b>40991</b>	<b>40991</b>	<b>40991</b>	<b>40991</b>	1300	–	–	40890.8	1262.5	40990.8	44955.924	
			50	0.001	36531	37068	37098	<b>37180</b>	1299	–	–	37120.03	1256.25	<b>37180</b>	45597.177
				0.01	39739	39917	39917	<b>39960</b>	1186	–	–	39906.7	1260.938	<b>39960</b>	34677.722
				0.1	40754	<b>40811</b>	<b>40811</b>	<b>40811</b>	1315	–	–	40751.47	1263.542	<b>40811</b>	38348.789

with GSEMO. However, when applying the Chernoff bound to the problems, the results obtained using GSEMO are better than those obtained using the heuristic approach in most instances. Moreover, it can be observed from the tables that the GSEMO outperforms (1+1) EA in combination with different estimate methods.

Furthermore, it can be seen from the values in the *profit* columns that the profit decreases as the value of  $\alpha$  decreases with a fixed value of  $\delta$ , and that the profit decreases when the value of  $\delta$  increases, while the value of  $\alpha$  stays constant. We take the first instances from Table 1 and Table 2 as an examples, presenting the effects of  $\delta$  and  $\alpha$  in Figures 2 and 3. Figure 2 shows how the chance-constrained bound (denoted as  $\alpha$ ) affects the quality of the solution when the uncertainty of weights is fixed. In both figures, the  $x$  labels are the algorithms combined with probability tools, where  $\mathbb{A}$  denotes ILP(2mins)-Chebyshev’s inequality,  $\mathbb{B}$  denotes heuristic approach-Chebyshev’s inequality,  $\mathbb{C}$  denotes heuristic approach-Chernoff bound,  $\mathbb{D}$  denotes (1+1) EA-Chebyshev’s inequality,  $\mathbb{E}$  denotes (1+1) EA-Chernoff bound,  $\mathbb{F}$  de-




Figure 2: Comparison for different values of  $\alpha$  with fixed  $\delta = 25$ .

notes GSEMO-Chebyshev’s inequality and  $\mathbb{G}$  denotes GSEMO-Chernoff bound.

Figure 2 shows how the chance-constrained bound denoted as  $\alpha$  affects the solution quality when the uncertainty of weights is fixed. Correspondingly, Figure 3 shows how the uncertainty of weights affects the solution quality when  $\alpha$  is fixed. Both bar charts show the average values of (1+1) EA and GSEMO with respect to probability inequality. In Figure 2, the three bars of each group correspond to the value of  $\alpha$  equal to  $\{0.001, 0.01, 0.1\}$ . In Figure 3, the two bars of each group correspond to the value of  $\delta = \{25, 50\}$ . We can see from the figures that profits increase as the chance-constrained bound  $\alpha$  increases or the uncertainty of weights  $\delta$  decreases. Intuitively, this makes sense, as the relaxing of  $\alpha$  or the tightening of  $\delta$  allows the algorithms to compute solutions that are closer to the capacity and thereby increase their profit.

Next, we investigate the difference between the estimated methods. It can be observed from Table 3, for all approaches, that when the value of  $\alpha$  is small (i.e.,  $\alpha = 0.001$  or  $0.01$ ), the profits obtained using the Chernoff bound are significantly better than those obtained using Chebyshev’s inequality. In contrast, if  $\alpha = 0.1$ , the results obtained using Chebyshev’s inequality are significantly better than those obtained using the Chernoff bound. The experimental results match the theoretical implications of Theorem 7 and our related discussion.

In Table 3, the *profit* under (1+1) EA and GSEMO denotes the average profit of the 30 runs, and *stat* denotes the statistical comparison of the algorithms combined with the estimation methods. The numbers in the *stat* column denote the significance of the results for an algorithm and constraint violation estimation method. For example, in Table 3, the numbers (2(+), 3(-), 4(+)) listed in the *stat* column in the first row under (1+1) EA - Chernoff bound (1) means that the current algorithm is significantly




Figure 3: Comparison for different values of  $\delta$  with fixed  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

better than *Chebyshev's inequality (2)* and *Chebyshev's inequality (4)*, and significantly worse than *Chernoff bound (3)*.

We now compare the performances of (1+1) EA with GSEMO. Looking at the values listed in the *stat* columns of Table 3, it can be seen that the results listed under *(1+1) EA-Chernoff (1)* are significantly worse than those under *GSEMO-Chernoff (3)*. A similar relationship exists between the values under *(1+1) EA-Chebyshev (2)* and *GSEMO-Chebyshev(4)*, indicating that the performance of GSEMO is significantly better than that of (1+1) EA under all probability tails.

In the second category of instances, the weights of items have multiplicative uniform distributions and take values in the real interval  $[(1 - \beta)a_i, (1 + \beta)a_i]$ . Here, the uncertainty gap corresponding to each item is expressed as a percentage of the expected weight. In this setting, the distance of the random intervals between each item vary for each item pair. We apply Chebyshev's inequality to deal with the chance constraint in this category of instances. The results are listed in Table 4 and Table 5, and we mark the best result across all approaches in each row in bold. The grey cubes in the table highlight the instances in which ILP can be completed in the computation time listed in the second columns under the title *ILP*. It can be observed that all algorithms produce inferior solutions when the uncertainty added to the weights of items (measured by  $\beta$ ) increases, or the upper bound of the probability of overloading the capacity in the form of  $\alpha$  decreases.

Furthermore, it can be observed from Table 4, we found that the results obtained using the heuristic approach are better than those obtained using EAs, and that results obtained through the heuristic approach are more significant in the case of *uncorrelated* instances. However, the results for instances which have 500 items cannot be list in

Table 5, since it takes more than two hours for the heuristic approach to obtain a result in such cases. Moreover, the results listed in the *ILP* columns are better than those in the *(1+1) EA* columns, but it is difficult to make a clear comparison of these results with the results of *GSEMO*. The computation time associated with ILP is longer than that associated with EAs for most of the instances. Besides, as shown in Table 5 the performance of GSEMO is significantly better than that of (1+1) EA for all instances.

In the last category of instance, we consider instances for which the weights of items conform to Normal distributions with known expectations and variances of weights. In all instances, the variances of weights are expressed as a percentage of the expected weights:  $\sigma_i^2 = a_i * \beta$ . In this arrangement, according to the theorem of the Chernoff bound, the upper bound of the chance constraint cannot be calculated using the Chernoff bound, and we only apply Chebyshev's inequality. The results are listed in Table 6 and Table 7, and we mark the best results across all approaches in each row in bold.

The *profit* column lists the mean value for 30 runs, and the *stat* column provides statistical test results based on the comparison of the performances of (1+1) EA and GSEMO. It can be observed from the tables that algorithms produce inferior solutions when the value of  $\beta$  increases or the value of  $\alpha$  increases. The results show that the heuristic approach outperforms the other algorithms for instances with 100 items, but takes more than two hours for instances with 500 items. Moreover, under the condition in which algorithms are run at similar computation times, the results solved by GSEMO are better than those solved using ILP. Furthermore, the performance of GSEMO is significantly better than that of (1+1) EA.

