

A First Step Towards Runtime Analysis of Evolutionary Neural Architecture Search

Zeqiong Lv¹, Chao Qian², Yanan Sun^{1*}

¹College of Computer Science, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

²National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, and School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China

zq_lv@stu.scu.edu.cn, qianc@nju.edu.cn, ysun@scu.edu.cn

Abstract

Evolutionary neural architecture search (ENAS) employs evolutionary algorithms to find high-performing neural architectures automatically, and has achieved great success. However, compared to the empirical success, its rigorous theoretical analysis has yet to be touched. This work goes preliminary steps toward the mathematical runtime analysis of ENAS. In particular, we define a binary classification problem UNIFORM, and formulate an explicit fitness function to represent the relationship between neural architecture and classification accuracy. Furthermore, we consider (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with mutation to optimize the neural architecture, and obtain the following runtime bounds: both the local and global mutations find the optimum in an expected runtime of $\Theta(n)$, where n is the problem size. The theoretical results show that the local and global mutations achieve nearly the same performance on UNIFORM. Empirical results also verify the equivalence of these two mutation operators.

1 Introduction

Manually designing deep neural networks (DNNs) requires expertise in both DNNs and domain knowledge of the problem to be solved. To address this, researchers propose neural architecture search (NAS) [Elsken *et al.*, 2019] that can automatically design promising neural architectures. In the early stages, NAS often employed the RL algorithms [Zoph and Le, 2016]. In recent years, the gradient algorithms [Liu *et al.*, 2018] have been proposed to improve search efficiency. Evolutionary computation (EC) is another optimization algorithm widely used to solve NAS. EC-based NAS (also known as evolutionary NAS, i.e., ENAS) regards the neural architectures as individuals and then searches for promising neural architecture with evolutionary operators, such as mutation. In fact, EC has already been used to optimize both weights and architectures of (shallow) neural networks since the late 1980s [Montana *et al.*, 1989; Yao, 1999; Stanley and Miikkulainen, 2002], which is also known as “evolving neural networks” or “neuroevolution.” But in recent years, along with the DNNs’ breakthrough, ENAS is in-

creasingly popular in the field of automated machine learning and has yielded impressive results of (deep) neural architectures in DNNs [Real *et al.*, 2019; Sun *et al.*, 2019; Liu *et al.*, 2023].

Along with extensive empirical knowledge on EC solving the complex optimization problem, there is also increasing solid theory that guides the design and application of EC. In particular, runtime analysis, which represents the expected number of fitness evaluations until an optimal or approximate solution is searched for the first time, has become an established branch in the theory of EC that enables such results [Auger and Doerr, 2011; Neumann and Witt, 2010; Zhou *et al.*, 2019; Doerr and Neumann, 2020]. This is reflected in that runtime bounds (lower and upper bounds) can help us understand the influence of certain parameter choices like the mutation rate, the population size, or the criterion selection. The tighter the runtime bounds are, the more can be said about these choices.

Analyzing the runtime bounds of ENAS in a rigorous and precise manner, however, is a challenging task and has yet to be touched. One of the main difficulties is the lack of an explicit expression of the fitness function, which in turn hinders the utilization of mathematical runtime analysis tools. Typically, fitness calculations in ENAS are obtained by training neural architectures, which is *NP*-hard when the neural architecture has more than two neurons [Blum and Rivest, 1992]. Such events make it impractical to comprehend the quality of the neural architecture and partition solution space from a theoretical perspective. Therefore, it is far beyond our current capability to analyze the runtime of ENAS on real-world problems related to NAS. It is worth noting that encountering such difficulty is common in theoretical analysis. Theoreticians often resort to analyzing search strategies on artificial problems with general structures, such as ONEMAX and LEADINGONES [Droste *et al.*, 2002], hoping that this gives new insight into the behavior of such search algorithms on real-world problems. This inspires us to provide an explicit fitness function on an artificial problem that maps the NAS problem. Note that Fischer *et al.* [2023] have conducted the first runtime analysis of neuroevolution, which, however, focuses on optimizing weights of neural networks given an architecture instead of searching neural architectures.

When tackling new problems, EC runtime studies typically begin with general-purpose algorithms, such as the (1+1)-

evolutionary algorithm (EA), that restricts the size of the population to just one individual and does not use crossover. Researchers concentrate on one-bit and multi-bit mutations, and have conducted rigorous runtime analysis on the influence of mutation operators [Doerr *et al.*, 2006; Doerr *et al.*, 2008; Kötzing *et al.*, 2014]. Usually, one-bit mutation is considered as local search, whereas multi-bit mutation (e.g., bit-wise mutation) relates to global search since it can increase the step size to prevent a local trap. One might be tempted to believe that the global operator generally is superior to the local one. However, [Doerr *et al.*, 2008] showed that bit-wise mutation could be worse than one-bit mutation hillclimbing (e.g., ONEMAX, LEADINGONES). Such work can provide insights into the choice of mutation operators. This is one important motivation for comparing the performance of these two mutations in a rigorous way.

As indicated above, the focus of this paper is to take the first step towards the runtime analysis of ENAS algorithms. The contributions are summarized as follows.

- We define a binary classification problem UNIFORM, and formulate an explicit fitness function to measure the precise quality (classification accuracy) of any given neural architecture.
- We partition the solution space based on the fitness, which is a key step in carrying out the runtime analysis by using mathematical tools.
- We analyze the runtime bounds of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithms with local and global mutations, and prove the equivalence of the two mutations on UNIFORM. Empirical results also verify the theoretical results.

2 Preliminaries


This section presents the foundations of neural architectures for classification problems that are relevant to our study and introduces a (1+1)-ENAS algorithm for searching neural architecture. Note that for intervals of integers we write $[k..l] := \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid k \leq x \leq l\}$.

2.1 Neural Architecture

In the work of [Fischer *et al.*, 2023], they introduced a feed-forward neural architecture that consists of an input layer, hidden layers, and an output layer, to solve binary classification problems. The hidden layers are constructed by a set of basic units (each unit is a single neuron with binary threshold activation function) that output binary strings, and an OR neuron that computes a Boolean OR of the binary outputs from the previous layer. Such a unit with a single neuron can act as a hyperplane that points to a half-space (a linearly divisible region)¹. Thus, only the linear classification problem is touched upon.

However, most classification problems are non-linearly divisible and can be described as the disjoint union of polyhedra

¹A hyperplane is defined as the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D \mid \mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} = z\}$, where \mathbf{a} is a nonzero vector in \mathbb{R}^D and z is a scalar, and a half-space is defined as the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^D \mid \mathbf{a}\mathbf{x} \geq z\}$ [Bertsimas and Tsitsiklis, 1997]. Note that a hyperplane is the boundary of a corresponding half-space.



