

Chance-Constrained Multiple-Choice Knapsack Problem: Model, Algorithms, and Applications

Xuanfeng Li, *Student Member, IEEE*, Shengcai Liu, *Member, IEEE*, Jin Wang, Xiao Chen, Yew-Soon Ong, *Fellow, IEEE*, Ke Tang, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The multiple-choice knapsack problem (MCKP) is a classic NP-hard combinatorial optimization problem. Motivated by several significant real-world applications, this work investigates a novel variant of MCKP called chance-constrained multiple-choice knapsack problem (CCMCKP), where the item weights are random variables. In particular, we focus on the practical scenario of CCMCKP, where the probability distributions of random weights are unknown but only sample data is available. We first present the problem formulation of CCMCKP and then establish two benchmark sets. The first set contains synthetic instances and the second set is devised to simulate a real-world application scenario of a certain telecommunication company. To solve CCMCKP, we propose a data-driven adaptive local search (DDALS) algorithm. The main novelty of DDALS lies in its data-driven solution evaluation approach that can effectively handle unknown probability distributions of item weights. Moreover, in cases with unknown distributions, high intensity of chance constraints, limited amount of sample data and large-scale problems, it still exhibits good performance. Experimental results demonstrate the superiority of DDALS over other baselines on the two benchmarks. Additionally, ablation studies confirm the effectiveness of each component of the algorithm. Finally, DDALS can serve as the baseline for future research, and the benchmark sets are open-sourced to further promote research on this challenging problem.

Index Terms—Combinatorial optimization, data-driven optimization, chance-constrained multiple-choice knapsack problem, evolutionary algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE multiple-choice knapsack problem (MCKP) is a variant of the classic knapsack problem [1]. MCKP finds applications in various areas, such as supply chain optimization [2], target market selection [3], investments portfolio selection [4], transportation programming [5], and component selection in the information technology systems [6]. Specifically, MCKP involves a set of items, each possessing a weight and a value. The items are divided into several disjoint classes. The objective of MCKP is to select exactly one item from each

class [1, 7] such as to maximize the total value while adhering to a predefined weight limit (i.e., the knapsack constraint). Over the past several decades, plenty of methods for solving MCKP have been proposed, including greedy methods [8], branch-and-bound [9], dynamic programming [10], approximation algorithms [11], and heuristic search [12].

Despite the research progress made thus far, advanced methods for solving MCKP still fall short when confronted with scenarios where item weights are not fixed but are random variables. In such cases, the constraint is no longer the total weight not exceeding a fixed limit, but rather the probability (confidence level) of the total weight not exceeding the limit is no less than a certain threshold. In this work, we refer to this particular variant of MCKP as the chance-constrained multiple-choice knapsack problem (CCMCKP). Furthermore, in real-world applications of CCMCKP, the probability distributions of item weights are often unknown [13, 14], and sample data is the only available information for characterizing these random variables.

The above-described CCMCKP finds applications in various domains. A typical example is the configuration of fifth-generation (5G) end-to-end (E2E) network. In the area of 5G for business [15], user plane time delay is one of the key performance indicators for low latency communication [16, 17]. As illustrated in Figure 1, the complete packet transmission path in a 5G cellular network consists of several segments, such as eNB, backhaul, and core network. Specifically, these segments correspond to the classes in CCMCKP, where for each class there exist different implementation options (items) and only one option can be selected. The total time delay of a packet transmission is calculated as the sum of the delays induced by all the selected options. Here, packet transmission delays (item weights) are random variables with unknown probability distributions because they are generally affected by various unpredictable factors such as workloads, broadcast environment, as well as random failures of software and hardware. The configuration of 5G E2E network is to select an implementation option for each segment, such that the total cost of the network configuration is minimized while ensuring the probability of packet transmission delay not exceeding the limit is no less than a certain threshold.

Another application of CCMCKP is supply chain planning and optimization in modern industries [2, 3]. The supply-chain operations reference (SCOR) model, published by the Supply-Chain Council [18], is a useful tool to design and reconfigure the supply chain. As illustrated in Figure 2, in SCOR, the E2E supply chain consists of four distinct processes: source, make,

Xuanfeng Li and Ke Tang are with the Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Brain-Inspired Intelligent Computation, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China (lix2020@mail.sustech.edu.cn, tangk3@sustech.edu.cn).

Shengcai Liu is with the Centre for Frontier AI Research (CFAR), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), Singapore (Liu_Shengcai@cfar.a-star.edu.sg).

Jin Wang and Xiao Chen are with Huawei Reliability Lab (wangjin171@huawei.com, chenxiao18@huawei.com).

Yew-Soon Ong is with the Centre for Frontier AI Research (CFAR), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), and also with the School of Computer Science and Engineering, Data Science and Artificial Intelligence Research Centre, Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore (asysong@ntu.edu.sg).




Fig. 1. 5G E2E network service model [17]




Fig. 2. SCOR model-based supply chain infrastructure [18]

deliver, and plan. Specifically, these processes can be further subdivided into supplier selection, R&D testing, production, transportation, and recycling handling, corresponding to the classes in CCMCKP. Each class has different configuration options and only one option can be selected. The processing delays of these options are random variables with unknown probability distributions because they are influenced by various random factors, such as market demand, cost fluctuations, and technology configurations. Finally, the goal is to select an option for each class to minimize the total cost, while ensuring the probability of total processing delay not exceeding the limit is no less than a certain threshold.

Despite the practical significance of CCMCKP, currently there is no direct research on solving this challenging problem. On the other hand, there are alternative methods that can be adapted to solve CCMCKP, such as stochastic optimization (SO) [19] that assumes known probability distributions of item weights, and distributionally robust optimization (DRO) [13] that employs the uncertainty set technique. Nonetheless, these methods exhibit unsatisfactory performance when the assumed probability distribution does not hold, intensity of the chance constraint is high, or the amount of sample data is not sufficiently large (see Section VI-B). Motivated by these observations, we propose a novel data-driven adaptive local search (DDALS) algorithm to effectively address CCMCKP. Through rigorous experiments, we demonstrate the superior performance of DDALS in comparison to existing methods.

The main contributions of this work are summarized below.

- 1) From the optimization problem perspective, we formulate the model of CCMCKP. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first endeavor to address this specific problem. Then, we establish two benchmark sets of CCMCKP. The first set contains synthetic instances while the second set is devised to simulate a real-world

business requirement of a certain telecommunication company. The generated benchmarks are available online to promote further research.

- 2) From the algorithmic perspective, we propose DDALS to solve CCMCKP. The main novelty of DDALS lies in its data-driven solution evaluation approach that can effectively handle situations where the distributions of item weights are unknown. Besides, DDALS incorporate surrogate weights using statistics of sample data and can adaptively jump between small and large search regions to find high-quality solutions. Lastly, DDALS employs a carefully designed mechanism to filter out infeasible solutions, further enhancing its efficiency.
- 3) From the computational perspective, we experimentally confirm the effectiveness of DDALS. First, experimental results show the superiority of DDALS over SO and DRO methods in cases with unknown distributions, high intensity of chance constraints, limited amount of sample data and large-scale problems. Then, further experiments show that DDALS outperforms alternative commonly used optimization methods including greedy search (Greedy), genetic algorithm (GA), and estimation of distribution algorithm (EDA). Lastly, ablation studies confirm the effectiveness of each component of DDALS. For future research, DDALS can serve as a baseline method for comparison experiments on solving CCMCKP.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the review of related works. Section III provides a formal definition of CCMCKP. In Section IV, DDALS is introduced and a detailed explanation is provided. In Section V, the benchmarks are described in details. Experimental results and analyses are given in Section VI. Finally, we summarize our findings and provide suggestions for future research in Section VII.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we first review existing research on the classic MCKP and then introduce the research on chance-constrained optimization. Finally, we review DRO that solves chance-constrained optimization problems by constructing uncertainty sets.

A. Algorithms for MCKP

Classic MCKP has been extensively studied in the literature. For instance, Dyer et al. [9] proposed a branch and bound method to solve MCKP. Pisinger [20] presented a minimal algorithm including linear relaxation, greedy algorithm and dynamic programming. Gens and Levner [11] and He et al. [21] both proposed approximation algorithms for MCKP. Hifi et al. [12] presented a reactive local search algorithm, Mkaouar et al. [22] employed the artificial bee colony algorithm, and Lamanna et al. [23] introduced a Kernel Search-based approach for solving multidimensional MCKP. However, these deterministic methods cannot be applied to CCMCKP as they cannot handle stochastic item weights.

B. Chance-Constrained Optimization

Chance-constrained optimization plays a critical role in SO [24–26]. Prior works have investigated chance-constrained optimization problems with known probability distributions, including Bernoulli, Poisson, exponential, and Gaussian [27–31]. Yang and Chakraborty [19] solved the chance-constrained knapsack problem where item weights follow Gaussian distributions. We sought to adapt their method, referred to as the Gaussian-distribution stochastic optimization (GDSO), to address CCMCKP. Specifically, a statistical fitting approach is applied to sample data to obtain the mean and variance of the Gaussian distribution, based on which GDSO is run. However, its performance on solving CCMCKP is not satisfactory due to deviations between the assumed Gaussian distributions and the unknown underlying distributions. Besides, as the problem scale increases, GDSO’s runtime becomes prohibitively long, as the algorithm utilizes dynamic programming. The detailed results are presented in Section VI-B.

C. Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO)

Robust optimization aims to construct an uncertainty set $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ such that a feasible solution of the form $g(x, \xi) \leq 0, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ is also feasible with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ with respect to P , i.e., $\mathcal{P}(g(x, \xi) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \epsilon, \forall \xi \in \mathcal{U}$, which has the same form as the chance constraint. DRO is proposed as an improvement of robust optimization when the distributions of the random variables are unknown and only observable through sample data. Researchers have explored various reformulations and approaches for DRO, utilizing techniques such as Wasserstein balls, conditional value-at-risk constraints, and strong duality formulations [13, 14, 32, 33]. Ji and Lejeune [13] studied distributionally robust multidimensional knapsack problem with Wasserstein ambiguity sets. We adapted their method, denoted as DRO, to address CCMCKP. However, experimental results show that DRO exhibits poor performance, when the sample size is not sufficiently large, or when intensity of chance constraints is high. Similar to GDSO, DRO also experiences a significant increase in runtime as the problem scale grows, eventually becoming impractical. The detailed results are presented in Section VI-B.

III. NOTATIONS AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

We give the formulation of CCMCKP in Eq. 1. Consider m mutually disjoint classes N_1, \dots, N_m of items. Each item $j \in N_i$ has an associated cost c_{ij} and weight w_{ij} , where $c_{ij}, j \in N_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ are fixed values while w_{ij} are random variables. The goal is to select one item from each class to minimize the total cost, subject to keeping the total weight below the knapsack’s capacity W with probability higher than the given confidence level P_0 . By introducing the binary variables x_{ij} which take on value 1 if item j is chosen in class N_i , the problem is formulated as:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} w_{ij} x_{ij} \leq W\right) \geq P_0 \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_i} x_{ij} = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \quad (1c)$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, j \in N_i \quad (1d)$$

In this work, we focus on the practical scenario where the probability distributions of random variables are unknown. For each item, L sample data is collected, denoted as $d_{ijl}, i \in 1, \dots, m, j \in N_i, l \in 1, \dots, L$, which is assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). To avoid trivial solutions, we also assume that the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \min_{1 \leq l \leq L, 1 \leq j \leq n_i} d_{ijl} \leq W \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \max_{1 \leq l \leq L, 1 \leq j \leq n_i} d_{ijl} \quad (2)$$

Note that MCKP is proven to be NP-hard [1]. Consider the scenario where item’s weights w_{ij} follow a particular distribution which takes probability 1 at one value, then CCMCKP simplifies to classic MCKP. Consequently, MCKP can be regarded as a special case of CCMCKP, implying that CCMCKP is also NP-hard.

IV. DATA-DRIVEN ADAPTIVE LOCAL SEARCH

As outlined in Section II, currently there is no direct research on solving CCMCKP. To address this problem, a novel approach termed DDALS is introduced. We elaborate three core components of DDALS sequentially: confidence level evaluation, surrogate weight design, and local search framework. Finally, a detailed analysis of the computational complexity is conducted.

