

Sampling-based Pareto Optimization for Chance-constrained Monotone Submodular Problems

Xiankun Yan

Optimisation and Logistics,
School of Computer and
Mathematical Sciences,

The University of Adelaide, Adelaide
Australia

Aneta Neumann

Optimisation and Logistics,
School of Computer and
Mathematical Sciences,

The University of Adelaide, Adelaide
Australia

Frank Neumann

Optimisation and Logistics,
School of Computer and
Mathematical Sciences,

The University of Adelaide, Adelaide
Australia

ABSTRACT

Recently surrogate functions based on the tail inequalities were developed to evaluate the chance constraints in the context of evolutionary computation and several Pareto optimization algorithms using these surrogates were successfully applied in optimizing chance-constrained monotone submodular problems. However, the difference in performance between algorithms using the surrogates and those employing the direct sampling-based evaluation remains unclear. Within the paper, a sampling-based method is proposed to directly evaluate the chance constraint. Furthermore, to address the problems with more challenging settings, an enhanced GSEMO algorithm integrated with an adaptive sliding window, called ASW-GSEMO, is introduced. In the experiments, the ASW-GSEMO employing the sampling-based approach is tested on the chance-constrained version of the maximum coverage problem with different settings. Its results are compared with those from other algorithms using different surrogate functions. The experimental findings indicate that the ASW-GSEMO with the sampling-based evaluation approach outperforms other algorithms, highlighting that the performances of algorithms using different evaluation methods are comparable. Additionally, the behaviors of ASW-GSEMO are visualized to explain the distinctions between it and the algorithms utilizing the surrogate functions.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Mathematics of computing** → **Stochastic control and optimization.**

KEYWORDS

Chance-constrained submodular problem, fast Pareto optimization, sampling-based evaluation, adaptive sliding-selection

ACM Reference Format:

Xiankun Yan, Aneta Neumann, and Frank Neumann. 2024. Sampling-based Pareto Optimization for Chance-constrained Monotone Submodular Problems. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO '24)*, July 14–18, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3638529.3654176>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

GECCO '24, July 14–18, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0494-9/24/07.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3638529.3654176>

1 INTRODUCTION

In real-world optimization problems, diminishing returns often affect the profit of a solution when adding more items to the solution. Such problems can be generalized by the submodular functions as highlighted in previous research [8, 10, 11]. In the past, the optimization of monotone submodular functions under deterministic knapsack constraint has been widely studied [6, 7, 11, 13]. The aim of such problems is to find a subset of elements that maximizes the function value without the total weight of the subset exceeding a bound given in the knapsack. Recently, people gradually paid more attention to the stochastic version of the optimization of monotone submodular functions since the stochastic scenarios in real-world applications are unavoidable. Consequently, it is crucial not only to consider the existing constraints but also to minimize the effects of stochastic items in the stochastic optimization problems.

A useful technique, *chance constraint*, is frequently utilized to address the effects of uncertainty in the problem involving stochastic items [2, 3, 5, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20–25]. This approach allows for a solution's actual weight to exceed the given bound but with a very small probability. Previous studies [4, 13, 14] have successfully applied the chance constraint to the optimization of monotone submodular functions under the uniform distribution setting. Furthermore, to evaluate the chance constraint, surrogate functions were established based on One-sided Chebyshev's inequality and Chernoff bound. These surrogate functions facilitate the translation of the chance constraint into their corresponding deterministic equivalents for a given confidence level. Additionally, the performance of some greedy algorithms and a global simple evolutionary multi-objective algorithm (GSEMO) were analyzed and tested on the chance-constrained submodular problem. From their theoretical analysis, it is shown that within a certain runtime, all algorithms using the surrogate functions can guarantee a solution with a good approximation relative to the optimal solution obtained in the corresponding deterministic setting. However, the previous work did not address the gap between the algorithm using the surrogate functions and those employing a sampling-based method to directly evaluate the chance constraint. Furthermore, the performance of algorithms in more complex settings has yet to be explored.