(a) A-type block (b) B-type block (c) C-type block

Figure 1: Three types of blocks that can be used to build DNNs with different topological architectures. All of the neurons output Boolean value. The latter two blocks are connected with ADD neurons and can function as non-linear classifiers.

of \mathbb{R}^D , where a polyhedron is the intersection of a finite number of half-spaces, categorized into bounded (finite region formed by hyperplanes) and unbounded polyhedra [Bertsimas and Tsitsiklis, 1997]. In Section 3.1, we will define a binary classification problem with classification regions: half-space, bounded polyhedron, and unbounded polyhedron.

By adding a layer to compute the Boolean AND of the outputs of finite neurons, the unit with these finite neurons and the added layer can point to any polyhedra (with nonlinear regions included). Note that polyhedra intersected by one to three half-spaces can co-form any polyhedron. Thus, three kinds of units are sufficient to build a neural architecture that can classify most classification problems. Typically, unit is also called block in the NAS community. These three types of blocks are shown in Figure 1. The neural architecture with an A/B-type block can classify unbounded polyhedra, while the neural architecture with a C-type block is suitable for bounded polyhedra. Note that when such neural architecture is used to deal with specific classification problems, one needs to consider which type of blocks to use and what their number is, depending on the polyhedra of the problem.

2.2 ENAS Algorithm

ENAS aims to search for a promising neural architecture from a given search space. We abbreviate the number of blocks of types A, B, and C to n_A , n_B and n_C , where $n_A, n_B, n_C \in \mathbb{Z}$. A solution can be represented as (n_A, n_B, n_C) . The search space can be represented as $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. In this study, we consider the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with mutation (i.e., based on (1+1)-EA), whose main steps are:

- 1) **Individual Initialization:** Randomly initialize the number of blocks in the initial solution x_0 according to the uniform distribution $U[0, s]$, where $s \in \mathbb{N}^+$ is a predetermined initial upper bound for each type of block.
- 2) **Offspring Generation:** Generate y_t by executing the mutation operation on parent x_t .
- 3) **Environmental Selection:** Select the solution with higher fitness value in x_t and y_t to enter into the next iteration. Note that, the offspring is preferred to the parent in case of ties by the selection operator.

For each mutation operation in offspring generation, it applies the *Addition*, *Removal* or *Modification* operator (used in AE-CNN [Sun *et al.*, 2019]) uniformly at random, and repeats this process K times independently. Specifically, it updates the individual by randomly adding a block of type A/B/C, removing a block of type A/B/C, or modifying a block to one

of the other types. Note that for the empty blocks, the removal operator will keep it unchanged. If the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm adopts the local mutation, K will be set as 1. Otherwise, if the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm adopts the global mutation, it will mutate $K \geq 1$ times in an iteration, where K is determined by the Poisson distribution with $\lambda = 1$, i.e., $K - 1 \sim \text{Pois}(1)$. Such mutation behavior is inspired by the mutation operator in fixed parameter evolutionary algorithm [Kratsch *et al.*, 2010], genetic programming [Durrett *et al.*, 2011; Qian *et al.*, 2015], and evolutionary sequence selection [Qian *et al.*, 2018; Qian *et al.*, 2023].

3 Constructing Analyzable Problem

In the machine learning community, classification problems are a crucial topic. Among them, the classic binary classification problems are commonly employed for comparing the performance of different DNNs. By establishing a mathematical relationship between the configuration of DNNs and classification accuracy on a binary classification problem, an explicit fitness function for evaluating DNNs on this problem can be formulated. Recently, Fischer *et al.* [2023] formulated the explicit fitness function between parameters (i.e., weights and biases) of the neuron and classification accuracy on a binary classification problem with labels in $\{0, 1\}$ on a unit hypersphere, and used it to analyze the runtime of (1+1)-Neuroevolution algorithm. However, the binary classification problem they defined restricts its solution scope to a fixed two-layer neural network, making it unsuitable for studying ENAS algorithms. Nevertheless, they motivated us to update their binary classification problem while formulating an explicit fitness function between neural architecture and classification accuracy. Furthermore, we can start analyzing the defined problem by partitioning the solution space based on fitness, which will be used in the runtime analysis.

3.1 Problem Definition

We consider points on $S := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^D \mid \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$ as inputs to the neural network, and define a binary classification problem UNIFORM with labels in $\{0, 1\}$ (i.e., negative class and positive class) on these points. Although the interpretation of neural network classifying points as 0 or 1 does not depend on D , as preliminary work, we will study the case $D = 2$ for simplicity. Let evenly divide the unit circle S into n sectors with angle $2\pi/n$. We denote the k -th sector as S_{sec}^k . Thus, $S = \cup_{k=1}^n S_{\text{sec}}^k$. Furthermore, let each sector S_{sec}^k be divided into a triangle S_{tri}^k with area $\frac{1}{2} \sin(\frac{2\pi}{n})$ and a segment region (a segment is cut from a circle by a ‘‘chord’’) $S_{\text{sec}}^k \setminus S_{\text{tri}}^k$. Then, we define the UNIFORM problem by assigning the positive and negative class points as shown in Definition 1.

Definition 1 (UNIFORM). *The problem assigns positive labels to points within $S^+ = (\cup_{k \in [1..n/4]} S_{\text{tri}}^{4k-3}) \cup (\cup_{k \in [1..n/2]} S_{\text{sec}}^{2k} \setminus S_{\text{tri}}^{2k}) \cup (\cup_{k \in [1..n/4]} S_{\text{sec}}^{4k-1})$, where $n/4 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \geq 6$, while labeling points in $S \setminus S^+$ as negative class.*

The sketch of UNIFORM ($n = 16$) is shown in Figure 2(a). Visually, the positive points fall into three cases of regions: 1) the green (positive) segment region connected to the white (negative) triangle, which can be seen as a half-space; 2) the




Figure 2: (a) Illustration of UNIFORM ($n = 16$) when $D = 2$. The green regions constitute the positive points classified as 1, while the white regions constitute the negative points classified as 0. (b) One optimal solution with a fitness of 1. The blocks at optimal positions (with the optimal weights) are colored as follows: blue for A-type blocks, yellow for B-type blocks, and red for C-type blocks. The arrow points to the positively classified half-space.

green sector region, which can be seen as an unbounded polyhedron; 3) the green triangle connected to the white segment region, which can be seen as a bounded polyhedron. Blocks of types A, B, and C can correctly classify these three cases respectively. We use a, b, c to represent the number of these three regions respectively. Then, we have $a = n/2, b = c = n/4$ for UNIFORM.