A. Confidence Level Evaluation

As the sample data is assumed to be i.i.d., it is imperative to extract the full informational value from the sample data. Given a solution S , one approach is to calculate all possible combinations of the sample data and determine the proportion of these combinations that meets the chance constraints. This proportion serves as an estimate of the real confidence level of S . However, it is impractical due to its computational complexity of L^m , especially for large-scale problems. Therefore, we propose an exact evaluation for small-scale problems that is much faster than brute-force enumeration. For large-scale problems, we propose an accelerated Monte Carlo evaluation.

1) *Exact evaluation*: Exact evaluation is based on counting and heaps [34]. Assume that the sample data of each item is already arranged from largest to smallest, and we have a solution $S = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m]$ under evaluated. The details of the algorithm are listed as follows:

- Maintain a maximum heap queue Q with the length $m(1 - P_0)L^m$. Every time Q pops the largest sum in the current heap queue [34];

- Initialization: push $Sum_1 = d_{s_1,1} + \dots + d_{s_m,1}$ into Q ;
- Iteration: Q pops the largest sum in D :

$$D = [d_{s_1 l_1}, d_{s_2 l_2}, \dots, d_{s_m l_m}].$$

Then push neighbors of the popped D whose sum is smaller than that of D into Q , listed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & [d_{s_1 l_1+1}, d_{s_2 l_2}, \dots, d_{s_m l_m}], \\ & [d_{s_1 l_1}, d_{s_2 l_2+1}, \dots, d_{s_m l_m}], \\ & \dots, \\ & [d_{s_1 l_1}, d_{s_2 l_2}, \dots, d_{s_m l_m+1}] \end{aligned}$$

Note that duplicates are not allowed in Q .

- Repeat until the pop sum of D is smaller than W or the iteration times k reach $\lceil (1 - P_0)L^m \rceil$.

More importantly, we have the following theorem,

Theorem 4.1: The popped sum in the k^{th} iteration is exactly the k^{th} largest sum.

Detailed proofs can be found online in the supplementary material. If the ratio of k^{th} to the total number of combinations exceeds $1 - P_0$, we conclude that the solution is infeasible.

2) *Accelerated Monte Carlo evaluation:* Monte Carlo simulation uses random numbers to solve computational problems [35, 36]. In this work, our focus is on scenarios where the knapsack constraints W are tightly defined at a high confidence level P_0 , indicating that feasible solutions constitute a small proportion of the entire solution space. It motivates us that the evaluation procedure can be greatly accelerated if most of the infeasible solutions can be quickly recognized. Assuming that the sample data of items has been sorted in descending order, we check the l^{th} largest data combination $d_{1l}, d_{2l}, \dots, d_{ml}$, compare them with the weight threshold W , thereby achieving the efficient screening of infeasible solutions. The process is summarized as follows.

- Construct a screening list according to the minimum prime factorization for $K = L^m \times (1 - P_0)$.
- A limited number of combinations are selected to construct the screening list $R \ll m!$;
- Calculate the sum of the data of each item of the screening list R , and check whether there is at least one combination satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^m d_{il} \geq W$. If not, S is evaluated by Monte Carlo simulation.

B. Surrogate Weight Design

It is infeasible to directly obtain the cost-effectiveness of each item in a data-driven scenario. To overcome this challenge, we construct the surrogate weight of item \tilde{w}_{ij} based on sample data. The sample mean and sample standard deviation of item are calculated, $\mu_{ij} = \mathbb{E}(w_{ij}), \sigma_{ij}^2 = \text{Var}(w_{ij}), i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j \in N_i$. The item weights are then calculated by the weighted sum of μ_{ij} and σ_{ij}^2 ,

$$\tilde{w}_{ij} := \mu_{ij} + \lambda \sigma_{ij}, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, j \in N_i. \quad (3)$$

where λ is the weighted parameter. This approach provides a statistical measure for constructing the surrogate weight from sample data.




Fig. 3. The block diagram of DDALS

C. Local Search Framework

Local search is a widely used heuristic search framework for solving various combinatorial optimization problems [12, 37]. We integrate local search with data-driven evaluation approach and surrogate weight design, leading to DDALS. The block diagram is illustrated in Figure 3. DDALS comprises five components: constructive procedure (CP) for solution initialization, a local swap search (LSS) operator for improving the current solution, a degradation (Degrade) operator for escaping local optima, and a further swap search (FSS) operator for searching in a larger region. Considering that limited sample data can not precisely mirror the true distribution, we additionally incorporate a solution feasibility enhancement (SFE) to enhance the feasibility of the output solutions.

Algorithm 1: Data-Driven Adaptive Local Search

Input: Problem instance; maximum iteration times, $MaxIter$; weighting factor, λ
Output: the optimal feasible solution S_{opt}

- 1 $S_{cp} \leftarrow ConstructProcedure(\lambda)$, cost list, MC list;
- 2 **while** $t \leq MaxIter$ **do**
- 3 $S_t \leftarrow LocalSwapSearch(S_t)$;
- 4 **if** S_t is a better solution **then**
- 5 $S^* \leftarrow S_t$
- 6 $S_t \leftarrow Degrade(S_t)$;
- 7 $t = t + 1$;
- 8 $S_{opt} \leftarrow FurtherSwapSearch(S^*)$;
- 9 Update S_{opt} through solution feasibility enhancement;
- 10 **Return** S_{opt} ;

Algorithm 1 illustrates the framework of DDALS. The inputs for DDALS include the problem instances, maximum iteration times $MaxIter$, and a pre-defined weighting factor λ . DDALS first initializes the solution S_{cp} using CP (line 1) and iteratively enhances the quality of solutions. At iteration t , LSS attempts to improve the feasible solution by operating on S_t (line 3). If LSS identifies an improvement, it updates the optimal solution S^* (lines 4-5). The current solution S_t is degraded by randomly selecting an item for replacement

to escape a local optimum (line 6). Once iterations end, FSS is applied to search for a better solution (line 8). The final solution S_{opt} is output by SFE. The detailed designs of these components are list as follows:

1) *Constructive procedure*: The initialization procedure is based on greedy strategy [7]. Utilizing the surrogate weights defined in Definition 3, we calculate the cost-effectiveness variables $u_{ij} = v_{ij}/\tilde{w}_{ij}$ for each item $j \in N_i$, then sort the items in descending order of u_{ij} for each class N_i . S_{cp} is constructed by selecting the item with the largest u_{ij} in each class. If the current S_t is infeasible, the item which has the largest \tilde{w}_{i_0j} in S_t is replaced by the one with a smaller weight in the same class i_0 . The procedure iterates until feasible S_{cp} is obtained. If all items in class i_0 have been tried but S_{cp} is still infeasible, S_{cp} will be constructed by the items with the smallest surrogate weights.

2) *Local swap search*: LSS applies a swapping strategy to improve the current solution S_t . If the obtained solution is feasible, the swap operation is authorized. LSS aims to select items with the smallest cost while ensuring that the constructed solution is feasible.

3) *Degrade*: Degrade randomly replaces an item j_{i_0} of class i_0 in the current solution S_t . If an infeasible solution is constructed, it randomly selects an item with smaller surrogate weight in class i_0 . If there is no suitable item, Degrade randomly selects another class and tries again until a new feasible solution S_t is obtained.

4) *Further swap search*: FSS iterates through all the item combinations (i_0, i_1) from two different classes of the current optimal solution S_t . When a pair of items with smaller total cost is found, S_t is updated. The procedure terminates when all possible pairs of items have been tried.

5) *Solution feasibility enhancement (SFE)*: In practical scenarios, we aim to minimize costs while ensuring that the solution is feasible. Notably, achieving smaller errors for arbitrarily distributed random variables necessitates an exceedingly large sample size (see the online supplementary material for theoretical analysis). Due to limited sample size, instead of blindly minimizing costs, by allowing for a certain margin of error, the probability of obtaining a solution that is truly feasible in practical scenarios is larger. Therefore, we designed the SFE. When DDALS starts running, SFE maintains two lists, each recording up to 30 feasible solutions. The first list is called MC list, which records the 30 solutions with the highest confidence levels obtained during the DDALS search process. The second list is called Cost list, which records the 30 lowest-cost feasible solutions obtained throughout the whole operation of DDALS.

- Original: DDALS outputs the optimal solution without enhancement.
- Variant 1: The minimum-cost solution with a higher confidence level. For example, S_t should satisfy that the confidence level is greater than 0.995 when $P_0 = 0.99$.
- Variant 2: All solutions are scored within their respective lists, and the scores in both lists are added together to obtain a total score. The solution with the highest total score is selected as the output.

D. Complexity Analysis

1) *Exact evaluation*: When S is fast recognized as infeasible solutions, it takes $O(1)$. Otherwise, in order to verify whether S is feasible, the maximum number of iterations that the evaluation process is $T = L^m(1 - P_0) - l_{min}^m$, where l_{min} is the index that the combination of l_{min} samples of solution is larger than T_{max} . The maximum size of heap is $k_0 + (m - 1)T = \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{m}{i} (l_{min} + 1)^{m-i} + (m - 1)L^m(1 - P_0) - (m - 1)l_{min}^m = O(mT)$. At each iteration, the evaluation approach needs to sort the heap once, so the total number of evaluation times is $O(\log(mT)) = O(\log m + \log T) = O(\log T)$, $m \ll L$. The total time complexity is $O(mL \log L + \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{m}{i} (l_{min} + 1)^{m-i} + T \log T) = O(\max\{T \log T, ml_{min}^{m-1}, m^2 l_{min}^{m-2}, \dots, ml_{min}\})$.

2) *Accelerated Monte Carlo evaluation*: The complexity of the accelerated Monte Carlo evaluation is $O((|G| + \alpha \times MonteCarlo) \times Eval)$, where *MonteCarlo* denotes the simulation times of Monte Carlo simulations and $|G|$ is the size of the filtered list. If S is infeasible recognized by filtered list, $\alpha = 0$, otherwise $\alpha = 1$.

3) DDALS:

- CP includes sorting and solution evaluation. The times of evaluation are up to $m \times N$. Thus, the complexity is $O(Eval \times mN)$, where $N = \max |N_i|$.
- LSS requires up to $m \times N$ times of evaluation to search for a better solution. The complexity is $O(Eval \times mN)$.
- For Degrade procedure, the worst case is that only one combination of items is feasible. Thus, the complexity is $O(Eval \times mN)$.
- FSS iterates through a maximum of combinations of classes $\binom{m}{2} \times N^2$. The complexity is $O(Eval \times m(m - 1)N^2/2) = O(Eval \times m^2N^2)$.

Note that SFE only takes $O(1)$. Therefore, the total time complexity of DDALS is $O(Eval \times mN + MaxIter \times (Eval \times mN + Eval \times mN) + Eval \times N^2m^2 + 1) = O(Eval \times \max\{N^2m^2, MaxIter \times mN\})$.

V. BENCHMARK DESIGN

As CCMCKP has not been studied before, there is a lack of corresponding benchmarks. To evaluate the performance of algorithms for solving CCMCKP, we designed two sets of benchmark with different problem scales and the intensity of chance constraints.

The first set aims to simulate the scenarios where the delay of items follows different common continuous distributions, named LAB. The distributions of items are randomly chosen from uniform, truncated normal, fatigue-life, bimodal and gamma distributions. The mean of items is uniformly distributed in $U(2, 8)$, where $U(2, 8)$ denotes a uniform distribution over the interval $[2, 8]$. In the case of gamma distribution, the mean value is $\mu \sim U(0.5, 2.5)$ and the variance is $\sigma^2 \sim U(0.05, 0.625)$. The cost, representing the value associated with taking each item, is randomly generated from $U(1, 10)$. This corresponding to an uncorrelated situation in the widely used benchmark of classic MCKP [22]. The probability density functions for different distributions in LAB are shown in Figure 4a.




Fig. 4. Probability density function of items. The horizontal axis represents the time delay and the vertical axis represents the probability density.