By investigating the results lists in all tables, we found when limited the computation time into decades seconds, the GSEMO can provide high quality solutions overall. Moreover, in an acceptable running time (minutes), Heuristic approach performs better than other approaches in small size instances, but can't obtain a solution within two hours for large size instances. However, in this paper, (1+1) EA and GSEMO are the simple evolutionary algorithms, in future studies, it might be possible to investigate the performance of different evolutionary algorithms on solving the chance-constrained knapsack problem.

## 6 Conclusion

Chance-constrained optimization problems play a crucial role in various real-world applications as they allow to limit the probability of violating a given constraint when dealing with stochastic problems. We have considered the chance-constrained knapsack problem and shown how to incorporate well-known probability tail inequalities into the search process of an evolutionary algorithm. Furthermore, we introduced deterministic approaches and compared them to the designed evolutionary algorithms. For the deterministic approaches, the disadvantage of them is the computation time when dealing with the chance-constrained knapsack problem. Our experimental results show that when solving large-size instances, DP can not finish in 10 hours, The heuristic approach can not finish in two hours while EAs can obtain a good quality solution in minutes. Even for small-size instances, GSEMO can get similar quality solutions as ILP and the heuristic approach but takes less computation time in most

instances. Furthermore, our investigations point out under what circumstances Chebyshev's inequality or Chernoff bounds are favored as part of the fitness evaluation. The Chernoff bound is preferable in cases where the probability of violating the capacity of knapsack is small. We also have shown that using a multi-objective approach when dealing with the chance-constrained knapsack problem provides a clear benefit compared to its single-objective formulation for all kinds of investigated instance classes.

## 7 Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the Australian Research Council through grant DP160102401 and by the South Australian Government through the Research Consortium "Unlocking Complex Resources through Lean Processing".

## References

- [1] H. Assimi, O. Harper, Y. Xie, A. Neumann, and F. Neumann. Evolutionary bi-objective optimization for the dynamic chance-constrained knapsack problem based on tail bound objectives. In *ECAI*, volume 325 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 307–314. IOS Press, 2020.
- [2] R. Beier and B. Vöcking. Random knapsack in expected polynomial time. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 69(3):306–329, 2004.
- [3] D. Benjamin. Probabilistic tools for the analysis of randomized optimization heuristics. *Theory of Evolutionary Computation: Recent Developments in Discrete Optimization*, pages 1–87, 2018.
- [4] A. Bhalgat, A. Goel, and S. Khanna. *Improved approximation results for stochastic knapsack problems*, pages 1647–1665. 2011.
- [5] A. Charnes and W. W. Cooper. Chance-constrained programming. *Management science*, 6(1):73–79, 1959.
- [6] G. W. Corder and D. I. Foreman. *Nonparametric statistics: A step-by-step approach*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [7] B. C. Dean, M. X. Goemans, and J. Vondrák. Approximating the stochastic knapsack problem: the benefit of adaptivity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(4):945–964, 2008.
- [8] B. Doerr, C. Doerr, A. Neumann, F. Neumann, and A. M. Sutton. Optimization of chance-constrained submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020*, 2020.
- [9] W. C. Driscoll. Robustness of the anova and tukey-kramer statistical tests. In *International Conference on Computers and Industrial Engineering, CIE 1996*. Pergamon Press, Inc., 1996.



- [10] J. Dunn and O. J. Dunn. Multiple comparisons among means. *American Statistical Association*, pages 52–64, 1961.
- [11] A. Ghasemi and S. Zahediasl. Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International journal of endocrinology and metabolism*, 10(2):486, 2012.
- [12] O. Giel and I. Wegener. Evolutionary algorithms and the maximum matching problem. In *STACS*, volume 2607 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 415–426. Springer, 2003.
- [13] A. Goel and P. Indyk. Stochastic load balancing and related problems. In *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No.99CB37039)*, pages 579–586. IEEE, 1999.
- [14] V. Goyal and R. Ravi. A PTAS for the chance-constrained knapsack problem with random item sizes. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 38(3):161–164, 2010.
- [15] F. S. Hillier. Chance-constrained programming with 0-1 or bounded continuous decision variables. *Management Science*, 14(1):34–57, 1967.
- [16] S. C. Horng, S. S. Lin, and F. Y. Yang. Evolutionary algorithm for stochastic job shop scheduling with random processing time. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 39(3):3603–3610, 2012.
- [17] H. Kellerer, U. Pferschy, and D. Pisinger. Knapsack problems. *Business & Economics*, 33(2):217–219, 2005.
- [18] J. Kleinberg, Y. Rabani, and E. Tardos. Allocating bandwidth for bursty connections. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 1997*. ACM, 1997.
- [19] O. Klopfenstein and D. Nace. A robust approach to the chance-constrained knapsack problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 2008.
- [20] S. Kosuch and A. Lisser. Upper bounds for the 0-1 stochastic knapsack problem and a b&b algorithm. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 176(1):77–93, 2010.
- [21] M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, E. Zitzler, E. Welzl, and K. Deb. Running time analysis of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms on a simple discrete optimization problem. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, pages 44–53. Springer, 2002.
- [22] B. Liu. Uncertainty theory. In *Uncertainty theory*, pages 205–234. Springer, 2007.
- [23] B. Liu, Q. Zhang, F. V. Fernández, and G. G. E. Gielen. An efficient evolutionary algorithm for chance-constrained bi-objective stochastic optimization. *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, 17(6):786–796, 2013.

- [24] T. McConaghy, P. Palmers, M. Steyaert, and G. G. E. Gielen. Variation-aware structural synthesis of analog circuits via hierarchical building blocks and structural homotopy. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 28(9):1281–1294, 2009.
- [25] L. L. Mercado, S.-M. Kuo, T.-Y. Lee, and R. Lee. Analysis of rf mems switch packaging process for yield improvement. *IEEE transactions on advanced packaging*, 28(1):134–141, 2005.
- [26] Y. Merzifonluoglu, J. Geunes, and H. E. Romeijn. The static stochastic knapsack problem with normally distributed item sizes. *Math. Program.*, 134(2):459–489, 2012.
- [27] B. L. Miller and H. M. Wagner. Chance constrained programming with joint constraints. *Operations Research*, 13(6):930–945, 1965.
- [28] G. L. Nemhauser and Z. Ullmann. Discrete dynamic programming and capital allocation. *Management Science*, 15(9):494–505, 1969.
- [29] F. Neumann. Expected runtimes of a simple evolutionary algorithm for the multi-objective minimum spanning tree problem. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 181(3):1620–1629, 2007.
- [30] F. Neumann and A. M. Sutton. Runtime analysis of the (1 + 1) evolutionary algorithm for the chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *FOGA*, pages 147–153. ACM, 2019.
- [31] F. Neumann and I. Wegener. Randomized local search, evolutionary algorithms, and the minimum spanning tree problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 378(1):32–40, 2007.
- [32] T. T. Nguyen and X. Yao. Continuous dynamic constrained optimization - the challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 16(6):769–786, 2012.
- [33] C. Pike-Burke and S. Grunewalder. Optimistic planning for the stochastic knapsack problem. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54, pages 1114–1122. PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017.
- [34] C. A. Poojari and B. Varghese. Genetic algorithm based technique for solving chance constrained problems. *European journal of operational research*, 185(3):1128–1154, 2008.
- [35] A. Prékopa. Dual method for the solution of a one-stage stochastic programming problem with random rhs obeying a discrete probability distribution. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, 34(6):441–461, 1990.
- [36] A. Prékopa. Programming under probabilistic constraint and maximizing probabilities under constraints. In *Stochastic Programming*, pages 319–371. Springer, 1995.