As discussed in Section 2.1, there is an optimal configuration for blocks in neural architecture: n_A, n_B , and n_C are equal to a, b , and c respectively. Refer to Figure 2(b) for a visual representation of an optimal solution. Note that the optimal solution is not unique because the combination of the A-type block and C-type block (i.e., ‘‘A+C’’-type blocks) leads to the same fitness improvement as the B-type block. In practice, the optimal solution simultaneously satisfies the following threshold conditions: $n_A \geq a + \max\{0, (b - n_B)\}, n_B + n_C \geq b + c, n_C \geq c$. If $\max\{0, (b - n_B)\} = (b - n_B) > 0$, it means that the optimal solution only has $n_B < b$ B-type blocks and uses $(b - n_B)$ ‘‘A+C’’-type blocks (i.e., $(b - n_B)$ A-type blocks and $(b - n_B)$ C-type blocks) to make up for it. The threshold conditions will serve as guidelines for the theoretical analysis presented below.

3.2 Fitness Function Explicitization

The fitness function f used to evaluate the classification accuracy of neural architectures can be interpreted as the fraction of correctly classified points on the unit circle S , which is similar to the definition of f in [Fischer *et al.*, 2023]. Then, we have

$$f = \frac{\text{vol}((C \cap L) \cup (\bar{C} \cap \bar{L}))}{\text{vol}(S)}, \quad (1)$$

where C is the union of polyhedrons pointed by blocks, $\bar{C} = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C$, $L \subset S$ represents the set of points classified as 1, $\bar{L} = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus L$, and $\text{vol}(\cdot)$ denotes the hypervolume. The union of $(C \cap L)$ and $(\bar{C} \cap \bar{L})$ represents the hypervolume of instances correctly classified as 1 or 0.

The explicit expression of Eq. (1) relies on the parameters of each neuron. Note that each neuron with binary threshold activation can be seen as a hyperplane (line). Thus, the parameters that needed to be tuned are the angle φ (weight) of the unit normal vector of each hyperplane and distance (bias)

of each hyperplane from the origin [Fischer *et al.*, 2023]. However, ENAS primarily focuses on the evolution of neural architecture, leaving the optimization of parameters to alternative training approaches like gradient descent. The crucial consideration is theoretically guaranteeing the optimal parameters. For this reason, we impose a constraint on the training of parameters (shown in Definition 2) to simplify the fitness evaluation progress in ENAS. In fact, due to the finite training set, it will inevitably introduce noise (i.e., cannot guarantee the optimal parameter) when evaluating the performance of the architecture. However, considering a noisy fitness function is challenging, as it relies on an unknown finite training set and requires to analyze the distribution of the dataset. A noisy fitness function is subject for future research.

Definition 2 (Neurons Parameter Training Strategy). *The bias of the neuron in the A-type block is set as $\cos(\pi/n)$; the bias of the neurons in the B-type block is set as 0, and the difference in φ between these neurons is $(2\pi/n)$; two neurons in C-type blocks have a bias of 0, with φ difference of $(2\pi/n)$, while the third neuron has a bias of $\cos(\pi/n)$ and a φ difference with the other two neuron of (π/n) . Then, a training approach such as gradient descent is used to theoretically guarantee the optimal parameters.*

Furthermore, based on Eq. (1) and Definition 2, we give Lemma 1 to portray how the basic units of neural architecture (i.e., blocks) influence the fitness value. The formulation Eq. (2) is an explicit fitness function that can directly calculate the classification accuracy for any given architecture.

Lemma 1. *Let $x = \{n_A, n_B, n_C\}$ be a solution on UNIFORM. Let $i = \min\{n_B + n_C, b + c\}$ ($i \in \{0, \dots, b + c\}$) be the number of B/C-type blocks that can classify the green triangles, and $j = \min\{n_A, a + \max\{0, b - n_B\}\} + \min\{n_B, b\} - \max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\}$ ($j \in \{0, \dots, a + b\}$) be the number of A/B-type blocks that classify the green segment regions minus the number of B-type blocks that classify the white segment regions connected to green triangle. Using the training strategy in Definition 2 for the architecture training, the fitness value of x can be explicitly represented by*

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \left(\left(\frac{n}{2} + i \right) \cdot \text{the area of a triangle} \right. \\ \left. + \left(\frac{n}{4} + j \right) \cdot \text{the area of a segment region} \right). \quad (2)$$

To further understand how a neural architecture works on UNIFORM, we take an example to illustrate the fitness calculation of a given neural architecture. We take the problem shown in Figure 2(a) as an example, i.e., $n = 16$. Given a set of blocks including an A-type, a B-type, and a C-type, i.e., $n_A = n_B = n_C = 1$, based on Section 2.1, the produced neural architecture A_{NA} is shown on Figure 3(a). The best position of the hyperplanes in A_{NA} is shown in Figure 3(b). Because $i = n_B + n_C = 2$ and $j = n_A + n_B = 2$, the fitness of architecture A_{NA} is $f(A_{NA}) = \left(\left(\frac{n}{2} + i \right) \cdot \text{the area of a triangle} + \left(\frac{n}{4} + j \right) \cdot \text{the area of a segment region} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\pi} = \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{8}\right) \cdot \frac{2}{\pi} + \frac{3}{8} \approx 0.62$, where the areas of a triangle and a segment region can be calculated by $\frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)$ and $\left(\frac{\pi}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)\right)$, respectively.

Let the neural network with optimal parameters be denoted as A_{NN} which is also called a classifier for UNIFORM when $n = 16$. The classification accuracy of A_{NN} is same as $f(A_{NA})$ based on Eq. (1). Below we show how this classifier works. Given an input (positive point) whose coordinates are (0.5,0.6), the OR neuron receives a binary string “010” (where “1” is calculated by B-type block) and finally outputs 1, indicating that the classifier A_{NA} can correctly classify this point.




Figure 3: (a) The neural architecture A_{NA} comprises an A-type, a B-type, and a C-type. (b) The best positions of the hyperplanes in A_{NA} for solving UNIFORM ($n = 16$), i.e., the sketch of the classifier A_{NN} . Given a point (0.5,0.6) as input, the classifier A_{NN} outputs 1.

Notably, using ENAS to solve the UNIFORM problem still primarily concentrates on the quantities of A, B, and C-type blocks within the neural network (i.e., n_A , n_B , and n_C), but simplifying the complexity of the problem from the perspective of fitness evaluation, making it resemble an optimization problem similar to the classical OneMax problem [Droste *et al.*, 2002]. Unlike OneMax, searching for the optimum of UNIFORM is not just about increasing the number of specific bits, but also requires considering the potential negative impact on fitness when adding certain bits (details in Section 3.3). Moreover, the non-uniqueness of the problem in terms of optimal solutions is also a distinction and challenge.