The second set, denoted as APP, is designed to simulate the real-world business requirements of the 5G E2E network from a certain telecommunications company. In APP, the distributions of item are also randomly chosen in the set of uniform, truncated normal, fatigue-life, bimodal and gamma distribution. However, in the 5G E2E network, each data package transmission is restricted to a time window with a fixed size, indicating that packets must be transmitted successfully within a set interval. This distinctive feature is known as retransmission mechanism [15]. Retransmission mechanism implies that each item in all classes has a probability of being retransmitted when a transmission failure occurs. In APP, the first attempt to transmit a data package must be completed within $(0, 10]$ ms with a success probability of 0.9. If the initial attempt fails, the second attempt occurs with a delay of $(10, 20]$ ms and a success probability of 0.9. This pattern continues for the third and fourth retransmissions. Finally, the transmission is recognized as a failure if the attempt is more than four times. The time delay for an item to transmit a data package falls within the intervals $(0, 10]$, $(10, 20]$, $(20, 30]$, $(30, 40]$ with probabilities of 0.9, 0.09, 0.009, 0.001, respectively. The distributions of items involved in APP are illustrated in Figure 4b. The cost generation formula is defined as $c_{ij} = 10/(\mu_{ij} + \sigma_{ij}) \times U(0.8, 1.2)$. This formulation is designed to induce a decrease in cost-effectiveness as the time delay decreases, simulating the marginal diminishing effect of cost-effectiveness in practical scenarios.

For instances in LAB and APP, we set the values of m and N similar to [22]. Additionally, we categorize them into small-scale and large-scale instances. The sample size is set as 30 for small-scale instances and 500 for large-scale instances. The settings of all instances are shown in Table I. “11,14” of T_{\max}^{LAB} means that T_{\max} of LAB is set 11 or 14 as two different intensity of chance constraints.

VI. COMPUTATIONAL STUDY

In the experiments, we first analyze the sensitivity of different parameter settings of DDALS. Secondly, we adapt the existing methods, GDSO and DRO, to address our problem and compare with DDALS. Thirdly, we further conduct experiments to compare and analyze various commonly used search

TABLE I
INSTANCES SETTING

Instance	m	N	L	T_{\max}^{LAB}	T_{\max}^{APP}
ss1	3	5	30	{11,14}	{21,27}
ss2	4	5	30	{18,26}	{47,49}
ss3	5	5	30	{11,20}	{27,38}
ss4	5	10	30	{10,16}	{16,27}
ls1	10	10	500	{19,23}	{32,37}
ls2	10	20	500	{12,15}	{13,16}
ls3	20	10	500	{25,32}	{43,48}
ls4	30	10	500	{43,52}	{58,70}
ls5	40	10	500	{55,63}	{85,95}
ls6	50	10	500	{63,75}	{91,100}

methods, such as greedy, estimation of distribution algorithm (EDA), and genetic algorithm (GA), combined with solution evaluation approaches against DDALS. Furthermore, we analyze the impact of the integrated acceleration mechanism, evaluating how it enhances the overall efficiency. Finally, we conduct ablation studies, which involves disabling individual components of DDALS, to assess the contribution of the components integrated in DDALS. The source code, benchmark sets and supplementary materials are available online ¹. All experiments were executed in python on an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2699A v4(2.40GHz,252G RAM) with Ubuntu 16.04 LST.

A. Sensitivity Analysis and Parameter Setting

Various parameter combinations of the weighted parameter λ and iteration times t to assess the algorithm’s performance are employed. The performance metric is the cost of the final solution when LSS reaches its maximum iteration times. The experiments are repeated 10 times, and the average value is computed. The parameter λ is varied from 1 to 10. The results are shown in Figure 5. In the experiments of LAB-ss2, when $T_{\max} = 18$, the current solution remains unchanged. The results show that the lowest cost was obtained when $\lambda = 0$. However, it is revealed that the solution is infeasible, indicating that the algorithm could not find feasible solutions without

¹GitHub: github.com/eddylx23/CCMCKP




Fig. 5. Performance analysis of different λ . The results show that the surrogate weight with a non-zero λ is necessary for DDALS.

TABLE II
EVALUATION ON LAB-SS2

Confidence Level%	S_1	S_2	S_3	S_4	S_5
Real	68.24	89.41	99.51	99.98	100.00
Exact	81.64	93.90	99.53	99.99	100.00

TABLE III
EVALUATION ON APP-LS1

Confidence Level%	S_1	S_2	S_3	S_4	S_5
Real	79.18	90.70	94.48	98.78	98.81
MC(10e2)	81.1 ± 3.78	90.7 ± 2.87	95.8 ± 2.15	99.0 ± 0.82	98.3 ± 1.16
MC(10e3)	79.61 ± 1.53	90.28 ± 0.67	95.14 ± 0.60	99.22 ± 0.25	98.24 ± 0.30
MC(10e4)	79.12 ± 0.53	90.27 ± 0.27	95.13 ± 0.60	99.24 ± 0.09	98.44 ± 0.13
MC(10e5)	79.07 ± 0.17	90.38 ± 0.02	95.13 ± 0.05	99.20 ± 0.03	98.40 ± 0.04
MC(10e6)	79.13 ± 0.05	90.38 ± 0.02	95.10 ± 0.03	99.21 ± 0.00	99.41 ± 0.01

considering the standard deviation. For $T_{\max} = 26$, different values of λ had no impact on the algorithm’s convergence to the lowest cost solution. In the experiments of LAB-ls2, with $T_{\max} = 25$, the algorithm exhibited slow convergence when $\lambda = 0$, while other settings allowed for quicker convergence. When $T_{\max} = 32$, different λ settings had small impact on the performance since the intensity of chance constraints are low, making the effect of standard deviation less significant. In summary, it is necessary to set a non-zero value for λ , and our algorithm exhibits robustness across different λ values. Meanwhile, $t = 30$ is an appropriate choice for iteration times.

In order to assess the performance of the exact evaluation approach, we calculate the real confidence level for specific solutions (denoted as “Real”) of LAB-ss2, namely S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5 through the original generator. Results in Table II show that the estimation error becomes smaller as the real confidence level increases. Additionally, we conduct Monte Carlo evaluation on APP-ls1 as shown in Table III. “MC(10e2)” represents that the simulation times is set 10e2. The experimental results are the averages of 10 trials. “81.1 ± 3.78” represents that the mean of estimated confidence level is 81.1% and the standard deviation is 3.78%. The results show that the estimation error of 10e2 times has the largest fluctuations and 10e5 tends to be close to the real confidence level, but still not enough to meet the requirement for larger problem scale and higher confidence level. Considering the trade-off between accuracy and speed, we set 10e6 as the Monte Carlo simulation times.

TABLE IV
DDALS VS GDSO VS DRO COMPARISON 1

T_{\max}	Brute Force		DDALS		GDSO		DRO	
	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost
27	3.81	8.07	0.99	8.07	0.03	8.07	-	fail
23	3.86	10.05	1.19	10.05	0.06	10.05	-	fail
18	3.94	10.36	1.69	10.36	0.04	10.36	-	fail
16	3.73	14	1.83	14	0.06	14	-	fail
14	3.60	19.41	2.1	19.41	-	fail	-	fail

B. Comparison of DDALS with GDSO and DRO

We adapt two existing algorithms, named GDSO [19] and DRO [13] respectively, to solve our problem. GDSO assumes that the distributions of random variable follow Gaussian distributions. Thus, we apply a statistical fitting method to sample data to obtain the mean and variance of item weights. DRO does not make any assumption about the distributions of random variables. Instead, DRO constructs ambiguity sets (such as ellipsoid sets) based on sample data and transform the problem into a deterministic mixed integer linear programming which can be solved by corresponding solvers. Details of the adaptation of these methods are available in the online supplementary.

In the first comparison shown in Table IV, we find that DRO can not find feasible solutions in the LAB-ss2 instance. GDSO also fail to find feasible solutions when $T_{\max} = 14$. In the second comparison in Table V, we increase the sample size to 500. The result reveals that GDSO could solve the problem normally, while DRO again fail to find feasible solutions when T_{\max} is less than or equal to 20. In the third comparison in Table VI, we change the distributions of the random variables to be uniform distribution, keeping sample size 500. GDSO starts to fail to find feasible solutions when T_{\max} is less than 35, while DRO can not find any feasible solutions. Actually, the difference between the uniform distribution and the Gaussian distribution is greater than the difference between the mixed distribution and the Gaussian distribution in the LAB. Under the same intensity of chance constraints, the performance of GDSO gets worse. Although GDSO and DRO have the advantage of short solution times for small-scale problems, as the problem scale increases, their running times show explosive growth. The time consumed when the problem scale is greater than 10×20 far exceeds the running time of DDALS, as shown in Table VII.

The comparison results are summarized as follows:

- GDSO fails to find any feasible solution under high in-

TABLE V
DDALS VS GDSO VS DRO COMPARISON 2

T_{\max}	Brute Force		DDALS		GDSO		DRO	
	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost
30	3.46	11.55	0.99	11.55	0.13	11.55	36.5	15.4
28	3.44	11.55	1.1	11.55	0.13	11.55	22.4	27.1
20	3.44	15.4	1.7	15.4	0.21	15.4	-	fail
15	3.40	18.91	2.2	18.91	0.16	18.91	-	fail
10	3.49	26.32	2.6	26.32	0.16	26.32	-	fail

TABLE VI
DDALS VS GDSO VS DRO COMPARISON 3

T_{\max}	Brute Force		DDALS		GDSO		DRO	
	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost
37	3.44	4.17	1.0	4.17	0.13	4.17	-	fail
36	3.53	4.17	1.0	4.17	0.13	4.17	-	fail
35.5	3.49	4.17	1.1	4.17	0.13	4.17	-	fail
34.5	3.48	4.35	1.7	4.35	-	fail	-	fail

TABLE VII
DDALS VS GDSO VS DRO COMPARISON 4

Instance	DDALS		GDSO		DRO	
	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost	Time(s)	Cost
LAB-ss1	0.75	5.91	0.07	5.91	0.35	7.1
LAB-ss2	0.82	8.07	0.07	8.07	0.31	8.07
LAB-ss3	1.10	10.06	0.08	10.06	0.42	10.06
LAB-ss4	1.36	9.22	0.09	9.22	1.43	10.47
LAB-ls1	7.73	26.65	2.13	26.68	>3600	-
LAB-ls2	7.95	17.3	48.37	17.3	>3600	-
LAB-ls3	60.98	55.67	>3600	-	>3600	-
LAB-ls4	194.41	97.03	>3600	-	>3600	-

tensity of chance constraint. Its runtime increases rapidly with the growth of problem scale. As the difference between the real distribution and the Gaussian distribution increases, its performance gets worse.

- DRO fails to find feasible solutions with insufficient sample size (≤ 500) and high intensity of chance constraint. Its runtime exponentially increases with problem scale.
- Our proposed algorithm, DDALS, proves effective across all these scenarios.

C. Testing Results on LAB and APP

To evaluate the effectiveness of DDALS, we conduct experiments to compare and analyze various commonly used search methods, named Greedy, GA, EDA, each combined with evaluation approaches. Greedy is particularly effective in scenarios where locally optimal choices contribute to globally optimal solutions. GA demonstrate proficiency across various combinatorial optimization problems [38–40], and EDA exhibits great success in both combinatorial and continuous optimization [41].

For equitable comparisons, we initiate the execution of DDALS, recording its evaluation times. Subsequently, Greedy, GA, and EDA start execution until convergence or their respective ET surpasses that of DDALS. The population sizes of GA and EDA are both set to 10, with 6 dominant individuals. The crossover probability for parents of GA is set to 0.1 and a variation probability of $1/m$. The real confidence level (RCL)

is computed by generating $10e7$ data using the real generators. In our experiments, P_0 is set to 0.99. A solution is considered feasible if its real confidence level exceeds 0.985, allowing for a 0.5% error margin.

All presented results are derived from a statistical analysis conducted with 30 repetitions, denoted as “mean \pm standard deviation”. Due to space constraints, selected results are included in the main text, while the complete dataset is available in the online supplementary material. Take Table VIII as an example. “ss3-Greedy” represents the results of the Greedy algorithm applied to the LAB-ss3 instance. Variants of the DDALS algorithm are denoted as “DDALS(O)”, “DDALS(V1)”, “DDALS(V2)”, and “DDALS(V3)” for the original, first, second, and third versions, respectively. Categories such as “small T_{\max} ” and “large T_{\max} ” correspond to the values of T_{\max} specified in Table I. For example, in experiments on LAB-ss1, “small T_{\max} ” is set to 11, and “large T_{\max} ” is set to 14, corresponding to 11, 14 in Table I. Five indicators are utilized to measure the performance: “C” represents the cost of the solution, “ET” measures the evaluation times for comparing convergence speeds, “ECL” signifies the estimated confidence level, “RCL” is real confidence level, and “FSR” denotes the ratio of actual feasible solutions in the results of all experiments. “Time” represents the actual runtime of the algorithm on the server, measured in seconds.