- [37] P. Raghavan and R. Motwani. *Randomized algorithms*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 1995.
- [38] P. Rakshit, A. Konar, and S. Das. Noisy evolutionary optimization algorithms - A comprehensive survey. *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, 33:18–45, 2017.
- [39] V. Roostapour, A. Neumann, and F. Neumann. On the performance of baseline evolutionary algorithms on the dynamic knapsack problem. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN XV*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 158–169. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [40] F. Shi, M. Schirneck, T. Friedrich, T. Kötzing, and F. Neumann. Reoptimization times of evolutionary algorithms on linear functions under dynamic uniform constraints. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2017*, pages 1407–1414, 2017.
- [41] J. Till, G. Sand, M. Urselmann, and S. Engell. A hybrid evolutionary algorithm for solving two-stage stochastic integer programs in chemical batch scheduling. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 31(5-6):630–647, 2007.
- [42] P. Toth. Dynamic programming algorithms for the zero-one knapsack problem. *Computing*, 25(1):29–45, 1980.
- [43] S. Uryasev. *Probabilistic constrained optimization: methodology and applications*, volume 49. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [44] P. H. Vance. Knapsack problems: Algorithms and computer implementations. *SIAM Review*, 35(4):684–685, 1993.
- [45] Y. Xie, O. Harper, H. Assimi, A. Neumann, and F. Neumann. Evolutionary algorithms for the chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2019*, pages 338–346, 2019.
- [46] Y. Xie, A. Neumann, and F. Neumann. Specific single- and multi-objective evolutionary algorithms for the chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *GECCO*, pages 271–279. ACM, 2020.

Table 2: Statistical results for instances with 100 items based on additive uniform distribution and using Chernoff bound

	Capacity	$\delta$	$\alpha$	Heuristic approach		DP		(1+1)EA		GSEMO		
				profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profits	time(ms)	
bou-s-c 1	11775	25	0.001	<b>15208</b>	293	–	–	15104.57	1236.979	<b>15208</b>	20055.67	
			0.01	<b>15348</b>	613	–	–	15232.07	1236.458	<b>15348</b>	25803.75	
			0.1	<b>15599</b>	1116	–	–	15454.03	1231.25	<b>15599</b>	20023.96	
			50	0.001	14367	715	–	–	14298.13	1243.75	<b>14406</b>	23056.49
				0.01	<b>14742</b>	556	–	–	14613.8	1240.104	<b>14742</b>	16970.46
				0.1	<b>15144</b>	317	–	–	15011.27	1235.417	<b>15144</b>	17916.35
bou-s-c 2	31027	25	0.001	36893	2545	–	–	36824.33	1264.063	<b>37027</b>	42719.51	
			0.01	<b>37219</b>	9410	–	–	36980.27	1232.012	<b>37219</b>	44305.01	
			0.1	<b>37437</b>	4156	–	–	37241.03	1258.854	<b>37437</b>	48447.63	
			50	0.001	<b>36071</b>	1910	–	–	35870.83	1268.229	36060.73	55605.18
				0.01	<b>36423</b>	2334	–	–	36250.57	1226.667	36416.27	60741.89
				0.1	<b>36893</b>	3088	–	–	36712.6	1346.067	36888.93	57344.08
bou-s-c 3	58455	25	0.001	65983	14478	–	–	66404.37	1289.063	<b>66635</b>	174822.8	
			0.01	66175	13885	–	–	66612.5	1286.458	<b>66840.87</b>	119783.3	
			0.1	66407	6809	–	–	66853.47	1286.979	<b>67095</b>	123643.2	
			50	0.001	64972	20041	–	–	65304.87	1292.708	<b>65552.8</b>	162435.2
				0.01	65355	10396	–	–	65755.47	1292.188	<b>65952.93</b>	165467.6
				0.1	65879	11290	–	–	66270.53	1291.667	<b>66451</b>	174008.9
uncorr 1	7715	25	0.001	<b>16432</b>	129	<b>16432</b>	169791803	16342.87	1255.729	<b>16432</b>	12182.77	
			0.01	<b>16638</b>	136	<b>16638</b>	194176080	16575.9	1240.625	<b>16638</b>	11075.88	
			0.1	<b>16945</b>	144	<b>16945</b>	216867406	16833.13	1235.938	<b>16945</b>	10966.21	
			50	0.001	<b>15299</b>	98	<b>15299</b>	150530586	15243.03	1254.688	<b>15299</b>	15636.04
				0.01	<b>15812</b>	161	<b>15812</b>	161619933	15711.03	1253.125	<b>15812</b>	16543.41
				0.1	<b>16362</b>	142	<b>16362</b>	174426689	16287.27	1245.313	<b>16362</b>	18197.93
uncorr 2	19545	25	0.001	<b>28786</b>	634	–	–	28690.93	1275	<b>28786</b>	29056.24	
			0.01	<b>28982</b>	839	–	–	28864.17	1271.354	<b>28982</b>	37327.55	
			0.1	<b>29165</b>	496	–	–	29090.6	1267.708	<b>29165</b>	38588.23	
			50	0.001	<b>27962</b>	469	–	–	27824.13	1279.688	<b>27962</b>	37555.58
				0.01	<b>28276</b>	793	–	–	28165.67	1279.167	<b>28276</b>	38640.84
				0.1	<b>28732</b>	823	–	–	28618.13	1276.042	<b>28732</b>	39601.95
uncorr 3	36091	25	0.001	<b>40581</b>	935	–	–	40539.3	1305.729	<b>40581</b>	17069.47	
			0.01	<b>40663</b>	983	–	–	40639.67	1303.646	<b>40663</b>	24246.41	
			0.1	<b>40830</b>	1439	–	–	40741.6	1300.521	<b>40830</b>	40830	
			50	0.001	<b>39960</b>	1330	–	–	39894.23	1307.292	<b>39960</b>	51009.26
				0.01	<b>40150</b>	1505	–	–	40123.97	1306.25	40149.4	40985.79
				0.1	<b>40482</b>	1246	–	–	40422.3	1306.771	40481.67	39895.53

Table 3: Statistical results for instances with 500 items based on additive uniform distribution