3.3 Solution Space Partition

We partition the solution space based on fitness, which serves for the runtime analysis by using mathematical tools [Zhou *et al.*, 2019]. In Eq. (2), $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{n}{2}\}$ is the number of green triangles (including the triangles that are contained in the green sector regions) that have been correctly classified by x , and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{3n}{4}\}$ is the subtraction difference between the number of green segment regions correctly classified and the number of white segment regions misclassified. When a solution satisfies $n_B + n_C \geq b + c$, $n_B \leq b$, $n_A \geq a + b - n_B$, there are $i = \frac{n}{4}$ and $j = \frac{3n}{4}$, and this solution is an optimal solution with a fitness value of 1. Additionally, we find that when n is greater than or equal to 6, the fitness improvement brought by maximizing the value of j is significantly less than that by increasing the value of i by 1, i.e., $\frac{3n}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{\pi}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right) \right) < \frac{1}{2} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)$.

Thus, according to the number of B/C-type blocks contributing to the fitness, the entire solution space can be partitioned into $(b + c + 1)$ subspaces that are denoted as $\cup_{i=0}^{b+c} \chi_i$. The following relationship exists between the subspaces:

$$\chi_0 <_f \chi_1 <_f \chi_2 < \dots <_f \chi_{b+c},$$

where $\chi_i <_f \chi_{i+1}$ represents that $f(x) < f(y)$ for any $x \in \chi_i$ and $y \in \chi_{i+1}$. Note that the solutions in subspace

χ_{b+c} may have more than $(b+c)$ B/C-type blocks, but the exceeding blocks do not affect fitness.

Furthermore, based on j defined in Lemma 1, we can partition each subspace χ_i into $(a+b+1)$ sub-subspaces, and each of the sub-subspace can be denoted as χ_i^j , where $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, b+c\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, a+b\}$. The following relationship exists between different sub-subspaces of χ_i :

$$\chi_i^0 <_f \chi_i^1 <_f \chi_i^2 < \dots <_f \chi_i^{a+b},$$

where $\chi_i^j <_f \chi_i^{j+1}$ represents that $f(x) < f(y)$ for any $x \in \chi_i^j$ and $y \in \chi_i^{j+1}$.

Based on the partitioning of the solution space described above, we find that the optimal solutions are in sub-subspace χ_{b+c}^{a+b} . Next, we will discuss the expected runtime when the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm finds the optimum for the first time.

4 Runtime Analysis

In this section, we analyze the expected runtime of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm when using the local mutation and global mutation for solving the UNIFORM problem. As the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm generates only one offspring solution in each iteration (generation), its expected runtime is just equal to the expected number T of generations to reach the optimum, which is denoted as $\mathbb{E}[T]$.

4.1 Local Mutation

We prove in Theorems 1 and 2 that the upper and lower bounds on the expected runtime of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with local mutation solving UNIFORM is $O(n)$ and $\Omega(n)$, respectively.

Theorem 1. *The (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with local mutation and neurons parameter training strategy (defined in Definition 2) needs $\mathbb{E}[T] \leq 63n/4 \in O(n)$ to find the optimum of the UNIFORM problem with $D = 2$, where $n \geq 6$.*

The main idea of the proof is based on the fitness-level technique [Wegener, 2003; Sudholt, 2013]. By analyzing the expected runtime required to jump out of each level and summing them up, we can determine the overall runtime. Based on the jumps that can be achieved by local mutation, the sub-subspaces can be categorized into three scenarios:

- For a solution in χ_i^j , where $i < b+c$ and $j < a+b$, it can jump to one of the sub-subspaces $\{\chi_i^{j+1}, \chi_{i+1}^{j-2}, \chi_{i+1}^{j-1}, \chi_{i+1}^j, \chi_{i+1}^{j+1}\}$ by mutation.
- For a solution in χ_i^j , where $i < b+c$ and $j = a+b$, it can jump to sub-subspace χ_{i+1}^{j-1} or χ_{i+1}^j by mutation.
- For a non-optimal solution in χ_{a+b}^j , it can only jump to sub-subspace χ_{a+b}^{j+1} by mutation.

We proceed to establish the proof for Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. The optimization process for solving the UNIFORM problem can be divided into two phases: 1) searching for a solution with $(b+c)$ B/C-type blocks that can partition all of the green triangles, i.e., finding a solution with $i = b+c$; 2) searching for a solution that can correctly partition all green and white segment regions, i.e., finding a

solution with $i = b+c$ and $j = a+b$. Let $\mathbb{E}[T_1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[T_2]$ represent the expected runtime for each phase, respectively, so that we have $\mathbb{E}[T] = \mathbb{E}[T_1] + \mathbb{E}[T_2]$.

In the first optimization phase, each parent satisfies $n_B + n_C < b+c$. The solution space can be partitioned into $(b+c+1)$ subspaces, i.e., $\cup_{i=0}^{b+c} \chi_i$. We say that algorithm \mathcal{A} is in level i if the best individual created so far is in χ_i . Let s_i be the lower bound on the probability of \mathcal{A} creating a new solution in $\cup_{i'=i+1}^{b+c} \chi_{i'}$, provided \mathcal{A} is in χ_i . Since \mathcal{A} uses the local mutation operator, the most optimistic assumption is that \mathcal{A} makes it rise one level (i.e., χ_{i+1}). A successful jump from χ_i to χ_{i+1} can occur in two ways: 1) when $n_A > 0$, modifying an A-type block into a B/C-type with the probability of $(1/3) \cdot (1/3) = 1/9$, where the first $1/3$ is the probability of selecting Modification operator, and the second $1/3$ is the probability of choosing to change A-type block; 2) adding a B/C-type block with probability $(1/3) \cdot (2/3) = 2/9$, where $1/3$ is the probability of selecting Addition operator, and $2/3$ is the probability of adding a B/C-type block. Thus, it can be derived that $s_i = 2/9$. Consequently, the expected runtime for the first phase is

$$\mathbb{E}[T_1] \leq \sum_{i=0}^{b+c-1} (s_i)^{-1} = \left(\frac{2}{9}\right)^{-1} \cdot (b+c) = \frac{9n}{4} \in O(n).$$