Table VIII shows the results of ss3, ss4 and ls4 in the LAB. DDALS consistently obtains the lowest-cost solutions across all test instances. In contrast, Greedy requires fewer than 10 evaluations but yields the highest cost. The feasibility ratio for all algorithms is approximately 1, suggesting that our solution evaluation approach is able to achieve an evaluation close to the true confidence level. In comparison with other variations, the original version of DDALS consistently produces lower-cost solutions while maintaining a feasibility ratio of 1, demonstrating the accuracy of the solution evaluation approach.

Table IX illustrates significant changes in the results of APP. In small-scale instance tests, only Greedy achieves a feasibility ratio of 1, while other algorithms nearly approach zero feasibility. Although DDALS obtain lower cost solutions than other algorithms, all of them are found to be infeasible. The primary challenge arises from the retransmission mechanism in APP, introducing discontinuities in item’s distribution that pose a considerable challenge to the solution evaluation approach. In cases of random sampling, small samples may overlook information about exceptional jumps, leading to a decline in solution evaluation performance. While Greedy achieves higher feasibility ratios, it sacrifices solution optimality. For large-scale problems, despite increased search difficulty with problem scale, DDALS consistently finds feasible solutions with the lowest cost. In the result of APP-ls4 with large T_{\max} , the feasibility ratio of DDALS(O) is 0.4, while that of DDALS(V1) is 0.8. Despite a 4.9% decrease in the average quality of solutions generated by DDALS(V1) relative to the original DDALS, the feasibility ratio increase by 100%. This emphasizes the effectiveness and necessity of filtering solutions in practical scenarios. Additionally, increasing the sample size L is able to effectively enhances evaluation

TABLE VIII

PERFORMANCE ON THE INSTANCES OF LAB. THE HIGHEST AVERAGE REAL CONFIDENCE LEVEL AND THE LOWEST COST ARE HIGHLIGHTED THROUGH BOLDING AND BEING UNDERLINED.

Instance	small T_{\max}						large T_{\max}					
	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	Time	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	Time
ss3-Greedy	21.4±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.2±0.0	17.4±0.0	4.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.4±0.0
ss3-GA	22.4±1.4	306.0±3.7	99.9±0.0	99.7±0.2	<u>1</u>	31.7±1.9	14.2±2.4	263.5±2.9	99.7±0.4	99.2±1.3	0.73	37.9±1.1
ss3-EDA	24.8±1.9	305.3±3.0	99.9±0.1	99.8±0.5	0.93	44.1±3.0	13.7±1.3	264.5±2.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>	42.8±3.4
ss3-DDALS(O)	21.4±0.0	288.5±9.3	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	9.6±0.5	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	14.7±0.9
ss3-DDALS(V1)	21.4±0.0	288.5±9.3	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	9.6±0.5	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	14.7±0.9
ss3-DDALS(V2)	21.4±0.0	288.5±9.3	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	9.6±0.5	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	14.7±0.9
ss3-DDALS(V3)	23.9±1.7	284	99.8±0.2	99.1±0.8	0.75	9.1	<u>15.5±1.7</u>	264	99.9±0.3	99.5±0.9	0.9	14.9
ss4-Greedy	30.1±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.1±0.0	14.9±0.0	5.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.3±0.0
ss4-GA	23.1±4.4	773.5±8.0	99.9±0.2	99.7±0.4	<u>1</u>	65.6±2.5	16.4±3.0	559.3±8.8	99.8±0.3	99.4±0.6	0.9	60.9±3.1
ss4-EDA	17.4±0.0	764.5±3.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	98.8±1.7	13.4±1.0	554.3±2.6	99.8±0.2	99.1±0.41	0.93	83.5±3.3
ss4-DDALS(O)	17.4±0.0	757.9±31.9	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	21.4±1.0	11.2±0.0	538.8±31.9	99.2±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	23.6±1.1
ss4-DDALS(V1)	17.4±0.0	757.9±31.9	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	21.4±1.0	12.3±0.7	538.8±31.9	99.6±0.1	98.9±0.2	<u>1</u>	23.6±1.1
ss4-DDALS(V2)	17.4±0.0	757.9±31.9	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	21.4±1.0	14.1±0.9	538.8±31.9	99.9±0.2	99.0±0.1	<u>1</u>	23.6±1.1
ss4-DDALS(V3)	25.3±4.1	822	99.8±0.2	99.6±0.5	<u>1</u>	22.9	14.3±1.5	514	99.6±0.3	99.2±0.7	0.9	24.1
ls4-Greedy	167.5±0.0	7.0±0.0	99.2±0.0	99.1±0.0	<u>1</u>	3.5±0.0	167.6±0.0	8.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	3.7±0.2
ls4-GA	124.1±8.7	11309.8±7.4	99.1±0.2	99.1±0.3	0.97	12310.4±282.8	107.5±6.8	8411.4±9.8	99.1±0.1	99.0±0.3	0.93	8437.8±157.5
ls4-EDA	123.6±3.6	11305.1±3.4	99.3±0.2	99.4±0.2	<u>1</u>	9498.8±243.3	116.6±3.2	8403.9±3.1	99.6±0.2	99.7±0.2	<u>1</u>	7970.2±162.7
ls4-DDALS(O)	107.1±1.0	11360.9±206.6	99.1±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>	5537.5±95.9	92.6±1.1	8483.8±335.8	99.1±0.1	99.0±0.3	0.93	4113.9±147.9
ls4-DDALS(V1)	109.5±0.5	11360.9±206.6	99.7±0.1	99.7±0.1	<u>1</u>	5537.5±95.9	98.8±2.1	8483.8±335.8	99.6±0.1	99.6±0.1	<u>1</u>	4113.9±147.9
ls4-DDALS(V2)	108.9±1.1	11360.9±206.6	99.6±0.2	99.6±0.2	<u>1</u>	5537.5±95.9	94.4±2.0	8483.8±335.8	99.4±0.2	99.3±0.3	<u>1</u>	4113.9±147.9
ls4-DDALS(V3)	110.8±3.5	11576	99.3±0.2	99.4±0.2	<u>1</u>	5651.3	95.1±2.5	7964	99.1±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	3883.5

TABLE IX

PERFORMANCE ON THE INSTANCES OF APP. DUE TO THE INTRODUCTION OF RETRANSMISSION MECHANISMS, THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE RESULTS BETWEEN LAB AND APP.

Instance	small T_{\max}						large T_{\max}					
	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	Time	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	Time
ss2-Greedy	5.9±0.0	6.0±0.0	99.8±0.0	98.5±0.0	0	12.6±0.4	5.9±0.0	6.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	8.7±0.2
ss2-GA	5.3±0.1	303.2±2.3	99.2±0.0	97.3±0.5	0	4508.8±1198.4	5.3±0.1	272.9±2.2	99.5±0.1	98.1±0.2	0.03	3422.4±352.0
ss2-EDA	5.5±0.3	305.0±2.7	99.2±0.2	97.6±0.7	0.1	3323.2±1532.5	5.6±0.3	274.1±2.4	99.5±0.2	98.5±0.5	0.47	1185.3±1048.5
ss2-DDALS(O)	5.2±0.0	300.0±10.9	99.2±0.0	97.3±0.0	0	1010.5±98.7	5.2±0.0	297.5±7.8	99.6±0.0	98.1±0.0	0	862.2±78.7
ss2-DDALS(V1)	5.4±0.0	300.0±10.9	99.8±0.1	97.4±0.2	0	1010.5±98.7	5.2±0.0	297.5±7.8	99.6±0.0	98.1±0.0	0	862.2±78.7
ss2-DDALS(V2)	5.4±0.0	300.0±10.9	99.8±0.0	97.4±0.2	0	1010.5±98.7	5.4±0.1	297±7.8	99.9±0.1	98.2±0.2	0.1	862.2±78.7
ss2-DDALS(V3)	5.4±0.1	306	99.5±0.3	97.6±0.4	0	1086.0	5.5±0.1	298	99.7±0.2	98.5±0.3	0.5	858.0
ss4-Greedy	34.9±0.0	3.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.2±0.0	28.5±0.0	4.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.3±0.0
ss4-GA	27.5±1.4	2008.9±7.9	99.8±0.2	90.3±0.5	0	251.8±24.5	20.5±2.7	1608.4±7.4	99.4±0.3	92.9±4.8	0	322.5±9.2
ss4-EDA	26.1±0.0	2005.7±2.3	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	333.9±11.8	18.3±2.7	1604.5±2.8	99.9±0.1	85.2±6.9	0	287.9±19.6
ss4-DDALS(O)	26.1±0.0	1988.9±27.8	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	33.3±2.3	16.6±0.8	1582.8±54.4	99.8±0.1	81.3±3.7	0	61.3±3.9
ss4-DDALS(V1)	26.1±0.0	1988.9±27.8	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	33.3±2.3	16.8±1.1	1582.8±54.4	99.8±0.1	81.8±4.3	0	61.3±3.9
ss4-DDALS(V2)	26.1±0.0	1988.9±27.8	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	33.3±2.3	18.3±2.2	1582.8±54.4	99.9±0.1	86.9±7.3	0	61.3±3.9
ss4-DDALS(V3)	29.7±2.5	1944	99.9±0.2	92.2±3.9	0.2	28.3	20.8±2.9	1586	99.7±0.3	88.3±6.3	0	59.3
ls2-Greedy	89.1±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.2±0.0	89.1±0.0	2.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	0.3±0.0
ls2-GA	76.7±2.8	22616.5±10.5	99.1±0.1	99.0±0.2	<u>1</u>	3925.1±155.5	60.9±2.7	21324.5±13.3	99.1±0.1	99.1±0.1	<u>1</u>	3382.2±64.9
ls2-EDA	79.3±1.1	22604.1±2.6	99.5±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	7174.3±44.2	59.9±0.8	21304.8±3.2	99.2±0.0	99.2±0.0	<u>1</u>	6970.8±88.9
ls2-DDALS(O)	72.0±0.3	22631.7±62.4	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	841.3±7.6	57.2±0.0	21265.2±73.3	99.3±0.1	99.3±0.0	<u>1</u>	776.4±6.6
ls2-DDALS(V1)	76.2±1.1	22631.7±62.4	99.5±0.1	99.5±0.1	<u>1</u>	841.3±7.6	59.0±1.2	21265.2±73.3	99.6±0.0	99.6±0.1	<u>1</u>	776.4±6.6
ls2-DDALS(V2)	73.2±0.4	22631.7±62.4	99.4±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	841.3±7.6	57.6±0.5	21265.2±73.3	99.4±0.1	99.5±0.1	<u>1</u>	776.4±6.6
ls2-DDALS(V3)	73.7±1.5	22536	99.2±0.1	99.0±0.2	<u>1</u>	846.2	58.3±0.6	21274	99.3±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	769.6
ls4-Greedy	238.1±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.4±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	1.5±0.0	193.7±0.0	15.0±0.0	99.2±0.0	98.8±0.0	<u>1</u>	7.0±0.2
ls4-GA	206.6±4.7	48018.6±13.4	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.3	0.73	46617.9±648.4	182.7±10.7	45015.2±11.7	99.0±0.0	98.5±0.2	0.6	42937.2±431.6
ls4-EDA	204.3±1.9	48004.5±3.5	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	45488.7±924.8	163.6±1.2	45003.5±2.4	99.1±0.1	98.8±0.1	<u>1</u>	42955.7±613.1
ls4-DDALS(O)	195.1±0.5	47999.9±83.0	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	16357.5±137.6	161.5±2.1	44440.5±344.6	99.0±0.0	98.5±0.3	0.4	15160.3±127.4
ls4-DDALS(V1)	209.2±2.8	47999.9±83.0	99.1±0.0	98.6±0.3	0.6	16357.5±137.6	169.4±4.2	44440.5±344.6	99.3±0.2	98.9±0.4	0.8	15160.3±127.4
ls4-DDALS(V2)	197.4±1.7	47999.9±83.0	99.1±0.0	99.0±0.1	<u>1</u>	16357.5±137.6	162.5±2.4	44440.5±344.6	99.1±0.1	98.6±0.2	0.7	15160.3±127.4
ls4-DDALS(V3)	196.8±0.8	48046	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.1	<u>1</u>	16280.8	163.5±3.5	44648	99.0±0.0	98.3±0.1	0.1	15162.6

performance, capturing more information and improving the accuracy of solution evaluation approach. The results reveal that the runtime of DDALS is significantly shorter than both EDA and GA.