Capacity	$\delta$	$\alpha$	ILP(Chebyshev)				(1+1)EA				GSEMO												
			2mins		6mins		10mins		profit		Chernoff(1)		Chebyshev(2)		profit		Chernoff(3)		Chebyshev(4)				
			time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat	time(ms)	stat			
bous-c 1	61447	25	0.001	74403	74385	74385	76464.3	5887.5	2(+),3(-),4(+)	73213.8	5866.67	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>77750.4</b>	25626.04	1(+),2(+),4(+)	74207.1	27694.79	1(-),2(+),3(-)					
				0.01	77951	77951	77951	76890.33	5887.50	2(+),3(-),4(-)	76569.53	5879.17	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>78064.47</b>	25572.4	1(+),2(+),4(+)	77552.07	28609.9	1(+),2(+),3(-)				
				0.1	78649	<b>78912</b>	<b>78912</b>	77194.97	5889.06	2(-),3(-),4(+)	77642.27	5883.33	1(+),3(-),4(-)	78429.77	25743.23	1(+),2(+),4(+)	78672.67	29402.6	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
				50	0.001	66465	69443	69443	74964.07	5894.79	2(+),3(-),4(+)	68709.77	5851.04	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>76008.8</b>	28145.31	1(+),2(+),4(+)	69627.7	25955.73	1(-),2(+),3(-)			
				0.01	76121	76222	76222	75627.37	5903.13	2(+),3(-),4(+)	75038.43	5869.27	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>76629.73</b>	28291.67	1(+),2(+),4(+)	75965.73	27930.73	1(+),2(+),3(-)				
				0.1	46027	<b>78227</b>	<b>78227</b>	76319.97	5892.71	2(-),3(-),4(-)	77231.63	5878.65	1(+),3(-),4(-)	77385.53	28717.19	1(+),2(+),4(+)	78187.27	28957.81	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
				bous-c 2	162943	25	0.001	177096	186590	186590	188967.4	6010.94	2(+),3(-),4(+)	184846.9	5990.10	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>190575.8</b>	31282.81	1(+),2(+),4(+)	186081.5	34696.35	1(-),2(+),3(-)	
								0.01	190681	190681	190757	189348.5	6015.10	2(+),3(-),4(+)	189003.4	6017.71	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>190940.3</b>	31718.23	1(+),2(+),4(+)	190297.6	36672.92	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								0.1	<b>192116</b>	<b>192116</b>	<b>192116</b>	189852.2	6002.08	2(-),3(-),4(+)	190439.4	6009.38	1(+),3(-),4(-)	191380.6	31677.6	1(+),2(+),4(+)	191632	37396.88	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								50	0.001	180281	180348	180348	187149.1	6005.21	2(+),3(-),4(+)	178807.7	5981.77	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>188326.5</b>	36233.33	1(+),2(+),4(+)	180210	33553.13
0.01	187042	187079	187079					187931.4	6008.85	2(+),3(-),4(+)	187005.2	5997.40	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>189064.4</b>	36852.6	1(+),2(+),4(+)	188299.7	35451.56	1(+),2(+),3(-)				
0.1	189477	190630	190630					188798.8	6011.46	2(-),3(-),4(-)	189713	6005.21	1(+),3(-),4(-)	189986	37560.42	1(+),2(+),4(+)	<b>190993.3</b>	37417.19	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
bous-c 3	307286	25	0.001					341305	341305	341453	344059.7	6132.81	2(+),3(-),4(+)	339020.5	6126.56	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>346115.3</b>	38438.54	1(+),2(+),4(+)	340895.1	40478.65	1(-),2(+),3(-)	
								0.01	346271	346271	346271	344460	6126.56	2(+),3(-),4(+)	343891	6135.94	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>346523.6</b>	39475	1(+),2(+),4(+)	345815.1	43563.54	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								0.1	347725	347729	<b>347905</b>	344976.1	6166.56	2(-),3(-),4(+)	345622.4	6134.38	1(+),3(-),4(-)	347048.1	39237.5	1(+),2(+),4(+)	347418.7	44185.42	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								50	0.001	169122	169122	210932	341860.8	6127.08	2(+),3(-),4(+)	332022.1	6108.85	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>343418.6</b>	47959.9	1(+),2(+),4(+)	333882.8	38178.13
				0.01	341530	343866	344052	342619.9	6132.29	2(+),3(-),4(+)	341661.9	6108.85	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>344242</b>	48193.75	1(+),2(+),4(+)	343537.7	41935.42	1(+),2(+),3(-)				
				0.1	346321	<b>347064</b>	<b>347064</b>	343776	6128.65	2(-),3(-),4(+)	344848.8	6131.77	1(+),3(-),4(-)	345325.3	49109.38	1(+),2(+),4(+)	346725.6	44240.1	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
				uncorr 1	37686	25	0.001	16998	58826	66238	83284.77	5958.23	2(+),3(-),4(+)	80509.37	5919.79	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>86117.7</b>	20805.52	1(+),2(+),4(+)	81397.77	20571.88	1(-),2(+),3(-)	
								0.01	86128	86128	86128	85685.3	5955.73	2(+),3(-),4(+)	85187.5	5930.73	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>86540.37</b>	20035.94	1(+),2(+),4(+)	86002.63	21854.17	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								0.1	87252	87675	<b>87675</b>	86218.6	5950.00	2(-),3(-),4(+)	86899.67	5939.06	1(+),3(-),4(-)	87066.83	20544.27	1(+),2(+),4(+)	87518.3	22421.88	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								50	0.001	15712	59369	70672	83116.43	5955.73	2(+),3(-),4(+)	73929.1	5895.31	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>83829.9</b>	23189.06	1(+),2(+),4(+)	74731.03	20529.69
0.01	58826	83985	83985					84020.67	5955.21	2(+),3(-),4(+)	83065.43	5917.19	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>84668.5</b>	22652.6	1(+),2(+),4(+)	83820.63	21008.33	1(-),2(+),3(+)				
0.1	<b>87068</b>	<b>87068</b>	<b>87068</b>					85065.93	5953.13	2(-),3(-),4(+)	86128.03	5931.25	1(+),3(-),4(-)	85719.73	23177.6	1(+),2(+),4(+)	86849.87	21986.46	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
uncorr 2	93559	25	0.001					143444	143448	143455	147143.5	6072.40	2(+),3(-),4(+)	142829.3	6061.98	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>147754.5</b>	24839.58	1(+),2(+),4(+)	143393.7	24064.58	1(+),2(+),3(+)	
								0.01	161066	147780	147780	147539.5	6072.40	2(+),3(-),4(+)	147115.2	6061.98	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>148125.7</b>	25049.48	1(+),2(+),4(+)	147605.7	24511.98	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								0.1	<b>149217</b>	<b>149217</b>	<b>149217</b>	147936.9	6068.75	2(-),3(-),4(+)	148518	6079.69	1(+),3(-),4(-)	148594.9	24431.25	1(+),2(+),4(+)	148960.7	25139.06	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								50	0.001	100660	120860	137219	145291.4	6063.54	2(+),3(-),4(+)	136767	6048.44	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>145594.4</b>	26981.25	1(+),2(+),4(+)	137400	22478.13
				0.01	101554	145726	145726	146067.2	6066.67	2(+),3(-),4(+)	145189.8	6048.44	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>146326</b>	27126.04	1(+),2(+),4(+)	145655.9	24484.9	1(-),2(+),3(-)				
				0.1	101648	<b>148531</b>	<b>148531</b>	146045.4	6070.83	2(-),3(-),4(+)	147955.5	6075.52	1(+),3(-),4(+)	147254	26751.56	1(+),2(+),4(+)	148368.5	24806.77	1(+),2(+),3(+)				
				uncorr 3	171819	25	0.001	138416	200244	204498	207630.3	6189.06	2(+),3(-),4(+)	204214.7	6166.67	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>208240.2</b>	22107.29	1(+),2(+),4(+)	204790.2	20989.58	1(-),2(+),3(-)	
								0.01	208260	208260	208260	207978.8	6205.73	2(+),3(-),4(+)	207537.9	6172.92	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>208532</b>	22053.13	1(+),2(+),4(+)	208161.3	21864.06	1(+),2(+),3(-)
								0.1	<b>209344</b>	<b>209344</b>	<b>209344</b>	208266.9	6196.35	2(-),3(-),4(+)	208671.4	6169.79	1(+),3(-),4(-)	208889.4	22261.46	1(+),2(+),4(+)	209180.5	21320.31	1(+),2(+),3(+)
								50	0.001	114287	144843	144843	206180.1	6193.75	2(+),3(-),4(+)	199212.3	6169.79	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>206374.7</b>	25970.83	1(+),2(+),4(+)	199810.8	19647.4
0.01	154981	156922	172798					206719.9	6193.23	2(+),3(-),4(+)	206014	6175.00	1(-),3(-),4(-)	<b>206629.5</b>	26699.48	1(+),2(+),4(+)	206622.3	22066.67	1(+),2(+),3(-)				
0.1	208391	<b>208899</b>	<b>208899</b>					207471.5	6190.10	2(-),3(-),4(+)	208135.4	6184.38	1(+),3(+),4(-)	207649	26861.46	1(+),2(-),4(-)	208754	21738.54	1(+),2(+),3(+)				