After the aforementioned phase, we pessimistically assume that \mathcal{A} belongs to χ_{b+c}^0 . The potential solutions in the subsequent optimization process can be further divided into $(a+b+1)$ sub-subspaces, i.e., $\cup_{j=0}^{a+b} \chi_{b+c}^j$. The realization of this optimization phase relies on algorithm \mathcal{A} increasing the value of j through mutation operations. To increase j , \mathcal{A} should decrease the number of B-type blocks that have incorrectly classified the white segment regions (i.e., decreasing $\max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\}$) or increase the number of A/B-type blocks that can correctly classify the green segment regions (i.e., increasing $\min\{n_A, a + \max\{0, b - n_B\}\} + \min\{n_B, b\}$). Thus, we consider three cases:

(1) If $n_B > b$ and $n_C < c$, there are $\min\{n_B - b, c - n_C\} > 0$ white segment regions that are misclassified. Modifying a B-type block into C-type enables accurate classification of the white segment region, which happens with probability $(1/3) \cdot (1/3) \cdot (1/2) = 1/18$, where the first $(1/3)$ is the probability of selecting Modification operator, and $(1/3) \cdot (1/2)$ is the probability of selecting B-type block and modifying it into C-type block. In addition, it also can add a C-type block with probability $1/9$ to classify the white segment region correctly. Thus, the probability of the fitness improvement in this case is at least $(1/18) + (1/9) = 1/6$.

(2) If $n_B \leq b$, there are $a+b - (n_A + n_B)$ green segment regions that are not classified correctly. For this case, the algorithm can increase the classified green segment regions in four ways: 1) by adding an A-type block with probability $1/9$; 2) by adding a B-type block when $n_B < b$, whose probability is $1/9$; 3) by modifying a C-type block into a B-type when $n_C > 0$ with probability $1/18$; 4) by modifying a C-type block into A-type when $n_B + n_C > b+c$ with probability $1/18$. However, the latter three ways require the solution to satisfy additional conditions. Thus, the probability of the fitness improvement in this case is at least $1/9$.

(3) If $n_B > b$ and $n_C \geq c$, there are $a - n_A$ green segment regions that are not classified correctly. For this case,

the algorithm can increase the classified green segment regions in three ways: 1) by adding an A-type block with probability $1/9$; 2) by modifying a B-type block into A-type with probability $1/18$; 3) by modifying a C-type block into A-type when $n_C > c$ with probability $1/18$. Thus, the probability of the fitness improvement in this case is at least $(1/9) + (1/18) = 1/6$.

Based on the above analysis, a jump upgrade between any two sub-subspaces (i.e., χ_{b+c}^j and χ_{b+c}^{j+1}) occurs with probability at least $1/9$. Thus, the expected runtime required to transition from χ_{b+c}^0 to χ_{b+c}^{a+b} is at most $9(a+b) = 27n/4 \in O(n)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[T_2] \in O(n)$.

By combining the two phases, we get $\mathbb{E}[T] \in O(n)$. \square

The proof of the lower bound on the expected runtime, as shown in Theorem 2, relies on the additive drift analysis tool [He and Yao, 2001]. First, a distance function has to be constructed to measure the current distance to the optimum. We define two distance functions for the two optimization phases. Let $d_1(x) = (b+c) - i$ and $d_2(x) = (a+b) - j$ represent the difference between a solution and the optimum in terms of i and j (defined in Lemma 1), where i is the number of B/C-type blocks contributing to the fitness in solution x , and j is the number of A/B-type blocks contributing to the fitness minus the number of B-type blocks that negatively affect the fitness. Then, we need to analyze the improvement in the distance to target state space (i.e., χ_{b+c} and χ_{b+c}^{a+b} for each phase) by one step. Finally, the upper/lower bound on the expected runtime can be derived through dividing the initial distance by a lower/upper bound on the improvement, where the calculation of initial distance relies on Lemma 2, i.e., the expected number of B/C-type blocks of the initial solution.

Theorem 2. *When the upper bound s on the number of each type of block in the initial solution is $n/4$, the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with local mutation and neurons parameter training strategy (defined in Definition 2) needs $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Omega(n)$ to find the optimum of the UNIFORM problem with $D = 2$, where $n \geq 6$.*

Lemma 2. *For the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm, let $Z_0 = n_B[x_0] + n_C[x_0]$ denote the number of B/C-type blocks of the initial solution x_0 , where $n_B[x_0] \sim U[0, s]$ and $n_C[x_0] \sim U[0, s]$. The expectation of Z_0 is s .*

Proof. The probability distribution of Z_0 is $P(Z_0 = z) = (\min\{z, 2s - z\} + 1)/(s+1)^2$, where $z \in [0, 1, \dots, 2s]$. Thus, the expectation of Z_0 is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_0] &= \sum_{z=0}^{2s} z \cdot P(Z_0 = z) \\ &= \sum_{z=0}^{s-1} \frac{(z+2s-z)(z+1)}{(s+1)^2} + \frac{s}{s+1} = s, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the second equality holds because the probability distribution diagram of Z_0 is symmetrically distributed about the point $P(Z_0 = s) = 1/(s+1)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We begin by analyzing the first phase. By considering operations that decrease the distance value, we can get the upper bound of the expected one-step improvement Δ_1 of the first phase, i.e., $\Delta_1 \leq (1/3) \cdot P(\text{add a B/C-type block}) +$

$$(1/3) \cdot P(\text{modify an A-type block into a B/C-type}) = (1/3) \cdot (2/3) + (1/3) \cdot (1/3) \cdot 1 = 1/3.$$

Let Z_0 denote the number of B/C-type blocks of the initial solution x_0 . According to Lemma 2 and $s \leq n/4 = (b+c)/2$, we can get that $\mathbb{E}[Z_0] = s \leq (b+c)/2$. Furthermore, let Z_0' represent the number of missing B/C-type blocks in x_0 , i.e., $Z_0' = (b+c) - Z_0 \geq (b+c)/2 = n/4$. Thus, according to the additive drift analysis tool, the expected runtime for the first phase is at most $(n/4)/(1/3) \in \Omega(n)$.

Because the runtime T_1 of the first phase is a lower bound on the runtime T of the whole process for finding an optimal solution belonging to χ_{b+c}^{a+b} , we have $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Omega(n)$. \square

4.2 Global Mutation

Next, we will show that by replacing local with global mutation, the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm can use the same time to find the optimal architecture. In particular, we prove in Theorems 3 and 4 that the expected runtime of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with global mutation is $O(n)$ and $\Omega(n)$ for solving the UNIFORM problem, respectively.