The sampling-based approach proves valuable for evaluating the chance constraint [1, 9, 19]. In the paper, we introduce a novel sampling-based method for optimizing chance-constrained submodular problems. This method involves sampling the actual weights of a solution multiple times and then sorting these weights to identify the highest sampled weight that complies with the specified probability threshold. If this maximum sampled weight remains

below the bound given in the chance constraint, the solution is regarded as feasible; otherwise, it is considered infeasible. In addition, we propose an enhanced GSEMO integrated with an adaptive window inspired by the sliding window GSEMO (SW-GSEMO) in [16]. This advanced algorithm is designated as ASW-GSEMO, to tackle problems under challenging settings. In [16], Neumann and Witt explain how the defined window in the SW-GSEMO helps the algorithm in selecting some potential individuals for the parent selection phase. It is important to note that the size of the window is fixed as 1, and the algorithm is tested in deterministic settings with smaller weights. However, our experiments reveal that the SW-GSEMO struggles to capture any individuals within the window when dealing with larger weights. To address this issue, the adaptive window is proposed. In the adaptive window, the lower bound of the window is still determined based on the given bound and the ratio between the current time and total time. However, the window size is allowed to increase by 1 step whenever no individual is present within the window. Simultaneously, inspired by the theoretical analysis of the sliding-selection presented in [16], the adaptive window aims to capture only one individual during optimization. Therefore, the window size is maintained when only one individual is within the window. However, if more than one individual is available for selection, the window size is reduced by 1 in the subsequent iteration. Moreover, following the experimental methodology in [14], we test the performances of the ASW-GSEMO using the sampling-base approach on the maximum coverage problems. The problems are based on the graphs under two different settings, including independent and identically distributed (IID) weights and uniform weights with the same dispersion. The experiments involve visualizing the behavior of ASW-GSEMO and comparing its performance against the GSEMO and SW-GSEMO across various instances and sampling sizes. Additionally, we explore the gap between results obtained from the sampling-based approach and those derived from different surrogate methods. The empirical findings indicate that the ASW-GSEMO outperforms other algorithms when the sampling-based approach is employed, and the quality of solutions obtained through this approach is comparable with those using surrogate methods.

The structure of this paper is organized in the following. Section 2 outlines the definition of the chance-constrained submodular problem and the settings investigated for the experiments. Section 3 discusses the previously established surrogate evaluation methods and the algorithms as the baseline applied to the problem under various settings. Section 4 introduced the proposed sampling-based evaluation method and the ASW-GSEMO. Section 5 investigates the performance analysis of the different algorithms using various evaluation methods and includes a visualization of how the ASW-GSEMO functions during optimization. Finally, Section 6 summarizes our findings and discusses future work.

2 PROBLEM DEFINITION AND SETTINGS

Given a ground set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, the optimization of a monotone submodular function $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is considered. A function is defined as monotone iff for every $S \subseteq T \subseteq V$, $f(S) \leq f(T)$ holds. Besides, a function f is submodular iff for every $S \subseteq T \subseteq V$ and $v \notin T$, $f(S \cup \{v\}) - f(S) \geq f(T \cup \{v\}) - f(T)$ is satisfied. Within

the paper, the optimization of a monotone submodular function f is considered subjected to the chance constraint where each element $v_i \in V$ has a stochastic weight $W(v_i)$. The chance-constrained optimization problem can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize } f(S) \\ & \text{S.t. } \Pr[W(S) > B] \leq \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $W(S)$ is the weight of the subset S (i.e., $W(S) = \sum_{v_i \in S} W(v_i)$) and B is the deterministic bound. The parameter α is a small and acceptable probability violating the bound B .

For the settings, they are both considered the actual weight of the element sampled from a uniform distribution with an expected weight and dispersion. There are two different cases for the expected weight $E_W(v_i)$ and dispersion $\delta(v_i)$ investigated in the paper:

- (1) *Uniform IID Weights* the stochastic weight $W(v_i)$ has the same expected weight and same dispersion, i.e., $E_W(v_i) = a$, $\delta(v_i) = d$, and $W(v_i) \in [a - d, a + d]$ with $0 < d \leq a$.
- (2) *Uniform Weights with the Same Dispersion* the elements' expected weights are different but their dispersion is the same, i.e., $E_W(v_i) = a_i$, $\delta(v_i) = d$, and $W(v_i) \in [a_i - d, a_i + d]$ with $0 < d \leq a_i$.