Table 4: Statistical results for the instance eil101 with 100 items based on multiplicative uniform distribution and Chebyshev's inequality

	Capacity	$\beta$	$\alpha$	ILP			Heuristic approach		DP		(1+1)EA		GSEMO					
				2mins	6mins	10mins	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profits	time(ms)				
bou-s-c 1	11775	0.01	0.001	15309	15309	15318	15350	690	15350	4810778	15230.67	1221.88	15349.6	62382.7675				
				15801	15801	15801	15801	1072	15801	12734208	15684.93	1234.9	15801	66815.46				
				15946	15946	15946	15946	1122	15946	26128269	15825.47	1218.75	15940.4	71332.5442				
				0.05	0.001	13100	13199	13199	13245	1369	13245	6293917	13123.27	1222.92	13245	55164.344		
				0.01	14905	14905	14905	15027	1073	15027	16956887	14926.2	1226.56	14992.4333	56806.4804			
				0.1	15702	15702	15702	15710	1181	15710	31257870	15581.1	1221.88	15710	59787.857			
				0.1	11128	11128	11128	11247	646	11270	6724128	11193.8	1222.4	11269.0667	53176.8783			
				0.01	13983	14002	14043	14143	1174	14143	19649101	14037.23	1222.4	14141.4667	59414.7318			
				0.1	15312	15346	15346	15384	1267	15384	35553950	15257.7	1220.31	15384	65737.6751			
				bou-s-c 2	31027	0.01	0.001	36524	36634	36634	36728	5427	—	—	36554.43	1264.58	36694.4667	116506.762
								37475	37515	37515	37557	8078	—	—	37375.73	1261.46	37488.7	119125.093
								37796	37796	37796	37819	14631	—	—	37679.77	1257.29	37816.6667	154614.705
0.05	0.001	32069	32170					32239	32685	4349	—	—	32607.13	1277.08	32701.1	210753.913		
0.01	35855	36002	36002					36069	5834	—	—	35903.27	1267.19	36044.3	200180.797			
0.1	37284	37284	37284					37367	6016	—	—	37170.57	1259.38	37301.1667	172459.537			
0.1	28246	28354	28354					28787	2575	—	—	28724.27	1286.46	28821	91837.3079			
0.01	34135	34135	34135					34419	5018	—	—	34278.83	1280.21	34418.5333	99988.7866			
0.1	36576	36701	36701					36784	5886	—	—	36619.67	1263.02	36758.13	78642.88			
bou-s-c 3	58455	0.01	0.001					65667	65667	65667	65737	63940	—	—	65510.7	1316.15	65690.53	97893.23
								66958	67011	67011	67077	80608	—	—	66831.33	1311.46	66995.6	101069.27
								67461	67461	67461	67480	151215	—	—	67290.13	1313.02	67439.1	100545.31
				0.05	0.001	58770	58770	58770	59319	18667	—	—	59223.87	1344.79	59304.3	84612.5		
				0.01	64472	64500	64500	64713	65809	—	—	64492.3	1320.83	64652.57	96270.83			
				0.1	66671	66671	66671	66742	69379	—	—	66507.07	1310.94	66691.73	100061.46			
				0.1	48564	51059	50689	53359	8798	—	—	53265.03	1358.33	53359.13	74005.21			
				0.01	61574	61657	61657	61974	58018	—	—	61924.97	1325	62063.7	90768.75			
				0.1	65674	65738	65738	65837	47670	—	—	65633.57	1319.27	65774.27	97894.79			
				uncorr 1	7715	0.01	0.001	17064	4s	—	17064	204	17064	31106720	16989.4	1218.23	17064	8394.56443
								17366	3.08s	—	17366	191	17366	49253218	17346.17	1229.69	17366	8361.6105
								17499	1.39s	—	17499	199	17499	56877261	17444	1263.54	17499	6842.4115
0.05	0.001	15322	15322					15322	15385	151	15385	13416371	15293.33	1210.94	15385	7834.6693		
0.01	16875	16875	16875					16875	185	16875	19806209	16808.23	1219.27	16875	7505.27357			
0.1	17325	4.64s	—					17325	176	17325	39985165	17290.97	1218.23	17325	6745.7595			
0.1	13589	13589	13589					13589	70	13589	463375	13507.6	1209.38	13589	4679.62223			
0.01	16143	60s	—					16143	117	16143	9685826	16047.6	1216.15	16143	6412.02927			
0.1	17064	60s	—					17064	158	17064	28925543	16994.47	1218.75	17064	9153.54877			
uncorr 2	19545	0.01	0.001					29075	29085	29085	29106	940	—	—	29106	1265.63	29106	15434.3676
								29466	16.52s	—	29466	1195	—	—	29390.6	1165.63	29466	15147.9511
								29585	3.01s	—	29585	1001	—	—	29521.43	1265.1	29585	21475.098
				0.05	0.001	27087	27087	27087	27096	814	—	—	26974.73	1256.25	27096	18433.7486		
				0.01	28740	28815	28742	28815	728	—	—	28687.23	1267.71	28815	15621.9082			
				0.1	29415	118.91s	—	29415	656	—	—	29327.2	1266.67	29415	22129.7554			
				0.1	25006	25033	25006	25043	540	—	—	24941.5	1248.44	25043	15159.6398			
				0.01	27985	27985	27985	27985	958	—	—	27899.77	1261.98	27985	14720.0369			
				0.1	29155	29155	29155	29155	740	—	—	29072.53	1265.63	29155	15869.881			
				uncorr 3	36091	0.01	0.001	40651	40672	40672	40672	1351	—	—	40633.83	1342.19	40671.7	55625.4561
								40994	57.04s	—	40994	1268	—	—	40938.17	1342.71	40994	53580.4838
								41091	1.82s	—	41091	1264	—	—	41054.23	1342.19	41090.9333	62323.5451
0.05	0.001	38742	38742					38742	38743	1414	—	—	38712.4	1328.13	38743	53287.6329		
0.01	40463	40463	40463					40463	1587	—	—	40348.77	1339.58	40463	55654.3928			
0.1	40985	82.48s	—					40985	2100	—	—	40869.57	1345.31	40985	51387.5036			
0.1	35650	35978	36305					36390	572	—	—	36317.6	1314.06	36390	42624.4348			
0.01	39628	39628	39628					39628	771	—	—	39587.9	1333.85	39628	48509.0626			
0.1	40668	40668	40668					40672	1047	—	—	40649.03	1342.19	40671.8	50373.7936			