Theorem 3. *When the upper bound s on the number of each type of block in the initial solution is $n/4$, the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with global mutation and neurons parameter training strategy (defined in Definition 2) needs $\mathbb{E}[T] = O(n)$ to find the optimum of the UNIFORM problem with $D = 2$, where $n \geq 6$.*

Theorem 4. *When the upper bound s on the number of each type of block in the initial solution is $n/4$, the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with global mutation and neurons parameter training strategy (defined in Definition 2) needs $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Omega(n)$ to find the optimum of the UNIFORM problem with $D = 2$, where $n \geq 6$.*

The proof of Theorems 3 and 4 is similar to that of Theorem 1 and 2, i.e., dividing the optimization process into two phases. Each phase aims to find $x_{T_1} \in \chi_{b+c}$ and $x_{T_2} \in \chi_{b+c}^{a+b}$, respectively. Differently, the analysis of jumps is more sophisticated, because jumps across multiple layers (subspaces) can be achieved in each iteration when using the global mutation.

Proof of Theorem 3. We begin by analyzing the first phase. After one mutation, the distance d_1 may either increase, decrease, or remain unchanged. Let D_1^+ , D_1^- , and D_1^N denote these events, respectively. The probabilities of these events occurring are as follows: (1) $2/9 = P(\text{add B/C-type block}) \leq P(D_1^-) \leq P(\text{add B/C-type block, or modify A-type block to B/C-type}) = 1/3$, where the lower bound is held by the case that there is no A-type block; (2) $1/6 \leq P(D_1^N) = P(\text{modify a B-type block into C-type, or modify a C-type into B-type, or add/remove an A-type block}) \leq 1/3$, where the lower bound is based on the fact that there is at least one B or C-type block in any generation but may not have an A-type block; (3) $P(D_1^+) = 1 - P(D_1^-) - P(D_1^N)$, thus $P(D_1^+) \geq 1/3$. Then, we can get the lower bounds on the probabilities $P(D_1^-)$, $P(D_1^+)$, and $P(D_1^N)$, which are abbreviated as $l_1^- = 2/9$, $l_1^+ = 1/3$, and $l_1^N = 1/6$, respectively.

Now we analyze the expected one-step improvement Δ_1 of the first phase. Let $\Delta(k)$ denote the expected

one-step improvement, given that the number of mutation times is k in an iteration. Then, we have $\Delta(k) \geq \sum_{u=1}^k \sum_{v=0}^{\min\{u-1, k-u\}} \binom{k}{u} \binom{k-u}{v} \cdot (l_1^-)^u (l_1^+)^v (l_1^N)^{k-u-v} \cdot (u-v)$, where u, v , and $(k-u-v)$ are the number of mutation times in which the distance decreases by one, the distance increases by one, and the distance remains unchanged, respectively. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} P(K=k) \Delta(k) \geq \sum_{k=1}^3 P(K=k) \Delta(k) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{e} (l_1^-) + \frac{1}{e} \sum_{u=1}^2 \binom{2}{u} (l_1^-)^u (l_1^N)^{2-u} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2e} \sum_{u=1}^3 \binom{3}{u} (l_1^-)^u \sum_{v=0}^m \binom{3-u}{v} (l_1^+)^v (l_1^N)^{3-u-v} (u-v) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \left[\frac{2}{9} + \frac{14}{81} + \frac{73}{972} \right] > \frac{1}{6}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $P(K=1) = 1/e$, $P(K=2) = 1/e$, and $P(K=3) = 1/(2e)$ since $K-1 \sim \text{Pois}(1)$, and $m = \min\{u-1, 3-u\}$.

Owing to the expected number of B/C-type blocks for the initial solution x_0 is s as derived in Lemma 2 and $0 \leq s \leq n/4$, the expected distance for x_0 is $b+c-s \leq b+c = n/2$. Consequently, according to the additive drift analysis tool, the expected runtime for the first phase is at most $(n/2)/(1/6) = 3n \in O(n)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[T_1] \in O(n)$.

Then, we analyze the second phase. To make progress, it is necessary to maintain $n_B + n_C \geq b+c$ (i.e., d_1 unchanged). Thus, it is sufficient to consider the change in d_2 to analyze the lower bound of one-step progress. Let D_2^+ , D_2^- , and D_2^N denote the events where the distance from d_2 increases, decreases, and remains unchanged, respectively. The probabilities of these events occurring are bounded by: (1) $P(D_2^-) = P(\text{add an A-type block, or modify B-type block into C-type, or add an C-type block}) \geq 1/9$, where the lower bound is held by the case of adding an A-type block when $n_B = b$; (2) $P(D_2^N) = P(\text{add a redundant A/B/C-type block, or remove a useful A/B/C-type block}) \geq 1/9$, where the lower bound is held by the case of adding a C-type block when $n_B < b$ and $n_A + n_B < a+b$; (3) $P(D_2^+) = P(\text{wrong modification between A/B/C-type blocks, or remove a useful A/B-type block}) \geq 1/18$, where the lower bound is held by the case of modifying B-type into C-type block when $n_B < b$.

Similar to the calculation of Δ_1 in Eq. (4), we can get the expected one-step improvement of the second phase by

$$\Delta_2 \geq \sum_{k=1}^3 P(K=k) \Delta(k) \geq \frac{1}{e} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{9} + \frac{4}{81} + \frac{11}{972} \right] > \frac{1}{16}.$$

In the most pessimistic scenario, there is $d_2(x_{T_1}) = a+b$. Thus, the expected runtime for the second phase is at most $(a+b)/(1/16) = 12n \in O(n)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[T_2] \in O(n)$. Combining the two phases, we get $\mathbb{E}[T] \in O(n)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3, we utilize its definition of $k, u, v, P(D_1^-), P(D_1^+)$, and $P(D_1^N)$, and analyze the expected one-step improvement $\Delta(k)$.

Note that the upper bound of $P(D_1^+)$ is $1/3$ which is held by the case of removing a B/C-type block or modifying B/C-type block into A-type. Thus, the upper bounds of $P(D_1^-), P(D_1^+)$, and $P(D_1^N)$ are all less than or equal to $1/3$, implying that the one-step improvement of the first optimization phase is bounded by




Figure 4: Average number of generations of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm using local and global mutations for solving UNIFORM.