Since the evolutionary algorithm is considered to solve the problem, we encode an element set S as a decision vector $x = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ with length n , where $x_i = 1$ means that the element $v_i \in V$ is picked up into the solution S . Given that all settings are based on a uniform distribution, the expected weight and variance of the solution are calculated as follows: $E[W(X)] = \sum_{i=0}^n E_W(v_i) x_i$, and $\text{Var}[W(X)] = \sum_{i=0}^n \delta(v_i)^2 x_i / 3$.

3 RELATED WORK

As described in previous work [14], the chance constraint is evaluated using the surrogate functions based on *One-sided Chebyshev's inequality* and *Chernoff bound*. The surrogate weight calculated by these different surrogate functions can be respectively expressed as

$$W_{cheb}(X) = E[W(X)] + \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \alpha)\text{Var}[W(X)]}{\alpha}},$$

and

$$W_{chen}(X) = E[W(X)] + \sqrt{3d|X| \ln(1/\alpha)},$$

where $|X|$ is the number of elements picked in the solution. Furthermore, multi-objective evolutionary algorithms (MOEAs) are studied to optimize the given problem in [14]. In the algorithm, each solution is considered a two two-dimensional search point in the objective space. The two-dimensional fitness function of the solution X is expressed as

$$g_1(X) = \begin{cases} f(X) & g_2(X) \leq B \\ -1 & g_2(X) > B \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$g_2(X) = W_{sg}(X), \quad (2)$$

where $f(X)$ is the submodular function value of X , $W_{sg}(X)$ is the surrogate weight of X . Let $Y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be another solution in the search space. Solution X (weakly) dominates Y (denoted as $X \geq Y$) iff $g_1(X) \geq g_1(Y)$ and $g_2(X) \leq g_2(Y)$. Comparatively, an infeasible solution is strongly dominated by a feasible one due to the objective function g_1 . Additionally, the objective function g_2 directs the solutions towards the feasible search space.

Algorithm 1 GSEMO**Input:** Probability α , bound B **Output:** the best individual X

```

1: Set  $X = 0^n$ ;
2:  $P \leftarrow \{X\}$ ;
3: repeat
4:   Choose  $X \in P$  uniformly at random;
5:    $Y \leftarrow$  flip each bit of  $X$  with probability  $\frac{1}{n}$ ;
6:   if  $\nexists W \in P : W > Y$  then
7:      $P \leftarrow (P \setminus \{Z \in P | Y \geq Z\}) \cup \{Y\}$ ;
8:   end if
9: until stop;

```

In [14], the GSEMO (see in Algorithm 1) is employed to address the chance-constrained problem. In our study, we consider this algorithm with the defined two-objective fitness function, as the baseline for subsequent experiments. The GSEMO initiates with an empty set and progressively includes items into this set by utilizing the standard bit mutation operator throughout the optimization process. During mutation, a new solution is generated by independently flipping each bit of the existing solution with a probability of $1/n$. If the newly generated offspring is dominated by any individual in the current population, it is subsequently rejected. Additionally, the GSEMO maintains a set of solutions, each of which is not dominated by any solution produced at each iteration during the optimization.

The SW-GSEMO (given in Algorithm 2) was examined in [16] for the problems under the deterministic settings. In our approach, we modify its fitness function, replacing the calculation of deterministic weight with the defined fitness function. Fundamentally, the SW-GSEMO shares the same mechanism and mutation operator as the GSEMO. However, the SW-GSEMO introduces a sliding-selection process (see in Algorithm 3) to choose some potential individuals from the whole population for mutation. This sliding-selection defines a window based on the given bound B and the total time t_{max} . The window is sliding according to the current time t , with the lower and upper bounds set as $\lfloor \frac{tB}{t_{max}} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{tB}{t_{max}} \rceil$, respectively. As t increases, so does the lower bound of the window. The algorithm selects an individual for mutation from within the window if there are any with evaluated weight; if not, it randomly selects from the original population.