D. Effectiveness of Components in DDALS

We conduct an ablation study to further assess the effectiveness of four components of DDALS, including CP, LSS, Degrade and FSS. Regarding the SFE, we can observe significant distinctions in the results between DDALS(O) and other variants in Table VIII and Table IX. To independently assess their effectiveness, four different variants of the original DDALS are tested on the instances of Lab:

- 1) r-CP DDALS: It uses random strategy for solution initialization instead of CP.
- 2) no-LSS DDALS: LSS is removed.
- 3) no-Degrade DDALS: Degrade is removed.
- 4) no-FSS DDALS: FSS is removed.

Table X presents the results. We compute the performance degradation ratio (PDR) by computing $(C_2 - C_1)/C_1$ for each instance, where C_1 and C_2 are the average cost of solution obtained by the variants and original DDALS across 10 independent runs, respectively. The effect of the component is considered positive for a specific LAB instance when the PDR is greater than 0. The results indicate that none of the examined components adversely impacts the performance of

TABLE X
AVERAGE PDR ON EACH INSTANCE OF LAB. THE HIGHEST PDR IS HIGHLIGHTED THROUGH BOLDING AND BEING UNDERLINED.

Instance	r-CP	no-LSS	no-Degrade	no-FSS
ss1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
ss2	0.00%	0.00%	<u>4.81%</u>	0.00%
ls1	0.16%	0.16%	0.16%	<u>0.73%</u>
ls2	0.10%	<u>1.07%</u>	0.63%	0.74%
ls3	-0.21%	0.63%	<u>0.70%</u>	0.54%
ls4	<u>1.07%</u>	-0.69%	0.09%	<u>0.22%</u>
Avg.PDR	0.19%	0.19%	<u>1.06%</u>	0.69%

DDALS. In most instances, these components enhance the performance of DDALS. Constructing utility for items proves beneficial for DDALS in achieving a favorable initial solution on average. While the purpose of LSS is to explore the solution space, a negative value on ls3 suggests that, due to large sample size, the algorithm may not converge within 30 iterations. Degrade contributes significantly to the performance of DDALS, addressing the problem by aiding its escape from local optima. FSS exhibits a slightly higher PDR than LSS. However, with the increase in the problem scale, the impact of FSS appears to diminish, indicating the need for more efficient and exploratory methods to address large-scale problems.

E. Acceleration Performance of Accelerated Monte Carlo

The effectiveness of accelerated Monte Carlo (AMC) evaluation is confirmed through validation. We randomly selected 10,000 solutions of LAB-ls1 for assessment, employing both Monte Carlo (MC) and AMC methods. We record the runtime required for every 1000 evaluations, and the results are presented in Figure 6.

Experiment results reveal a nearly linear increase in the consumed time with the growth in the number of evaluation times. For various T_{\max} settings, MC exhibits nearly constant time consumption, since the required number of simulations remains consistent across different T_{\max} . In contrast, AMC demonstrates superior acceleration, particularly with smaller T_{\max} . For example, compared to the MC's runtime of 526.601s, AMC completes the evaluation in 458.449s when $T_{\max} = 11$, processing a fast-filtered solution count of 10,000. At $T_{\max} = 23$, AMC takes approximately 471.395s, with a pre-fast-filtered count of 9,718. As T_{\max} increases, the challenge posed by the intensity of chance constraint diminishes, resulting in a higher percentage of feasible solutions in the entire solution space. When $T_{\max} = 27$, AMC and MC take nearly the same time, while at $T_{\max} = 35$, AMC needs 807.435s, compared to approximately 500s for MC. The results show that accelerated mechanism may have a negative impact on the overall efficiency when the intensity of chance constraint is low. In conclusion, when implementing the accelerated mechanism, it is necessary to pre-assess whether the intensity of chance constraints is high or not.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, motivated by practical applications, we study a novel variant of MCKP named chance-constrained MCKP.




Fig. 6. Acceleration performance of AMC on LAB-ls1. The mechanism has a positive effect when the intensity of chance constraint is high, but has a negative impact on the overall efficiency as the intensity of chance constraint is lower, i.e., T_{\max} becomes larger.

To address CCMCKP, we propose a data-driven adaptive local search algorithm. DDALS facilitates the data-driven solution evaluation approach that can effectively handle situations where the distributions of item weights are unknown, and incorporates a surrogate weight mechanism to ensure solution optimality. Moreover, a solution filtering mechanism is introduced to improve the feasibility of the output solutions. Two benchmark sets for CCMCKP have been established, one of which simulates the real business requirement of a 5G E2E network scenario for a communication company. Experimental results demonstrate the superiority of DDALS over other baselines on the two benchmarks. In cases with high intensity of chance constraints and limited amounts of sample data, DDALS still exhibits good performance. Ablation studies also confirm the effectiveness of each component of the algorithm.

Overall, our proposed algorithm holds great promise for addressing CCMCKP. Our proposed algorithm DDALS can serve as a baseline for future research. The source code of algorithm, benchmark sets and supplementary materials are available online for promoting further research on solving this problem. Furthermore, DDALS is not confined to CCMCKP but can be easily applied to other problems. Specifically, it is applicable to any chance-constrained problem that can be addressed via data-driven evaluation approach. While the algorithm framework is robust, it can be further improved in two aspects. A new surrogate weight design could enhance efficiency and solution quality beyond the current implementation. Additionally, it is necessary to further accelerate the evaluation process, since the evaluation of solutions is time-consuming due to extensive Monte Carlo simulations involved in each evaluation process.

APPENDIX A

DETAILS ABOUT CONCENTRATION INEQUALITIES

A. Bernstein's Inequality

Assume that there are m classes at the E2E, each denoted as variable $X_j, j = 1, \dots, m$. X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m are independent

and satisfy for given some $\{(a_j, b_j), \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$ and constant C there are $P(X_j \in [a_j, b_j]) = 1, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $b_j - a_j = c_j \leq C$. Denote $S = X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_m$ as the sum of random variables X_j and $V = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}(X_j)$ is the sum of variances. Then we have Bernstein's inequality,

$$P(S \leq E(S) + \alpha) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2/2}{V + C\alpha/3}\right) \quad (4)$$

B. K-order Hoeffding's Inequality

Similar to Bernstein's inequality, we assume that X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m are independent and satisfy for given some a_j, b_j , there is $P(X_j \in [a_j, b_j]) = 1, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Denote new variable $Y_j = X_j - a_j$, which satisfies $P(Y_j \in [0, c_j]) = 1, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Denote $S = Y_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_m$ and we have $\mathbb{E}(Y_j^k) = \mu_j^k$. K is the order of origin moment. Thus, we have following K -order Hoeffding's inequality:

$$P(S \leq E(S) + \alpha) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2\alpha^2}{\sum_{j=1}^m b_j^2 C_K\left(\frac{4\alpha b_j}{D}, b_j, \mu_j^1, \dots, \mu_j^K\right)}\right) \quad (5)$$

where $D = \sum_{j=1}^m (\mu_j^2/\mu_j^1)^2$ and $C_K\left(\frac{4\alpha b_j}{D}, b_j, \mu_j^1, \dots, \mu_j^K\right)$ is a value calculated by all the orders of origin moments of Y_j . However, the concentration inequality does not make any assumptions about the form of the distribution of the variables; hence, the lower bound provided by the inequality may be imprecise. Additionally, as the inequalities are solely based on data-driven background, they may only serve as rough estimates for the upper and lower bounds of the variables and this may introduce extra errors into the confidence evaluation.

Since only data of items are available, if we manage to calculate the ratio of the combination of data meeting the upper bound W , to the total number of data combinations, then we can know whether the solution satisfies the chance constraint. For uncertain solution $S = [s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m]$, we count the number of $\sum_{i=1}^m d_{i,j_i,l} \leq W$ and check if it exceeds $P_0 L^m$. Since P_0 is usually a number very close to 1 under high confidence level requirement, it is more practical to compare the number of $\sum_{i=1}^m d_{s_i,l} \geq W$ with $(1-P_0)L^m$. If the number of $\sum_{i=1}^m d_{s_i,l} \geq W$ is greater than $(1-P_0)L^m$, then we can determine quickly that it is an infeasible solution.

APPENDIX B PROOF

Theorem B.1: The popped sum in the k^{th} iteration is exactly the k^{th} largest sum.

Proof B.1: Suppose the i^{th} largest sum is $S_r = d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 l_1} + \dots + d_{s_m l_m}$.

- For any pair in the combination or queue Q that has already been output, the combinations with indices less than or equal to it must have been popped or exist in Q .

- Construct a chain S , then we have the following chain, denoted as $S_0 \leq S_1 \leq \dots \leq S_l$.

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{s_1 0} + d_{s_2 0} + \dots + d_{s_m 0}, \\ & \geq d_{s_1 1} + d_{s_2 0} + \dots + d_{s_m 0}, \\ & \geq \dots, \\ & \geq d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 0} + \dots + d_{s_m 0} \\ & \geq \dots, \\ & \geq d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 l_2} + \dots + d_{s_m 0} \\ & \geq \dots, \\ & \geq d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 l_2} + \dots + d_{s_m l_m} \end{aligned}$$

- Let S_j be the first sum in chain S which was not popped from queue Q before the j^{th} iteration. During the j^{th} iteration, when S_{j-1} is popped, S_j is added to Q .
- Thus, during the k^{th} iteration, the popped sum S_i satisfies $S_i \leq S_j \leq S_l = d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 l_1} + \dots + d_{s_m l_m}$.
- By induction, since the $(i-1)^{\text{th}}$ largest sum has been popped before the i^{th} iteration, so the sum popped in the i^{th} iteration is exactly the i^{th} largest sum $S_l = d_{s_1 l_1} + d_{s_2 l_1} + \dots + d_{s_m l_m}$.

Then we finish the proof.

A simple example is shown when $m = 2$ in Fig.7.

APPENDIX C

A THEORETICAL QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN ESTIMATION ERROR AND SAMPLE SIZE

To theoretically quantify the relationship between estimation error and sample size of data, we construct a new random variable S that is the sum of multiple random variables such that the variable itself is a random variable. Then we define a Bernoulli variable $Z \in \{0, 1\}$, i.e.,

$$Z = \begin{cases} 1, & S \leq W \\ 0, & S > W \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

for a combination of items with L sample size, where p is the true confidence level, i.e., the expectation $\mathbb{E}Z$ of the variable Z . Hoeffding's inequality shows that for independent identically distributed random variables Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_L taking values $[a, b]$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the following inequality holds,

$$Pr\left(|\mathbb{E}[Z] - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L Z_l| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{2L\epsilon^2}{(b-a)^2}\right) \quad (7)$$

For our problem, we are concerned with the true value is lower than the estimate and greater than the error, i.e., where ϵ is the estimation error corresponding to the confidence level. For the Bernoulli distribution, we have $\mathbb{E}Z = p$ and $a = 0, b = 1$. Thus, the inequality becomes

$$Pr(p - f(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_L) \leq -\epsilon) \leq \exp(-2L\epsilon^2) \quad (8)$$

where $f(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_L)$ denotes the confidence evaluation algorithm on some combination of items. Assuming that at least 5 of the 10 solutions in the output solution set are true feasible solutions, and $f(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_L)$ is accurate, then we have $1 - \exp(-2L\epsilon^2) \geq 5/10$. Finally, it leads to

$$L \geq \frac{\ln 2}{2\epsilon^2} \quad (9)$$



Fig. 7. An example of exact evaluation when $m = 2$ 

Fig. 8. Sample size requirement with different error in theory

As this bound is derived from Hoeffding's inequality, Chernoff bound is proposed in [42] and a more tight one is proposed in [43]. However, all of these inequalities indicate that a large amount of samples is necessary. The curve of the variation of L with ϵ is shown in Figure 8.

The minimum sample sizes required for different estimation error are listed in Table XI.

Overall, Hoeffding provides the tightest bounds, especially suitable for larger errors. However, as error requirements become smaller, the bounds provided by Alamo are more advantageous. Practically, it is verified that the amount of data required to meet the corresponding error requirement for the true confidence will be much smaller than the theoretical value obtained.