$\Delta(k) \leq \sum_{u=1}^k \sum_{v=0}^{\min\{u-1, k-u\}} \binom{k}{u} \binom{k-u}{v} (u-v) (1/3)^k \leq \sum_{u=1}^k \binom{k}{u} 2^{k-u} k/3^k$, where the last inequality holds by $u-v \leq k$. Then, we have the expected one-step improvement of the first phase by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} P(K=k) \cdot \sum_{u=1}^k \binom{k}{u} 2^{k-u} \cdot (k/3^k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} P(K=k) \cdot \left((1+2)^k - \binom{k}{0} \cdot 2^k \right) \cdot (k/3^k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} P(K=k) \cdot k \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^k \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} k \cdot \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} e^{-\lambda} - \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} k \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^k \cdot \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} e^{-\lambda} \\ &= 2 - \left(\frac{2}{3} \right) e^{(\frac{2}{3}-1)\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} k \cdot \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^{k-1} e^{-\frac{2}{3}\lambda} \\ &= 2 - \frac{2}{3} e^{-1/3} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{3} + 1 \right) = 2 - \frac{10}{9} e^{-1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Because the expected number of B/C-type blocks of the initial solution x_0 is s as derived in Lemma 2, the expectation of $d_1(x_0)$ is $b+c-s \geq n/4$. Thus, the expected runtime of T_1 is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[T_1] \geq \frac{n/4}{2 - \frac{10}{9} e^{-1/3}} \geq \frac{1}{5} n \in \Omega(n),$$

implying that the expected runtime of the whole process is $\mathbb{E}[T] = \Omega(n)$. \square

5 Experiments

In this section, we investigate the empirical performance of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithm with local mutation and global mutation by experiments. We set the problem size n from 10 to 100, with a step of 10, the upper bound $s = n/4$ for each type of block, as suggested in Theorems 1 to 4. Figure 4 shows the average number of generations (on running 10,000 runs) of the algorithms before reaching the optimal value of UNIFORM. We can observe that local mutation and global mutations achieve nearly the same performance, which verifies our theoretical analysis.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we take the first step towards the mathematical runtime analysis of the ENAS algorithm. Specifically, we defined a problem UNIFORM based on a binary classification

problem with labels in $\{0, 1\}$ on a unit circle points. Furthermore, we formulated an explicit fitness function to represent the relationship between the neural architecture and classification accuracy. Then, we analyzed the expected runtime of the (1+1)-ENAS algorithms with local and global mutations, respectively. Our theoretical results show that local mutation and global mutations can achieve nearly the same performance, which is also verified by experiments. In this first study of the runtime of ENAS algorithms, we have only scratched the surface of the rich structure arising from a binary classification problem. Future works will conclude more advanced classification problems. In addition, more advanced evolutionary operators (e.g., crossover operators) and population mechanisms will be considered for future research.

References

- [Auger and Doerr, 2011] Anne Auger and Benjamin Doerr. *Theory of Randomized Search Heuristics - Foundations and Recent Developments*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2011.
- [Bertsimas and Tsitsiklis, 1997] Dimitris Bertsimas and John N Tsitsiklis. *Introduction to Linear Optimization*. Athena Scientific, 1997.
- [Blum and Rivest, 1992] Avrim L. Blum and Ronald L. Rivest. Training a 3-node neural network is NP-complete. *Neural Networks*, 5(1):117–127, 1992.
- [Doerr and Neumann, 2020] Benjamin Doerr and Frank Neumann. *Theory of Evolutionary Computation: Recent Developments in Discrete Optimization*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2020.
- [Doerr et al., 2006] Benjamin Doerr, Nils Hebbinghaus, and Frank Neumann. Speeding up evolutionary algorithms through restricted mutation operators. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature (PPSN’06)*, pages 978–987, Reykjavik, Iceland, 2006.
- [Doerr et al., 2008] Benjamin Doerr, Thomas Jansen, and Christian Klein. Comparing global and local mutations on bit strings. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO’08)*, pages 929–936, Atlanta, GA, 2008.
- [Droste et al., 2002] Stefan Droste, Thomas Jansen, and Ingo Wegener. On the analysis of the (1+1) evolutionary algorithm. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 276(1-2):51–81, 2002.
- [Durrett et al., 2011] Greg Durrett, Frank Neumann, and Una-May O’Reilly. Computational complexity analysis of simple genetic programming on two problems modeling isolated program semantics. In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Foundations of Genetic Algorithms (FOGA’11)*, pages 69–80, Schwarzenberg, Austria, 2011.
- [Elsken et al., 2019] Thomas Elsken, Jan Hendrik Metzen, and Frank Hutter. Neural architecture search: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):1997–2017, 2019.
- [Fischer et al., 2023] Paul Fischer, Emil Lundt Larsen, and Carsten Witt. First steps towards a runtime analysis of neuroevolution. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Workshop on Foundations of Genetic Algorithms (FOGA’23)*, pages 61–72, Potsdam, Germany, 2023.
- [He and Yao, 2001] Jun He and Xin Yao. Drift analysis and average time complexity of evolutionary algorithms. *Artificial Intelligence*, 127(1):57–85, 2001.
- [Kötzing et al., 2014] Timo Kötzing, Andrew M Sutton, Frank Neumann, and Una-May O’Reilly. The max problem revisited: The importance of mutation in genetic programming. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 545:94–107, 2014.
- [Kratsch et al., 2010] Stefan Kratsch, Per Kristian Lehre, Frank Neumann, and Pietro Simone Oliveto. Fixed parameter evolutionary algorithms and maximum leaf spanning trees: A matter of mutation. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature: Part I (PPSN’10)*, pages 204–213, Kraków, Poland, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [Liu et al., 2018] Hanxiao Liu, Karen Simonyan, and Yiming Yang. DARTS: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09055*, 2018.
- [Liu et al., 2023] Yuqiao Liu, Yanan Sun, Bing Xue, Mengjie Zhang, Gary G. Yen, and Kay Chen Tan. A survey on evolutionary neural architecture search. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(2):550–570, 2023.
- [Montana et al., 1989] David J Montana, Lawrence Davis, et al. Training feedforward neural networks using genetic algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI’89)*, pages 762–767, Detroit Michigan, 1989.
- [Neumann and Witt, 2010] Frank Neumann and Carsten Witt. *Bioinspired Computation in Combinatorial Optimization - Algorithms and Their Computational Complexity*. Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2010.
- [Qian et al., 2015] Chao Qian, Yang Yu, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Variable solution structure can be helpful in evolutionary optimization. *Science China: Information Sciences*, 58(11):1–17, 2015.
- [Qian et al., 2018] Chao Qian, Chao Feng, and Ke Tang. Sequence selection by Pareto optimization. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI’18)*, pages 1485–1491, Stockholm, Sweden, 2018.
- [Qian et al., 2023] Chao Qian, Dan-Xuan Liu, Chao Feng, and Ke Tang. Multi-objective evolutionary algorithms are generally good: Maximizing monotone submodular functions over sequences. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 943:241–266, 2023.
- [Real et al., 2019] Esteban Real, Alok Aggarwal, Yanping Huang, and Quoc V Le. Regularized evolution for image classifier architecture search. In *Proceedings of the 33th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI’19)*, pages 4780–4789, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, 2019.