4 FAST SAMPLING-BASED PARETO OPTIMIZATION

We now introduce our proposed novel algorithm utilizing the sampling-based approach. In the sampling-based approach, we independently sample the actual weight of each element from a given uniform distribution T_{sp} times. This results in a solution X with a set of independent sampling weights, denoted by W_s . Next, we sort the sampling weights in descending order. With the $index = \lceil T_{sp} \cdot \alpha \rceil$, the maximal sampling weight $W_{sp}(X)$ that meets the chance constraint under the probability α is obtained, i.e., $W_{sp}(X) = W_s[index]$. Therefore, we can consider that the solution is feasible if the sampling weight of solution X does not exceed the

Algorithm 2 SW-GSEMO**Input:** Total time t_{max} , probability α , bound B **Output:** the best individual X

```

1: Set  $X = 0^n$ ;
2:  $P \leftarrow \{X\}$ ;
3:  $t \leftarrow 0$ ;
4: repeat
5:    $t = t + 1$ 
6:   Choose  $X = \text{sliding-selection}(P, t, t_{max}, \alpha, B)$ ;
7:    $Y \leftarrow$  flip each bit of  $X$  with probability  $\frac{1}{n}$ ;
8:   if  $\nexists W \in P : W > Y$  then
9:      $P \leftarrow (P \setminus \{Z \in P | Y \geq Z\}) \cup \{Y\}$ 
10:  end if
11: until  $t \geq t_{max}$ ;

```

Algorithm 3 Sliding-selection**Input:** Population P , current iteration t , total time t_{max} , probability α , bound B **Output:** the selected individual X

```

1: if  $t \leq t_{max}$  then
2:    $\hat{c} \leftarrow (t/t_{max}) \cdot B$ ;
3:    $\hat{P} = \{X \in P \mid \lfloor \hat{c} \rfloor \leq g_2(X) \leq \lceil \hat{c} \rceil\}$ ;
4:   if  $\hat{P} = \emptyset$  then
5:      $\hat{P} \leftarrow P$ ;
6:   end if
7:   else
8:      $\hat{P} \leftarrow P$ ;
9:   end if
10: Choose  $X \in \hat{P}$  uniformly at random;
11: Return  $X$ ;

```

bound (i.e., $W_{sp}(X) \leq B$); otherwise, the solution is deemed infeasible. The pseudo-code for this approach is outlined in Algorithm 4. With the sampling weight $W_{sp}(X)$, the function to minimize the weight of solution in fitness changes to $g_3(X) = W_{sp}(X)$. The new fitness function becomes $g = (g_1(X), g_3(X))$. We have $X \geq Y$ iff $g_1(X) \geq g_1(Y)$ and $g_3(X) \leq g_3(Y)$.

In the novel ASW-GSEMO algorithm, we modify the sliding-selection process in Algorithm 2 at line 6 by combining with an adaptive sliding-selection approach. This algorithm is a variant of the SW-GSEMO. It's important to note that in Algorithm 3, the window size is fixed at exactly one. This limitation makes it challenging to capture potential individuals when the weights of the elements are significantly larger than 1. Consequently, the results yielded by the SW-GSEMO tend to be similar to those of the GSEMO when dealing with larger weights. To address these challenges, we introduce the adaptive sliding-selection method (described in Algorithm 5). The lower bound of the adaptive window is defined as the same way as the sliding-selection approach, but a global variable w_{size} is used to control the size of the window. When no individual is present within the window, w_{size} increases by one. However, if more than one individual is in the window and w_{size} is larger than 1, w_{size} decreases by 1; otherwise, w_{size} remains. Additionally, similar to the classical sliding window approach, if

Algorithm 4 Sampling weight of solution (W_{sp})

Input: Solution x , sampling size T_{sp} , probability α , weight sampling set $\{\hat{w}_i | 0 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Output: the sampling weight

```

1:  $t = 0, W_s \leftarrow \emptyset, index = \lceil T_{sp} \cdot \alpha \rceil;$ 
2: while  $t < T_{sp}$  do
3:   Sample  $w_i \sim \hat{w}_i;$ 
4:    $w_s = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i;$ 
5:    $W_s.add(w_s)$ 
6:    $t = t + 1$ 
7: end while
8:  $sort(W_s)$  in descending order;
9: return  $W_s[index]$ 