TABLE XI
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EE AND SAMPLE SIZE

Estimation error(%)	5	0.5	0.05	0.005
Hoeffding's bound	139	13863	1386295	138629437
Chernoff's bound [42]	278	27726	2772589	277258873
Alamo's bound [43]	1573	15723	157227	1572269

APPENDIX D DETERMINISTIC METHOD BASED ON GAUSSIAN ASSUMPTION AND MIX INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING FOR DDCCMCKP

A. Risk-averse knapsack problem method

Yang and Chakraborty [19] proposed an algorithm for the chance-constrained knapsack problem (CCKP) assuming known Gaussian distributions of the random variables (mean and variance are known). CCKP was then transformed into an iterative Risk-averse Knapsack Problem (RA-KP), which could be solved via dynamic programming. The implement on DDCCMCKP of this work is easy. We first calculated the sample mean and standard deviation of the item weights, $\mu_{ij} = \mathbb{E}(w_{ij}), \sigma_{ij}^2 = \text{Var}(w_{ij}), i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j \in N_i$, and then plug them into the algorithm of Yang's,

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} c_{ij} x_{ij} \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} \mu_{ij} x_{ij} + \Phi^{-1}(P_0) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} \sigma_{ij}^2 x_{ij}} \leq W \quad (10b)$$

$$\sum_{j \in N_i} x_{ij} = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \quad (10c)$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, j \in N_i \quad (10d)$$

where Φ represents the CDF of a standard normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance.

B. Mix Integer Linear Programming

Ji and Lejeune [13] studied the distribution-robust chance-constrained planning (DRCCP) optimization problem with data-driven Wasserstein fuzzy sets and proposed an algorithm and reconstruction framework suitable for all types of distribution-robust chance-constrained optimization problems, which was then applied to multidimensional knapsack problems. When the decision variables are binary, the proposed LP (who becomes MILP) formulations are equivalent reformulations of the CC. To fit the CC into [13]'s modelling and solution framework, we first formulate $\text{Prob}(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} w_{ij} x_{ij} \leq W) \geq P_0$ as:

$$\text{Prob}(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in N_i} w_{ij} x_{ij} > W) \leq 1 - P_0 \quad (11)$$

Define $b = -W, \epsilon = 1 - P_0, \tilde{w}_{ij} = -w_{ij}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, j \in N_i$. Let $\bar{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{NM}$ as the vectorization of $x \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{NM}$ is the vectorization of $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$. Finally, we have the standard form of 11 as [13]:

$$\text{Prob}(\xi^T \bar{x} < b) \leq \epsilon \quad (12)$$

Then we can utilize Theorem 10 in [13] to reformulate the above inequation 11, and get the MILP formulation of DDCCMCKP:

$$(\bar{x}, \lambda, \eta, s, \phi) \in \mathcal{Z}_{LP}^{MCKP} = \begin{cases} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L s_l \leq \epsilon, \\ \lambda \geq 0, \\ s_l \geq 0, \eta_l \geq 0, & \forall l \in \mathcal{L} \\ 1 + \eta_l b' - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \xi_{ql}^0 \phi_{ql} \leq s_l, & \forall l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \phi_{ql} \leq \lambda, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}, l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \phi_{ql} \leq \eta_l, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}, l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \phi_{ql} \leq U_{\eta_l} \bar{x}_q, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}, l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \phi_{ql} \geq 0, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}, l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \phi_{ql} \geq \eta_l + U_{\eta_l} \bar{x}_q - U_{\eta_l}, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}, l \in \mathcal{L} \\ \sum_{i=Nm-N+1}^{Nm} \bar{x}_i = 1, & \forall m \in \mathcal{M} \\ \bar{x}_q \in \{0, 1\}, & \forall q \in \mathcal{Q} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $b' = b - \delta$, δ is a user-defined infinite small positive number. \mathcal{Q} is the set of all $N \times M$ items, \mathcal{M} is the set of M classes. Note that $\sum_{i=Nm-N+1}^{Nm} \bar{x}_i = 1, \forall m \in \mathcal{M}$ is multiple-choice constraint in MCKP. U_{η_l} is the upper bound of η and can be determined by:

$$U_{\eta_l} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{K}'^*, & \text{if } \exists \bar{x} : \bar{x}^T \xi_l^0 - b > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where \mathcal{K}'^* is the optimal objective value of the linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}'^* &= \min \bar{x}^T \xi_l^0 - b \\ \text{s.t. } &\bar{x}^T \xi_l^0 \leq 0 - \tau' \\ &\bar{x} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where τ' a user-defined small non-negative number.

Overall, we first solve linear programming 15 to get $U_{\eta_l}, \forall l \in \mathcal{L}$ then solve MILP \mathcal{Z}_{LP}^{MCKP} 13 to find the optimal solution of DDCCMCKP.

APPENDIX E

COMPLETE EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we show the complete experimental results of DDALS on LAB and APP.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Sinha and A. A. Zoltners, "The multiple-choice knapsack problem," *Operations Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 503–515, 1979.
- [2] T. C. Sharkey, H. E. Romeijn, and J. Geunes, "A class of nonlinear nonseparable continuous knapsack and multiple-choice knapsack problems," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 126, no. 1, pp. 69–96, 2011.
- [3] K. Taaffe, J. Geunes, and H. Romeijn, "Target market selection with demand uncertainty: the selective news vendor problem," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 189, no. 3, pp. 987–1003, 2008.
- [4] R. M. Nauss, "The 0–1 knapsack problem with multiple choice constraints," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 125–131, 1978.
- [5] T. Zhong and R. Young, "Multiple choice knapsack problem: Example of planning choice in transportation," *Evaluation and program planning*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 128–137, 2010.
- [6] C. K. Kwong, L.-F. Mu, J. Tang, and X. Luo, "Optimization of software components selection for component-based software system development," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 618–624, 2010.
- [7] H. Kellerer, U. Pferschy, and D. Pisinger, "The multiple-choice knapsack problem," in *Knapsack Problems*. Springer, 2004, pp. 317–347.
- [8] E. Zemel, "The linear multiple choice knapsack problem," *Operations Research*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1412–1423, 1980.
- [9] M. Dyer, N. Kayal, and J. Walker, "A branch and bound algorithm for solving the multiple-choice knapsack problem," *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 231–249, 1984.
- [10] K. Dudziński and S. Walukiewicz, "Exact methods for the knapsack problem and its generalizations," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 3–21, 1987.
- [11] G. Gens and E. Levner, "An approximate binary search algorithm for the multiple-choice knapsack problem," *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 261–265, 1998.
- [12] M. Hifi, M. Michrafy, and A. Sbihi, "A reactive local search-based algorithm for the multiple-choice multidimensional knapsack problem," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 271–285, 2006.
- [13] R. Ji and M. A. Lejeune, "Data-driven distributionally robust chance-constrained optimization with wasserstein

- metric,” *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 779–811, 2021.
- [14] W. Xie, “On distributionally robust chance constrained programs with wasserstein distance,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 186, no. 1-2, pp. 115–155, 2021.
- [15] A. Nasrallah, A. S. Thyagaturu, Z. Alharbi, C. Wang, X. Shao, M. Reisslein, and H. ElBakoury, “Ultra-low latency (ull) networks: The ieee tsn and ietf detnet standards and related 5g ull research,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 88–145, 2018.
- [16] G. P. A. W. Group *et al.*, “View on 5g architecture: Version 2.0,” <https://5g-ppp.eu/>, 2017.
- [17] I. Parvez, A. Rahmati, I. Guvenc, A. I. Sarwat, and H. Dai, “A survey on low latency towards 5g: Ran, core network and caching solutions,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 3098–3130, 2018.
- [18] S. H. Huan, S. K. Sheoran, and G. Wang, “A review and analysis of supply chain operations reference (scor) model,” *Supply chain management: An international Journal*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 23–29, 2004.
- [19] F. Yang and N. Chakraborty, “Algorithm for optimal chance constrained knapsack problem with applications to multi-robot teaming,” in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1043–1049.
- [20] D. Pisinger, “A minimal algorithm for the multiple-choice knapsack problem,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 394–410, 1995.
- [21] C. He, J. Y. Leung, K. Lee, and M. L. Pinedo, “An improved binary search algorithm for the multiple-choice knapsack problem,” *RAIRO-Operations Research*, vol. 50, no. 4-5, pp. 995–1001, 2016.
- [22] A. Mkaouar, S. Htiouech, and H. Chabchoub, “Solving the multiple choice multidimensional knapsack problem with abc algorithm,” in *2020 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [23] L. Lamanna, R. Mansini, and R. Zanotti, “A two-phase kernel search variant for the multidimensional multiple-choice knapsack problem,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 297, no. 1, pp. 53–65, 2022.
- [24] E. Delage and S. Mannor, “Percentile optimization for markov decision processes with parameter uncertainty,” *Operations research*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 203–213, 2010.
- [25] B. Doerr, C. Doerr, A. Neumann, F. Neumann, and A. Sutton, “Optimization of chance-constrained submodular functions,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 02, 2020, pp. 1460–1467.
- [26] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*. SIAM, 2021.
- [27] J. Kleinberg, Y. Rabani, and É. Tardos, “Allocating bandwidth for bursty connections,” in *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 1997, pp. 664–673.
- [28] A. Goel and P. Indyk, “Stochastic load balancing and related problems,” in *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No. 99CB37039)*. IEEE, 1999, pp. 579–586.
- [29] V. Goyal and R. Ravi, “A ptas for the chance-constrained knapsack problem with random item sizes,” *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 161–164, 2010.
- [30] R. Chai, A. Savvaris, A. Tsourdos, S. Chai, Y. Xia, and S. Wang, “Solving trajectory optimization problems in the presence of probabilistic constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 4332–4345, 2020.
- [31] X. Zhang, J. Ma, Z. Cheng, S. Huang, S. S. Ge, and T. H. Lee, “Trajectory generation by chance-constrained nonlinear mpc with probabilistic prediction,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 3616–3629, 2021.
- [32] P. Mohajerin Esfahani and D. Kuhn, “Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 171, no. 1-2, pp. 115–166, 2018.
- [33] R. Gao and A. Kleywegt, “Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with wasserstein distance,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2022.
- [34] A. Ferreira and J. M. Robson, “Fast and scalable parallel algorithms for knapsack-like problems,” *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 1996.
- [35] N. Metropolis and S. Ulam, “The monte carlo method,” *Journal of the American statistical association*, vol. 44, no. 247, pp. 335–341, 1949.
- [36] S. Liu, K. Tang, Y. Lei, and X. Yao, “On performance estimation in automatic algorithm configuration,” in *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI’2020*, New York, NY, Feb 2020, pp. 2384–2391.
- [37] C. Luo, W. Xing, S. Cai, and C. Hu, “Nusc: An effective local search algorithm for solving the set covering problem,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, pp. 1–14, 2022.
- [38] K. Tang, S. Liu, P. Yang, and X. Yao, “Few-shots parallel algorithm portfolio construction via co-evolution,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 595–607, 2021.
- [39] S. Liu, K. Tang, and X. Yao, “Memetic search for vehicle routing with simultaneous pickup-delivery and time windows,” *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 66, p. 100927, 2021.
- [40] S. Liu, Y. Zhang, K. Tang, and X. Yao, “How good is neural combinatorial optimization? A systematic evaluation on the traveling salesman problem,” *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 14–28, 2023.
- [41] P. Yang, K. Tang, and X. Lu, “Improving estimation of distribution algorithm on multimodal problems by detecting promising areas,” *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 1438–1449, 2015.
- [42] R. Tempo, E.-W. Bai, and F. Dabbene, “Probabilistic robustness analysis: Explicit bounds for the minimum number of samples,” in *Proceedings of 35th IEEE Con-*

ference on Decision and Control, vol. 3. IEEE, 1996, pp. 3424–3428.

- [43] T. Alamo, R. Tempo, and A. Luque, “On the sample complexity of randomized approaches to the analysis and design under uncertainty,” in *Proceedings of the 2010 American Control Conference*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 4671–4676.

TABLE XII
PERFORMANCE ON BENCHMARKS OF LAB. THE HIGHEST AVERAGE REAL CONFIDENCE LEVEL AND THE LOWEST COST ARE HIGHLIGHTED THROUGH BOLDING AND BEING UNDERLINED.