- [Stanley and Miikkulainen, 2002] Kenneth O Stanley and Risto Miikkulainen. Evolving neural networks through augmenting topologies. *Evolutionary Computation*, 10(2):99–127, 2002.
- [Sudholt, 2013] Dirk Sudholt. A new method for lower bounds on the running time of evolutionary algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 17(3):418–435, 2013.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2019] Yanan Sun, Bing Xue, Mengjie Zhang, and Gary G Yen. Completely automated CNN architecture design based on blocks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(4):1242–1254, 2019.
- [Wegener, 2003] Ingo Wegener. Methods for the analysis of evolutionary algorithms on pseudo-Boolean functions. In *Evolutionary Optimization*, pages 349–369. Springer, 2003.
- [Yao, 1999] Xin Yao. Evolving artificial neural networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 87(9):1423–1447, 1999.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2019] Zhi-Hua Zhou, Yang Yu, and Chao Qian. *Evolutionary Learning: Advances in Theories and Algorithms*. Springer, Singapore, 2019.
- [Zoph and Le, 2016] Barret Zoph and Quoc V Le. Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01578*, 2016.

7 Appendix

This part provides the proof of Lemma 1, which is omitted in Section 3.2 of our original paper due to space limitation.

Proof of Lemma 1. The UNIFORM problem evenly divides the unit circle into n sectors and each sector can be divided into a triangle with area $s_{\text{tri}} = \frac{1}{2} \sin(\frac{2\pi}{n})$ and a segment region with area $s_{\text{seg}} = (\frac{\pi}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \sin(\frac{2\pi}{n}))$. Given a neural architecture x with n_A A-type blocks, n_B B-type blocks, and n_C C-type blocks, its fitness (classification accuracy) is determined by the area of correctly and incorrectly classified regions. We begin our proof by introducing the impact of parameter tuning on classification accuracy.

According to Definition 2, the parameter tuning is exclusively associated with the φ of each hyperplane (line). Specifically, the parameters that need to be tuned are the φ of the neuron in A-type block, the φ of one neuron in B-type block, and the φ of one neuron in C-type block. Let the boundary between the green and white region be called the green boundary. To achieve optimal classifying, each hyperplane of x should overlap with a green boundary while its normal vector points to the green region. A special case is that when a C-type block is used to classify the triangle of the green sector region or when an A-type block is used to classify the segment region of the green sector region, the hyperplane of this block needs to overlap the edge of the triangle that is not connected to the origin. Note that a region will not be classified by multiple blocks unless $n_A > a + \max\{0, (b - n_B)\}$ or $n_B + n_C \geq b + c$, since the training strategy ensures optimal parameter configuration. Let l_t and l_s be the number of correctly classified triangles and segment regions, respectively. The classification accuracy equals $(l_t \cdot s_{\text{tri}} + l_s \cdot s_{\text{seg}}) / \pi$. We explain l_t and l_s in detail below.

First, we analyze the number of correctly classified triangles, i.e., l_t , which is influenced by the number of B/C-type blocks. Under the optimal parameter guarantee, the white triangles will not be incorrectly classified by any block. Thus, the number of white triangles that are correctly classified is $n/2$. Furthermore, according to the different cases of n_B and n_C , we analyze the number of green triangles that are correctly classified.

(1) Case 1: When $n_B \geq b$ and $n_C \geq c$, there are b B-type blocks for classifying the green sectors and c C-type blocks for classifying the green triangles connected with white segment regions; thus, $b + c$ green triangles are correctly classified.

(2) Case 2: When $n_B \geq b$ and $n_C < c$, there are b B-type blocks for classifying the green sectors, while n_C C-type blocks and $\min\{n_B - b, c - n_C\}$ B-type blocks for classifying the green triangles connected with white segment regions; thus, $b + n_C + \min\{n_B - b, c - n_C\} = \min\{n_B + n_C, b + c\}$ green triangles are correctly classified.

(3) Case 3: When $n_B < b$ and $n_C \geq c$, there are c C-type blocks for classifying the green triangles connected with white segment regions, while n_B B-type blocks and $\min\{b - n_B, n_C - c\}$ C-type blocks for classifying the green sectors; thus, $c + n_B + \min\{b - n_B, n_C - c\} = \min\{c + b, n_B + n_C\}$ green triangles are correctly classified.

(4) Case 4: When $n_B < b$ and $n_C < c$, there are n_B B-type blocks for classifying the green sectors and n_C C-type blocks for classifying the green triangles connected with white segment regions; thus, $n_B + n_C$ green triangles are correctly classified.

According to the above four cases, the number of green triangles that are correctly classified is $\min\{b + c, n_B + n_C\} = i$. Thus, $l_t = n/2 + i$.

Second, we analyze the number of correctly classified segment regions, i.e., l_s , which is affected by the number of A/B-type blocks. Since B-type blocks may incorrectly classify white segment regions when $n_B > b$ and $n_C < c$, we consider two cases based on n_B .

(1) Case 1: When $n_B \leq b$, n_B green segment regions that are connected to the green triangle are classified correctly by B-type blocks. Furthermore, there are $\min\{n_A, a + b - n_B\}$ green segment regions (including the green segment region in the green sector) that are correctly classified by A-type blocks. In addition, the number of white segment regions that are correctly classified is the number of white segment regions in UNIFORM, i.e., $n/4$. Thus, we can get $l_s = n_B + \min\{n_A, a + b - n_B\} + n/4$ for this case.

(2) Case 2: When $n_B > b$, b green segment regions that are connected to the green triangle are classified correctly, while $\min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}$ white segment regions that are connected to the green triangle are classified incorrectly when $n_C < c$. Thus, the number of white segment regions that are correctly classified is $n/4 - \max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\}$. Furthermore, $\min\{n_A, a\}$ green segment regions that are connected to the white triangle will be classified correctly by A-type blocks. Thus, we can get $l_s = b + n/4 - \max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\} + \min\{n_A, a\}$ for this case.

Based on Case 1 and Case 2, we can get $l_s = \min\{n_B, b\} + \min\{n_A, a + \max\{0, b - n_B\}\} + n/4 - \max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\} = n/4 + j$, where j is the number of A/B-type blocks that classify the green segment regions (i.e., $\min\{n_B, b\} + \min\{n_A, a + \max\{0, b - n_B\}\}$) minus the number of B-type blocks that classify the white segment regions connected to green triangles (i.e., $\max\{0, \min\{(n_B - b), (c - n_C)\}\}$). \square