```

Algorithm 5 Adaptive sliding-selection

Input: Population P , current iteration t , total time t_{max} , probability α , bound B

Output: the selected individual X

```

1: Global  $w_{size}$ 
2: if  $t \leq t_{max}$  then
3:    $\hat{c} \leftarrow (t/t_{max}) \cdot B;$ 
4:    $\hat{P} = \{X \in P \mid \lfloor \hat{c} \rfloor \leq g_3(X) \leq \lfloor \hat{c} \rfloor + w_{size}\};$ 
5:   if  $\hat{P} = \emptyset$  then
6:      $\hat{P} \leftarrow P;$ 
7:      $w_{size} = w_{size} + 1$ 
8:   else if  $w_{size} > 1$  and  $|\hat{P}| > 1$  then
9:      $w_{size} = w_{size} - 1$ 
10:  end if
11: else
12:   $\hat{P} \leftarrow P;$ 
13: end if
14: Choose  $X \in \hat{P}$  uniformly at random;
15: Return  $X;$ 

```

there are no individuals within the adaptive window, the algorithm selects an individual as a parent from the entire population.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we investigate the performance of ASW-GSEMO and other algorithms that employ the sampling-based evaluation method on the chance-constrained submodular problem across various settings. We specifically focus on the maximum coverage problem (MCP) based on graphs [7], which is a kind of classical submodular problem, as part of our experimental work. Additionally, we conduct a comparison of the results achieved by the ASW-GSEMO against those garnered by the GSEMO and SW-GSEMO using the sampling-based evaluation approach. Moreover, we examine the performances of ASW-GSEMO across various surrogates to highlight the gap among the different evaluation methods.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Within this paper, we examine a chance-constrained version of MCP. To briefly describe, given an undirected graph G with a set of vertices $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and a set of edges E , we denote $N(V')$

the number of vertices of V' and their neighbors in the graph. The objective of MCP is to find a subset $V' \subseteq V$ so that $N(V')$ is maximized according to the chance constraint with a deterministic bound B . Additionally, a linear function $W : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is provided to determine the weight of each vertex. The MCP under chance constraint can be formulated as

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{V' \in V} N(V') \text{ s.t. } Pr[W(V') > B] \leq \alpha. \quad (3)$$

For our experiments, we utilize three larger sparse graphs: ca-GrQc ($n = 4, 158$), ca-HepPh ($n = 11, 204$) and ca-Astroph ($n = 17, 903$). We denote $D(v_i)$ the degree of each vertex v_i . In our IID weight setting, each vertex is assigned identical expected weights and dispersion values, set at $a = d = n$. For the uniform weight setting, we define variable expected weights as $a_i = \frac{(n+D(v_i))^5}{n^4}$ and the identical dispersion as $d = n$. They differ from previous work where smaller values were used in their experimental setup. In this specific setting, the impact of uncertainty closely approximates the expected weight when surrogate evaluation methods are applied. The algorithms are tested with different bounds $B \in \{\lfloor n^2/2 \rfloor, n^2\}$ and probability values $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.001\}$ respectively. Different sampling times T_{sp} are considered for $\alpha = 0.1$, where weights are independently sampled 250, 500, and 1,000 times. These sampling files are stored to ensure that algorithms can obtain the same feasible solution. For $\alpha = 0.001$, we set $T_{sp} = 1000$. Furthermore, the maximum iterations for the GSEMO and the total times for the SW-GSEMO and ASW-GSEMO are set to 1,500,000. To statistically compare the performance of the algorithms, each one is executed for 30 independent runs, and the minimum, maximum, average values, and standard deviation of the results will be reported. Additionally, the ASW-GSEMO using surrogates is tested under the same experimental setup. To verify the differences between the various evaluation methods, we apply the Kruskal-Wallis test with a 95% confidence level to ensure the statistical validity of the results.


5.2 The Result on Uniform IID Weights

Here, we focus on the performance of various algorithms on the MCP with IID weights. We present the results obtained by the algorithms in Table 1 and compare the performance across different instances. Further, we visualize the optimization processing of the ASW-GSEMO to demonstrate its advantage contract to the SW-GSEMO. Additionally, we provide a visualization of the optimization process of the ASW-GSEMO to highlight its advantages over the SW-GSEMO. Additionally, we present results from the ASW-GSEMO using the surrogate evaluation method and identify the differences between the two evaluation approaches.