Benchmark	small T_{\max}					large T_{\max}				
	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR
ss1-Greedy	22.2±0.0	2.0±0.0	0±0.0	99.6±0.0	<u>1</u>	15.1±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss1-GA	18.7±0.1	354±4.2	99.8±0.3	99.6±0.8	0.8	10.8±0.0	253.3±4.1	99.9±0.1	99.0±1.2	0.6
ss1-EDA	21.5±1.4	354.5±2.9	-	99.5±0.5	0.1	<u>13.0±3.4</u>	234.7±2.8	99.8±0.3	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>
ss1-DDMLS(O)	18.6±0.0	351.7±5.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	10.8±0.0	231±13.7	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss1-DDMLS(V1)	<u>18.6±0.0</u>	351.7±5.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	10.8±0.0	231±13.7	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss1-DDMLS(V2)	18.6±0.0	351.7±5.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	10.8±0.0	231±13.7	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss1-DDMLS(V3)	20.7±2.0	360	99.6±0.3	99.2±0.9	0.3	<u>13.0±1.7</u>	218	99.8±0.3	99.1±1.0	0.7
ss2-Greedy	19.4±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	16.5±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss2-GA	19.4±0.0	384.5±2.6	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	11.1±1.4	303.6±3.4	99.7±0.2	99.7±0.4	<u>1</u>
ss2-EDA	19.9±0.4	385.9±2.7	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>	14.8±2.2	304.5±2.6	99.7±0.2	99.7±0.4	<u>1</u>
ss2-DDMLS(O)	19.4±0.0	378.8±8.2	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	10.4±0.0	298.9±15.5	99.8±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss2-DDMLS(V1)	19.4±0.0	378.8±8.2	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	10.4±0.0	298.9±15.5	99.8±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss2-DDMLS(V2)	19.4±0.0	378.8±8.2	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	<u>12.3±2.0</u>	298.9±15.5	99.9±0.1	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss2-DDMLS(V3)	21.8±2.4	377	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	13.8±1.6	319	99.8±0.3	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>
ss3-Greedy	24.4±0.0	2.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	21.8±0.0	3.0±0.0	100±0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss3-GA	22.6±1.5	303.4±2.8	99.9±0.0	99.7±0.2	<u>1</u>	12.9±0.7	262.4±1.6	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>
ss3-EDA	24.1±2.3	304.1±2.3	99.9±0.1	99.6±0.6	0.9	14.0±2.0	264.5±2.9	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.1	<u>1</u>
ss3-DDALS(O)	21.4±0.0	291.9±6.2	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss3-DDALS(V1)	21.4±0.0	291.9±6.2	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss3-DDALS(V2)	21.4±0.0	291.9±6.2	99.9±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	12.6±0.0	254.4±4.7	100.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss3-DDALS(V3)	23.9±1.7	279	99.8±0.2	99.1±0.8	0.8	<u>15.7±1.9</u>	260	99.9±0.3	99.6±0.9	0.9
ss4-Greedy	30.1±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	27.5±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.7±0.0	99.4±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss4-GA	23.8±5.5	768.9±8.5	99.9±0.3	99.7±0.4	<u>1</u>	17.2±3.0	562.6±5.7	99.7±0.3	99.6±0.3	<u>1</u>
ss4-EDA	17.4±0.0	763.4±2.5	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	13.0±1.0	553.4±2.7	99.8±0.2	98.9±0.4	<u>1</u>
ss4-DDALS(O)	17.4±0.0	759.9±25.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	11.2±0.0	525.3±39.1	99.2±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss4-DDALS(V1)	17.4±0.0	759.9±25.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	<u>12.1±0.0</u>	525.3±39.1	99.5±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ss4-DDALS(V2)	17.4±0.0	759.9±25.8	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	14.0±1.2	525.3±39.1	99.9±0.2	99.0±0.3	<u>1</u>
ss4-DDALS(V3)	24.6±4.0	735	99.8±0.2	99.5±0.5	<u>1</u>	13.8±1.3	561	99.8±0.3	99.5±0.5	<u>1</u>
ls1-Greedy	58.8±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.8±0.0	99.8±0.0	<u>1</u>	56.0±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.6±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls1-GA	50.6±0.9	3007.2±4.1	99.1±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>	41.0±4.7	1412.6±8.3	99.3±0.3	99.2±0.4	<u>1</u>
ls1-EDA	54.7±2.1	3003.1±2.2	99.2±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	37.7±0	1404.6±2.3	99.3±0.0	99.3±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls1-DDMLS(O)	49.8±0.1	2928.8±71.5	99.3±0.0	99.2±0.0	<u>1</u>	32.0±0	1371.3±12.4	99.2±0.0	99.1±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls1-DDMLS(V1)	52.2±0.3	2928.8±71.5	99.6±0.1	99.6±0.1	<u>1</u>	34.6±0.9	1371.3±12.4	99.6±0.0	99.6±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls1-DDMLS(V2)	49.9±0.3	2928.8±71.5	99.3±0.0	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>	33.1±1.1	1371.3±12.4	99.4±0.2	99.3±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls1-DDMLS(V3)	51.2±0.9	2919	99.3±0.2	99.3±0.3	<u>1</u>	35.1±1.5	1383	99.3±0.2	99.2±0.3	<u>1</u>
ls2-Greedy	66.6±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.7±0.0	99.7±0.0	<u>1</u>	66.6±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	100.0±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls2-GA	53.1±2.9	9623.1±21.8	99.2±0.1	99.2±0.2	<u>1</u>	43.3±3.1	3317.4± 17.2	99.6±0.3	99.5±0.3	<u>1</u>
ls2-EDA	53.5±3.1	9604.4±2.4	99.1±0.0	99.2±0.0	<u>1</u>	38.7±2.7	3304.6± 2.5	99.5±0.3	99.5±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls2-DDMLS(O)	47.9±0.0	9548.9±46.4	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	27.2±0.0	3305.6±342.6	99.3±0.0	99.3±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls2-DDMLS(V1)	<u>51.3±0.0</u>	9548.9±46.4	99.4±0.0	99.5±0.0	<u>1</u>	<u>27.9±0.4</u>	3305.6±342.6	99.6±0.0	99.6±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls2-DDMLS(V2)	49.1±0.0	9548.9±46.4	99.2±0.0	99.2±0.0	<u>1</u>	28.0±0.5	3305.6±342.6	99.6±0.1	99.6±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls2-DDMLS(V3)	51.2±2.4	9518	99.2±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>	29.2±1	3197	99.4±0.2	99.4±0.3	<u>1</u>
ls3-Greedy	101.8±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	101.8±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.8±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls3-GA	85.7±5.6	7213.2±11.3	99.1±0.1	98.8±0.1	<u>1</u>	71.3±4.0	5209.5±7.2	99.4±0.3	99.3±0.3	<u>1</u>
ls3-EDA	82.5±0.4	7202.6±2.8	99.1±0.2	98.8±0.2	<u>1</u>	73.4±3.3	5203.7±2.8	99.7±0.3	99.6±0.4	<u>1</u>
ls3-DDMLS(O)	74.9±0.2	7233.5±58.3	99.1±0.0	98.7±0.0	<u>1</u>	63.4±0.9	5217.5±274.1	99.3±0.2	99.1±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls3-DDMLS(V1)	79.6±1.3	7233.5±58.3	99.6±0.1	99.4±0.1	<u>1</u>	65.2±2.1	5217.5±274.1	99.6±0.1	99.5±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls3-DDMLS(V2)	75.9±0.7	7233.5±58.3	99.4±0.1	99.1±0.1	<u>1</u>	65.0±1.9	5217.5±274.1	99.7±0.2	99.6±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls3-DDMLS(V3)	77.3±1.5	7175	99.3±0.1	99.0±0.2	<u>1</u>	65.2±0.8	5109	99.4±0.3	99.3±0.4	<u>1</u>
ls4-Greedy	169.7±0.0	5±0.0	99.8±0.0	99.8±0.0	<u>1</u>	162.5±0.0	6.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls4-GA	123.1±8.8	11307.2±8.0	99.1±0.1	99.1±0.2	<u>1</u>	104.1±5.1	8409.1±5.6	99.1±0.2	99.2±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls4-EDA	126.2±2.3	11304.8±2.1	99.2±0.2	99.4±0.2	<u>1</u>	114.8±4.5	8403.4±2.8	99.6±0.2	99.6±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls4-DDALS(O)	106.6±0.8	11289.9±92.0	99.1±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>	92.8±0.7	8376.6±378.8	99.1±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls4-DDALS(V1)	109.5±0.4	11289.9±92.0	99.7±0.1	99.7±0.1	<u>1</u>	97.9±2.2	8376.6±378.8	99.6±0.1	99.7±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls4-DDALS(V2)	108.9±1.3	11289.9±92.0	99.6±0.2	99.7±0.2	<u>1</u>	93.8±1.4	8376.6±378.8	99.3±0.2	99.4±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls4-DDALS(V3)	108.7±1.1	11171	99.2±0.2	99.3±0.2	<u>1</u>	96.5±1.7	8177	99.1±0.1	99.2±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls5-Greedy	213.8±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.8±0.0	<u>1</u>	205.5±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls5-GA	192.6±6.7	29013.4±7.6	99.0±0.0	98.8±0.0	<u>1</u>	170.2±7.7	18313±10.3	99.1±0.2	99.0±0.3	0.9
ls5-EDA	195.2±2.2	29004.2±3.1	99.1±0.1	99.0±0.2	<u>1</u>	165.9±1.9	18305.5±2.8	99.3±0.2	99.3±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls5-DDMLS(O)	178.1±0.8	28840.1±289.5	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	144.5±1.0	18276.1±395.4	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls5-DDMLS(V1)	184.5±1.4	28840.1±289.5	99.3±0.0	99.2±0.0	<u>1</u>	155.8±3.3	18276.1±395.4	99.6±0.1	99.5±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls5-DDMLS(V2)	179.6±1.9	28840.1±289.5	99.2±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	147.3±3.4	18276.1±395.4	99.2±0.2	99.1±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls5-DDMLS(V3)	182.9±1.6	28624	99.1±0.0	99.0±0.0	<u>1</u>	147.4±4.0	17573	99.1±0.2	99.1±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls6-Greedy	256.3±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.4±0.0	99.4±0.0	<u>1</u>	250.0±0.0	7.0±0.0	99.8±0.0	99.7±0.0	<u>1</u>
ls6-GA	233.5±14.0	34609.3±6.0	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	187.2±9.3	20211.9±8.3	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.2	0.9
ls6-EDA	214.1±2.8	34604.9±2.8	99.3±0.2	99.2±0.2	<u>1</u>	181.7±1.8	20205.1±2.7	99.4±0.2	99.3±0.2	<u>1</u>
ls6-DDMLS(O)	198.5± 0.5	34570.7±619.3	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	<u>1</u>	162.2±1.1	20178.8±1031.6	99.1±0.1	99.0±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls6-DDMLS(V1)	206.8± 2.3	34570.7±619.3	99.5±0.0	99.4±0.1	<u>1</u>	169.6±1.4	20178.8±1031.6	99.5±0.0	99.5±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls6-DDMLS(V2)	201.5± 2.4	34570.7±619.3	99.3±0.2	99.2±0.2	<u>1</u>	163.1±1.5	20178.8±1031.6	99.3±0.1	99.3±0.1	<u>1</u>
ls6-DDMLS(V3)	202.6± 2.0	33681	99.1±0.1	99.1±0.1	<u>1</u>	165.0±2.6	19387	99.2±0.2	99.1±0.1	<u>1</u>

TABLE XIII
 PERFORMANCE ON BENCHMARKS OF APP. DUE TO THE INTRODUCTION OF RETRANSMISSION MECHANISMS, THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN THE RESULTS BETWEEN LAB AND APP.