Table 5: Statistical results for the instance eil101 with 500 items based on multiplicative uniform distribution and Chebyshev's inequality

	Capacity	$\beta$	$\alpha$	ILP			(1+1)EA(1)			GSEMO(2)					
				2mins	6mins	10mins	profit	time(ms)	stat	profits	time(ms)	stat			
bou-s-c 1	61447	0.01	0.001	77951	77951	77951	76680.71	5941.67	2(-)	77364.63	38885.42	1(+)			
			0.01	78649	78666	78749	77757.42	5928.65	2(-)	78423.77	39448.44	1(+)			
			0.1	79411	79411	79411	77937.93	5945.83	2(-)	78774.67	39529.69	1(+)			
			0.05	0.001	71001	71825	71825	71273.63	5932.81	2(-)	71866.73	38789.06	1(+)		
			0.01	76766	76766	76766	75786.83	5937.5	2(-)	76556.33	39010.94	1(+)			
			0.1	78751	78751	78751	77472.63	5928.13	2(-)	78160.3	39192.19	1(+)			
			0.1	44200	49668	49672	65449.73	5949.48	2(-)	66057.46	37460.94	1(+)			
			0.01	45378	74709	74709	73659.27	5943.23	2(-)	74308.9	38843.75	1(+)			
			0.1	77951	77951	78011	76666.37	5928.13	2(-)	77456.63	39206.25	1(+)			
			bou-s-c 2	162943	0.01	0.001	188693	189540	189540	187857.09	6138.54	2(-)	187986.63	62129.69	1(+)
						0.01	191716	191716	191716	190031.37	6133.33	2(-)	190110.66	62969.79	1(+)
						0.1	192263	192329	192437	190653.74	6133.33	2(-)	190824.75	63540.1	1(+)
0.05	0.001	175165				175870	175870	176974.32	6151.04	2(-)	177249.9	61518.04	1(+)		
0.01	187042	187614				187614	186179.49	6133.85	2(-)	186342.34	62348.44	1(+)			
0.1	191045	191098				191098	189401.84	6130.73	2(-)	189591.47	62891.67	1(+)			
0.1	120607	147427				155490	165606.16	6167.19	2(-)	165991.14	57807.81	1(+)			
0.01	181967	182660				182660	181746.03	6143.23	2(-)	181972.58	61254.69	1(+)			
0.1	189477	189477				189477	188041.25	6126.56	2(-)	188168.17	62590.63	1(+)			
bou-s-c 3	307286	0.01				0.001	343297	343820	343820	341568.23	6425	2(-)	342432.33	85480.73	1(+)
						0.01	346271	347015	347145	344745.61	6421.83	2(-)	344843.61	85917.19	1(+)
						0.1	347820	348151	348151	345852.22	6406.79	2(-)	345952.21	86294.27	1(+)
			0.05	0.001	168902	168902	203124	324236.08	6435.94	2(-)	324561.56	81405.73	1(+)		
			0.01	199323	248792	311808	338751.13	6425.52	2(-)	338830.56	85056.25	1(+)			
			0.1	346271	346271	346271	343994.57	6425	2(-)	344849.08	86061.98	1(+)			
			0.1	167882	231201	231201	305712.67	6461.98	2(-)	306298.87	76398.96	1(+)			
			0.01	169122	254642	254642	331962.13	6431.77	2(-)	331991.33	82465.1	1(+)			
			0.1	200994	341453	343392	341835.52	6425	2(-)	341914.53	84382.29	1(+)			
			uncorr 1	37686	0.01	0.001	87252	87333	87465	86527.83	5964.58	2(-)	87259.37	22572.92	1(+)
						0.01	88093	88104	88104	87167.43	5961.46	2(-)	87897.4	22578.13	1(+)
						0.1	88311	88311	88311	87314.5	5963.54	2(-)	88099.57	22747.4	1(+)
0.05	0.001	82872				82872	82872	82862.63	5951.56	2(-)	83631.43	22251.56	1(+)		
0.01	86847	86847				86847	85984.17	5953.65	2(-)	86720.27	22438.54	1(+)			
0.1	16687	87904				87926	87003.1	5959.38	2(-)	87759.4	22661.98	1(+)			
0.1	16590	58953				75707	78590.73	5934.38	2(-)	79491.4	21914.06	1(+)			
0.01	84948	85449				85449	84462.23	5947.92	2(-)	85287.3	22295.83	1(+)			
0.1	16687	87253				87489	86561.52	5955.21	2(-)	87314.33	22748.96	1(+)			
uncorr 2	93559	0.01				0.001	101601	148534	148534	147858.42	6346.31	2(-)	147978.3	30017.71	1(+)
						0.01	37741	149398	149403	148717.23	6253.65	2(-)	148800.6	30072.4	1(+)
						0.1	37741	149695	149696	149021.6	6248.44	2(-)	149097	29593.75	1(+)
			0.05	0.001	101527	143671	143671	143106.43	6220.31	2(-)	143671	98357.81	1(+)		
			0.01	101593	142271	147820	147109.2	6248.44	2(-)	147676.7	99925.52	1(+)			
			0.1	148834	148834	149218	148500.83	6247.4	2(-)	149050.2	101393.23	1(+)			
			0.1	37939	114416	114416	137665.33	6257.29	2(-)	137942.4	28286.98	1(+)			
			0.01	101587	143082	145893	145231.46	6267.71	2(-)	145816	99587.5	1(+)			
			0.1	148605	148613	148613	147931.4	6655.73	2(-)	148450	100575.52	1(+)			
			uncorr 3	171819	0.01	0.001	69026	208530	208530	207914.33	6685.42	2(-)	207955.3	114927.6	1(+)
						0.01	69076	209489	209489	208724.56	6684.8	2(-)	208737	114892.71	1(+)
						0.1	69076	209734	209734	208963.6	6617.71	2(-)	208980.9	114864.58	1(+)
0.05	0.001	68118				141171	156856	203217.33	6648.96	2(-)	203416	113179.69	1(+)		
0.01	129569	207365				207985	207275.63	6617.71	2(-)	207315.8	114427.6	1(+)			
0.1	129871	209229				209255	208519.46	6657.29	2(-)	208567	114638.02	1(+)			
0.1	66564	142764				154311	197404.69	6572.4	2(-)	197631.8	111736.46	1(+)			
0.01	68197	204818				206030	205424.63	6635.42	2(-)	205511.3	113712.5	1(+)			
0.1	115721	208706				208706	208053.79	6643.23	2(-)	208019.7	114743.23	1(+)			

Table 6: Statistic results for the instance eil101 with 100 items based on Normal distribution and Chebyshev's inequality

	Capacity	$\beta$	$\alpha$	ILP			Heuristic approach		DP		(1+1)EA		GSEMO		
				2mins	6mins	10mins	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profit	time(ms)	profits	time(ms)	
bou-s-c 1	11775	0.01	0.001	15635	15635	15635	15635	1074	-	-	15481.8	1227.083	15635	122546.3	
			0.01	15946	59.92s	-	15946	1836	-	-	15759.4	1232.813	15946	119314.8	
			0.1	15946	59.51s	-	15946	1211	-	-	15862.53	1223.958	15946	114167.2	
			0.05	0.001	15114	15114	15114	15128	1316	-	-	14971.97	1224.479	15128	95547.55
			0.01	15732	15732	15732	15736	1360	-	-	15631.53	1222.917	15736	98784.17	
			0.1	15946	16.88s	-	15946	1546	-	-	15789.63	1225	15946	113056.9	
			0.1	0.001	14719	14719	14719	14739	971	-	-	14631.63	1224.479	14739	100566.2
			0.01	15630	15630	15630	15635	2152	-	-	15480.13	1226.042	15635	110594.3	
			0.1	15946	13.94s	-	15946	1634	-	-	15758.67	1221.354	15946	112109.6	
			bou-s-c 2	31027	0.01	0.001	37359	37359	37359	37359	22126	-	-	37159.3	1271.35
0.01	37272	37272				37272	37272	28381	-	-	37586.77	1265.625	37751.9	265563.1	
0.1	37874	36.48s				-	37874	27277	-	-	37703.33	1268.75	37874	399498.2	
0.05	0.001	36539				36539	36539	36606	20569	-	-	36425.97	1269.271	36605.83	446766.4
0.01	37509	37515				37515	37537	22290	-	-	37345.97	1274.479	37536.07	541687.4	
0.1	37776	37791				37791	37809	27942	-	-	37622.23	1266.667	37808.97	523256	
0.1	0.001	35982				36000	36000	36103	35383	-	-	35857.93	1281.771	36100.5	336191.5
0.01	37272	37303				37303	37375	32159	-	-	37163.57	1286.979	37374.5	292882	
0.1	37752	37752				37752	37760	34877	-	-	37587.67	1266.667	37760	166735.9	
bou-s-c 3	58455	0.01				0.001	66883	66883	66889	66895	263962	-	-	66633	1310.93
			0.01	67402	67402	67402	67414	307935	-	-	67214.13	1410.93	67412.17	252614.6	
			0.1	67581	67581	67581	67582	217621	-	-	67395.43	1314.583	67580.73	250042.7	
			0.05	0.001	65863	65865	65865	65871	178900	-	-	65674.87	1324.479	65868.4	244173.4
			0.01	67067	67085	67085	67119	226313	-	-	66903.47	1328.125	67104.73	250305.2	
			0.1	67492	67492	67492	67493	226818	-	-	67284.2	1314.583	67491.37	250183.9	
			0.1	0.001	65181	65187	65187	65187	193779	-	-	64911.7	1317.188	65102.6	241117.2
			0.01	66883	66883	66883	66899	230572	-	-	66675.67	1311.458	66851.1	249634.4	
			0.1	67425	67425	67425	67426	215087	-	-	67230.03	1327.083	67423.43	246294.3	
			uncorr 1	7715	0.01	0.001	17151	155.74s	-	17151	170	17151	62462460	17099.73	1230.208
0.01	17366	5.22s				-	17366	153	17366	74021365	17333.5	1243.75	17366	7432.983	
0.1	17499	1.92s				-	17499	342	17499	81548280	17445.2	1322.396	17499	6449.72	
0.05	0.001	16638				16638	16638	16638	127	16638	46226151	16571.3	1227.604	16638	8861.319
0.01	17247	15.46s				-	17247	109	17247	66880112	17167.67	1229.167	17247	6220.258	
0.1	17408	3.77s				-	17408	164	17408	71001731	17373.7	1199.688	17408	7471.837	
0.1	0.001	16266				1.23s	-	16266	80	16266	44301629	16177.27	1229.167	16266	6806.991
0.01	17151	58.59s				-	17151	672	17151	50929605	17090.43	1247.604	17151	6305.284	
0.1	17366	3.86s				-	17366	688	17366	66415177	17338.23	1242.083	17366	8335.682	
uncorr 2	19545	0.01				0.001	29248	29248	29248	29250	610	-	-	29159.13	1276.042
			0.01	29508	9.98s	-	29508	658	-	-	29401.57	1166.042	29508	19399.76	
			0.1	29595	2.87s	-	29595	586	-	-	29512.8	1277.083	29595	20561.9	
			0.05	0.001	28766	2.45s	-	28766	691	-	-	28312.4	1276.563	28766	19775.83
			0.01	29415	5.78s	-	29415	584	-	-	29159.7	1278.125	29415	21976.75	
			0.1	29585	4.6s	-	29585	1048	-	-	29446.37	1273.438	29585	20835.11	
			0.1	0.001	28472	5.18s	-	28472	1050	-	-	28379.33	1273.958	28472	23583.94
			0.01	29248	29248	29248	29250	516	-	-	29117.5	1276.563	29250	23508.19	
			0.1	29508	8.01s	-	29508	581	-	-	29505.1	1276.042	29508	18264.97	
			uncorr 3	36091	0.01	0.001	40858	105.48s	-	40858	1190	-	-	40785.7	1448.958
0.01	41084	2.75s				-	41084	881	-	-	41022.8	1348.958	41084	70468.21	
0.1	41121	4.3s				-	41121	1721	-	-	41069.2	1346.875	41120.53	64887.42	
0.05	0.001	40482				40482	40482	40482	2445	-	-	40124.27	1342.188	40482	67218.26
0.01	40985	58.57s				-	40985	1562	-	-	40778.7	1346.354	40985	68263.79	
0.1	41090	4.91s				-	41090	1121	-	-	40995.8	1348.958	41090	60929.71	
0.1	0.001	40150				40150	40150	40150	1597	-	-	40096.6	1341.667	40148.83	57693.78
0.01	40858	40858				40858	40858	1422	-	-	40845.53	1346.875	40858	58638.7	
0.1	41084	5.77s				-	41084	1305	-	-	41059.5	1347.917	41084	58810.93	