Benchmark	small T_{max}					large T_{max}				
	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR	C	ET	ECL	RCL	FSR
ss1-Greedy	9.2±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.3±0.0	96.7±0.0	0	9.0±0.0	60.0±0.0	99.6±0.0	98.3±0.0	0
ss1-GA	10.5±2.3	337.4±5.2	99.4±0.3	96.9±0.7	0	8.6±2.1	303.7±2.7	99.5±0.1	97.2±0.0	0
ss1-EDA	9.0±0.0	332.5±2.3	99.3±0.0	96.5±0.0	0	8.0±0.9	304.2±2.4	99.6±0.0	97.7±0.6	0
ss1-DDMLS(O)	9.0±0.0	311.4±10.2	99.2±0.0	96.5±0.0	0	7.3±0.0	285.5±14.8	99.6±0.0	97.2±0.0	0
ss1-DDMLS(V1)	14.0±0.0	311.4±10.2	99.9±0.0	97.2±0.0	0	7.3±0.0	285.5±14.8	99.6±0.0	97.2±0.0	0
ss1-DDMLS(V2)	13.5±1.5	311.4±10.2	99.8±0.2	97.1±0.2	0	7.3±0.0	285.5±14.8	99.6±0.0	97.2±0.0	0
ss1-DDMLS(V3)	14.8±3.4	321	99.7±0.3	98.0±1.0	0.5	11.1±2.4	300	99.5±0.0	97.7±0.6	0.1
ss2-Greedy	6.4±0.0	3±0.0	99.7±0.0	98.6±0.0	1	6.4±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.8±0.0	99.0±0.0	1
ss2-GA	5.3±0.0	301.8±2.2	99.2±0.0	97.3±0.4	0	5.3±0.0	272.6±2.8	99.5±0.1	98.1±0.2	0
ss2-EDA	5.4±0.2	303.1±3.0	99.3±0.2	97.4±0.7	0.1	5.4±0.2	274.9±3.0	99.6±0.2	98.3±0.4	0.3
ss2-DDALS(O)	5.2±0.0	307±7.6	99.2±0.0	97.3±0.0	0	5.2±0.0	291±10.6	99.6±0.0	98.1±0.0	0
ss2-DDALS(V1)	5.5±0.1	307±7.6	99.8±0.0	97.5±0.3	0	5.2±0.0	291±10.1	99.6±0.0	98.1±0.0	0
ss2-DDALS(V2)	5.5±0.1	307±7.6	99.8±0.0	97.5±0.3	0	5.4±0.1	291±10.1	99.9±0.1	98.2±0.1	0
ss2-DDALS(V3)	5.4±0.1	295	99.4±0.3	97.7±0.4	0	5.3±0.1	272.6±2.8	99.5±0.1	98.1±0.2	0
ss3-Greedy	18.3±0.0	6.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	96.3±0.0	0	13.8±0.0	8.0±0.0	99.6±0.0	97.6±0.0	0
ss3-GA	17.5±0.3	634.6±4.0	99.3±0.3	95.3±0.5	0	12.1±1.0	503.6±2.5	99.2±0.2	94.0±1.6	0
ss3-EDA	17.1±0.3	634.5±3.5	99.1±0.2	93.9±1.1	0	11.2±0.2	503.7±3.1	99.5±0.2	94.7±0.8	0
ss3-DDMLS(O)	17.1±0.2	675.9±36.2	99.1±0.1	94.2±0.7	0	11.1±0.1	499.7±21.7	99.5±0.2	94.6±0.7	0
ss3-DDMLS(V1)	18.1±0.2	675.9±36.2	99.6±0.1	96.7±0.6	0	11.5±1.0	499.7±1.7	99.6±0.0	95.4±1.1	0
ss3-DDMLS(V2)	18.1±0.3	675.9±36.2	99.8±0.2	96.7±0.7	0	11.3±0.8	499.7±21.7	99.6±0.2	94.9±1.0	0
ss3-DDMLS(V3)	19.0±0.8	632	99.5±0.3	96.3±0.5	0	12.4±0.8	499	99.5±0.2	95.5±0.1	0
ss4-Greedy	34.9±0.0	3.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	1	27.2±0.0	4.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	1
ss4-GA	27.3±1.1	2010±8.4	99.8±0.3	90.4±5.0	0	21.5±2.9	1614.8±9.8	99.6±0.3	93.2±4.8	0
ss4-EDA	26.1±0.0	2005.7±2.3	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	16.4±0.0	1602.7±2.1	99.9±0.0	80.3±0.0	0
ss4-DDALS(O)	26.1±0.0	1988.2±30.4	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	16.7±0.9	1579.4±76.8	99.8±0.2	81.8±4.4	0
ss4-DDALS(V1)	26.1±0.0	1988.2±30.4	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	16.7±1.0	1579.4±76.8	99.9±0.0	81.5±3.6	0
ss4-DDALS(V2)	26.1±0.0	1988.2±30.4	100.0±0.0	90.1±0.0	0	18.0±1.9	1579.4±76.8	99.9±0.1	86.1±7.0	0
ss4-DDALS(V3)	29.1±2.4	2022	99.9±0.2	91.3±2.9	0	19.9±1.7	1589	99.7±0.3	92.0±5.3	0
ls1-Greedy	84.1±0.0	2.0±0.0	99.3±0.0	99.5±0.0	1	65.3±0.0	5.0±0.0	99.1±0.0	99.0±0.0	1
ls1-GA	65.0±1.9	6432.1±6.4	99.1±0.2	98.8±0.1	1	59.3±3.9	6332.7±6.7	99.0±0.0	98.8±0.2	1
ls1-EDA	68.9±0.0	6423.1±2.9	99.1±0.0	99.4±0.0	1	61.35±0.0	6323.2±3.2	99.2±0.0	99.1±0.0	1
ls1-DDMLS(O)	61.5±0.0	6417.8±16.3	99.2±0.0	98.5±0.0	1	53.9±2.3	6318±65.9	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.1	0.9
ls1-DDMLS(V1)	63.4±1.4	6417.8±16.3	99.6±0.0	99.1±0.1	1	61.8±0.5	6318±65.9	99.7±0.3	99.4±0.2	1
ls1-DDMLS(V2)	62.3±0.3	6417.8±16.3	99.4±0.2	98.9±0.3	1	54.8±2.8	6318±65.9	99.1±0.1	98.8±0.1	1
ls1-DDMLS(V3)	62.9±0.8	6403	99.2±0.1	98.7±0.2	1	57.4±2.6	6340±65.9	99.1±0.0	98.7±0.1	1
ls2-Greedy	85.7±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.9±0.0	99.9±0.0	1	85.7±0.0	3.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	100.0±0.0	1
ls2-GA	76.9±2.7	22617.4±10.9	99.0±0.1	98.9±0.2	1	61.2±2.1	21327.1±20.3	99.1±0.0	99.1±0.1	1
ls2-EDA	75.9±0.0	22604.3±3.3	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	1	59.2±0.3	21306.5±2.5	99.2±0.0	99.2±0.1	1
ls2-DDALS(O)	71.9±0.3	22591.3±63.6	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	1	57.2±0.0	21233.5±51.9	99.3±0.1	99.3±0.1	1
ls2-DDALS(V1)	76.6±1.1	22591.3±63.6	99.6±0.1	99.5±0.1	1	58.5±0.8	21233.5±51.9	99.6±0.1	99.6±0.1	1
ls2-DDALS(V2)	72.9±0.6	22591.3±63.6	99.3±0.2	99.2±0.2	1	57.5±0.2	21233.5±51.9	99.4±0.1	99.5±0.1	1
ls2-DDALS(V3)	73.1±0.7	22564	99.2±0.1	99.1±0.1	1	57.9±0.4	21245	99.2±0.1	99.2±0.2	1
ls3-Greedy	158.3±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.4±0.0	99.3±0.0	1	158.3±0.0	3.0±0.0	99.6±0.0	99.9±0.0	1
ls3-GA	119.4±3.9	21008.5±7.5	99.1±0.1	98.4±0.4	0.7	122.6±5.3	21007.5±4.2	99.0±0.1	98.4±0.4	0.5
ls3-EDA	117.0±0.0	21005.3±3.0	99.4±0.0	98.9±0.0	1	115.0±2.0	21004.8±2.6	99.3±0.2	99.0±0.1	0.6
ls3-DDMLS(O)	112.0±1.2	20942.2±211.2	99.1±0.0	98.9±0.1	0.9	111.4±1.5	20956.2±193.7	99.3±0.3	98.8±0.4	0.5
ls3-DDMLS(V1)	119.0±2.7	20942.2±211.2	99.5±0.1	98.9±0.3	0.9	114.4±4.3	20956.2±193.7	99.5±0.2	99.0±0.4	0.7
ls3-DDMLS(V2)	115.7±1.9	20942.2±211.2	99.4±0.1	98.8±0.1	1	111.8±1.7	20956.2±193.7	99.4±0.3	98.9±0.4	0.6
ls3-DDMLS(V3)	115.6±1.5	20810	99.2±0.1	97.9±0.6	0.3	113.7±0.7	20819	99.0±0.0	98.3±0.2	0.1
ls4-Greedy	207.3±0.0	13.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	1	195.3±0.0	17.0±0.0	99.4±0.0	99.4±0.0	1
ls4-GA	208.5±8.3	48014.1±12.1	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.3	0.7	175.2±10.3	45014.6±10.2	99.0±0.0	98.5±0.2	0.6
ls4-EDA	205.3±2.4	48004.5±3.3	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	1	163.8±1.3	45005.5±2.6	99.1±0.0	98.8±0.0	1
ls4-DDALS(O)	194.9±0.8	47962.8±67.7	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.0	1	163.3±3.6	44822.1±583.5	99.0±0.0	98.4±0.1	0.3
ls4-DDALS(V1)	203.2±2.0	47962.8±67.7	99.1±0.0	99.0±0.1	1	172.8±4.5	44822.1±583.5	99.3±0.1	98.9±0.3	0.8
ls4-DDALS(V2)	196.5±1.3	47962.8±67.7	99.0±0.0	99.0±0.0	1	165.3±4.3	44822.1±583.5	99.1±0.1	98.5±0.2	0.3
ls4-DDALS(V3)	196.9±2.1	48010	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.1	1	168.2±2.3	44174	99.0±0.0	98.9±0.1	1
ls5-Greedy	267.2±0.0	11.0±0.0	99.1±0.0	98.6±0.0	1	264.0±0.0	12.0±0.0	99.3±0.0	98.9±0.0	1
ls5-GA	241.2±9.4	81015.9±10.3	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.1	0.7	219.9±10.5	79012.6±7.5	99.0±0.0	98.5±0.2	0.6
ls5-EDA	220.3±0.3	81002.4±2.4	99.1±0.0	98.7±0.0	1	198.7±1.8	79005.3±3.1	99.1±0.2	98.6±0.2	1
ls5-DDMLS(O)	218.2±1.0	81144.5±283.4	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.0	1	199.4±2.2	78638.8±555.0	99.0±0.1	98.6±0.1	0.9
ls5-DDMLS(V1)	228.3±2.9	81144.5±283.4	99.2±0.1	98.9±0.2	1	209.3±5.8	78638.8±555.0	99.2±0.1	98.9±0.2	0.9
ls5-DDMLS(V2)	220.3±3.0	81144.5±283.4	99.1±0.1	98.7±0.1	1	200.1±2.7	78638.8±555.0	99.1±0.1	98.7±0.2	1
ls5-DDMLS(V3)	221.5±1.5	81213	99.0±0.0	98.7±0.0	1	202.2±3.1	78784	99.1±0.1	98.9±0.2	0.9
ls6-Greedy	388.8±0.0	4.0±0.0	99.1±0.0	98.6±0.0	1	374.4±0.0	12.0±0.0	99.7±0.0	99.6±0.0	1
ls6-GA	354.5±14.3	125315.6±10.0	99.0±0.0	98.2±0.1	0	325.3±10.5	121508.9±4.8	99.0±0.0	98.2±0.2	0.1
ls6-EDA	337.8±0.9	125305.4±2.4	99.0±0.0	98.6±0.0	1	301.6±1.7	121503.7±2.6	99.1±0.1	98.7±0.1	1
ls6-DDMLS(O)	324.2±0.9	125232.9±226.2	99.0±0.0	98.1±0.0	0	298.7±5.6	121483.4±943.5	99.0±0.0	98.4±0.1	0.3
ls6-DDMLS(V1)	333.1±1.9	125232.9±226.2	99.2±0.1	98.6±0.2	0.6	311.5±7.0	121483.4±943.5	99.3±0.1	98.6±0.3	0.6
ls6-DDMLS(V2)	325.5±2.7	125232.9±226.2	99.0±0.1	98.2±0.1	0.1	301.4±5.2	121483.4±943.5	99.1±0.2	98.5±0.2	0.5
ls6-DDMLS(V3)	328.3±2.4	124923	99.0±0.0	98.3±0.1	0	304.7±3.2	121648	99.1±0.0	98.4±0.1	0.1