Table 7: Statistic results for the instance eil101 with 500 items based on Normal distribution and Chebyshev's inequality

	Capacity	$\beta$	$\alpha$	ILP			(1+1)EA (1)			GSEMO (2)							
				2mins	6mins	10mins	profit	time(ms)	stat	profits	time(ms)	stat					
bou-s-c 1	61447	0.01	0.001	78649	78649	78649	75578.23	10723.1	2(-)	77967.43	64191.74	1(+)					
				0.1	78649	78991	78991	77276.7	11453.57	2(-)	78614.93	65536.54	1(+)				
				0.05	0.1	79471	79471	79471	77930.87	12345.55	2(-)	78775.83	65576.01	1(+)			
				0.01	77515	77515	77515	66902.87	11525.26	2(-)	76868.6	64167.35	1(+)				
				0.1	78649	78823	78897	74202.93	11487.28	2(-)	78222.2	64482.46	1(+)				
				0.05	0.1	79095	79275	79280	76840.73	8534.408	2(-)	78664.87	65810.88	1(+)			
				0.1	45784	73809	76045	58576.47	9455.142	2(-)	76069.83	64195.89	1(+)				
				0.01	78649	78649	78649	70790.93	11302.55	2(-)	77959.23	64669.14	1(+)				
				0.1	79024	79024	79108	75677.07	14396.65	2(-)	78590.93	65864.06	1(+)				
				bou-s-c 2	162943	0.01	0.001	190595	190630	190992	185699.2	14038.99	2(-)	189585.9	106708.7	1(+)	
								0.1	192267	192267	192267	189245.8	13191.94	2(-)	190586.1	107000.5	1(+)
								0.05	0.1	192091	192445	192587	190476.9	12174.11	2(-)	190861.6	109597.3
0.01	189477	189477	189477					168475.9	12581.75	2(-)	187893.3	106447.4	1(+)				
0.1	191739	191739	191739					182869	12546.28	2(-)	190051.8	107138.7	1(+)				
0.05	0.1	192200	192340					192385	188430.7	12950.24	2(-)	190718.1	109228.8	1(+)			
0.1	187042	187826	187826					151777.8	12721.25	2(-)	186650.7	198824.9	1(+)				
0.01	190595	190595	190606					175823.3	12746.82	2(-)	189036.6	153722.1	1(+)				
0.1	192252	192252	192252					185978	12273.07	2(-)	190568.9	109722.5	1(+)				
bou-s-c 3	307286	0.01	0.001					346237	346560	346560	338244.3	12581.56	2(-)	343847.3	258392	1(+)	
								0.1	347893	348099	348099	343735.8	12276.5	2(-)	345168.6	177581.7	1(+)
								0.05	0.1	348242	348411	348417	345411	12445.5	2(-)	345577.9	176647.7
				0.01	200259	343015	344569	310428.7	12381.02	2(-)	341663.5	161079.6	1(+)				
				0.1	346222	346473	346473	333825.5	12646.84	2(-)	344489.5	156963.6	1(+)				
				0.05	0.1	347997	348128	348212	342423.9	8960.956	2(-)	345352.1	152797.6	1(+)			
				0.1	202187	341627	341627	283131.2	12028.49	2(-)	339939.8	301736	1(+)				
				0.01	346271	346767	346767	322537.6	12357.88	2(-)	343863.1	156330.3	1(+)				
				0.1	348020	348020	348020	338710.1	12106.73	2(-)	345162	156225.4	1(+)				
				uncorr 1	37686	0.01	0.001	87489	87515	87515	85923.03	10130.34	2(-)	87311.57	49110.62	1(+)	
								0.1	88169	88169	88169	86916.9	11220.51	2(-)	87887.03	55903.9	1(+)
								0.05	0.1	88331	88331	88331	87354.8	11674.73	2(-)	88078.5	23058.93
0.01	86431	86431	86431					79797.07	11502.3	2(-)	86271.57	53259.75	1(+)				
0.1	87252	87729	87765					84955.23	11715.79	2(-)	87578.73	51830.28	1(+)				
0.05	0.1	88169	88236					88236	86697.47	12063.41	2(-)	87977.4	23219.8	1(+)			
0.1	84636	85738	85738					73279.37	13354.03	2(-)	85481.67	30391.65	1(+)				
0.01	16687	87513	87513					82380.23	12894.84	2(-)	87314.6	30685.76	1(+)				
0.1	88169	88169	88169					85934.5	11955.7	2(-)	87913.5	26798.67	1(+)				
uncorr 2	93559	0.01	0.001					148834	148834	148834	146900.1	12483.14	2(-)	148232.8	42380.86	1(+)	
								0.1	149445	149516	149516	148429.4	12386.6	2(-)	148769.8	42206.33	1(+)
								0.05	0.1	149726	149730	149730	148869	12523.58	2(-)	148951.5	38688.04
				0.01	37741	147694	147780	139095.4	12240.31	2(-)	147102.9	41993.5	1(+)				
				0.1	148834	148934	148934	145768.8	11206.09	2(-)	148419.6	42218.72	1(+)				
				0.05	0.1	148834	149625	149625	148125.6	14307.55	2(-)	148839.1	39514.93	1(+)			
				0.1	101587	146281	146888	130418.7	13508.59	2(-)	146250.9	41917.14	1(+)				
				0.01	37741	148834	148834	142598.9	11929.05	2(-)	148163.2	41993.42	1(+)				
				0.1	149398	149543	149543	147111.4	12399.31	2(-)	148791	39720.63	1(+)				
				uncorr 3	171819	0.01	0.001	208811	209074	209074	207151.1	12162.4	2(-)	206872.6	49345.98	1(+)	
								0.1	209630	209630	209630	208489.4	13234.64	2(-)	207338.3	49400.53	1(+)
								0.05	0.1	209790	209790	209790	208946.9	14540.8	2(-)	207487.1	49227.39
0.01	141224	208033	208095					199039.4	12712.34	2(-)	205892.9	49377.69	1(+)				
0.1	209229	209289	209289					205913.6	12785.77	2(-)	206973	49178.8	1(+)				
0.05	0.1	209663	209694					209694	208144.3	12656.35	2(-)	207608.4	49367.14	1(+)			
0.1	141356	144160	207294					188980.9	12458.81	2(-)	205302.1	48909.96	1(+)				
0.01	141561	209047	209047					202708.7	13160.75	2(-)	206906.2	49180.67	1(+)				
0.1	209630	209630	209630					207203.3	12552.59	2(-)	207316.4	49094.54	1(+)				