5.2.1 Results comparison and Visualization of ASW-GSEMO. The results in Table 1 illustrate that the ASW-GSEMO generally outperforms the GSEMO and SW-GSEMO. However, it is noteworthy that the standard deviation of the ASW-GSEMO is higher than the others across all instances. This is because the size adaptive window in different runs is not stable. The results also reveal that the performance of the SW-GSEMO is almost on par with the GSEMO. Furthermore, the table indicates that the average number of elements $|V'|$ in the best solution is larger when the ASW-GSEMO is

Table 1: Results for Maximum coverage problem with IID weights using sampling-based evaluation

Graph	B	α	T_{sp}	GESMO					SW-GESMO					ASW-GESMO					
				Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V' $	Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V' $	Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V' $	
ca-GrQc	$n^2/2$	0.1	250	3584	3688	3644.933	22.162	787	3620	3681	3647.466	14.95	789	4051	4157	4137.733	21.866	807	
			500	3600	3671	3634.533	18.402	780	3608	3680	3645.3	21.537	792	3931	4157	4126.2	46.314	806	
			1000	3600	3685	3643.6	22.808	737	3594	3687	3647.133	20.744	803	3641	4155	4109.266	103.252	800	
		n^2	0.001	1000	3619	3709	3656.866	23.376	836	3583	3696	3646	23.613	804	3903	4157	4134.866	46.303	810
				250	3611	3698	3650.166	22.853	794	3597	3723	3648.2	26.184	791	3690	4151	4072.366	88.084	791
				500	3605	3684	3648.733	20.291	806	3591	3685	3649.133	25.828	795	3685	4145	4040.366	97.905	777
	0.001	n^2	1000	3613	3695	3652.133	20.611	797	3606	3678	3648.533	18.768	794	3696	4142	4047.733	100.77	785	
				1000	3598	3685	3649.433	23.048	806	3597	3718	3653.033	25.541	802	3865	4147	4069.3	67.987	798
				1000	3598	3685	3649.433	23.048	806	3597	3718	3653.033	25.541	802	3865	4147	4069.3	67.987	798
		$n^2/2$	0.1	250	7907	8195	8090.5	63.93	1286	7928	8216	8077.966	65.415	1026	8175	10890	10244.8	661.6687	1383
				500	7943	8233	8066.433	60.02	1093	7938	8230	8081.233	70.599	1072	8310	11002	10090.766	711.786	1377
				1000	7941	8178	8055.1	54.066	1148	7936	8222	8077.1	58.3	1065	8695	11043	10152.266	518.776	1381
n^2	0.001		1000	7982	8179	8083.933	54.247	1056	7943	8179	8054.866	45.394	1033	8603	10966	10184.9	666.218	1296	
			250	7902	8142	8052.766	67.183	1047	7951	8205	8071.433	64.906	1073	8122	10737	9707.033	684.183	1262	
			500	8003	8134	8080.8	35.424	1050	7969	8133	8050.8	45.735	1010	8239	10595	9667.1	633.359	1268	
0.001	n^2	1000	7908	8244	8066.866	77.486	1032	7952	8180	8067.033	54.643	1025	8129	10560	9733.1	566.416	1287		
			1000	7931	8195	8080.333	59.6	1057	7911	8206	8068.033	73.88	1070	8142	10593	9614.966	741.976	1227	
			1000	7931	8195	8080.333	59.6	1057	7911	8206	8068.033	73.88	1070	8142	10593	9614.966	741.976	1227	
	$n^2/2$	0.1	250	12498	12842	12651.033	72.806	1056	12400	12699	12586.2	77.693	1027	14032	17261	16061.6	942.73	1550	
			500	12349	12850	12617.766	88.295	1040	12458	12780	12636.4	80.161	1047	13029	17063	15640.933	1094.443	1527	
			1000	12385	12797	12634.166	102.409	1041	12502	12823	12647.766	100.1	1053	12789	17440	15873.633	1091.795	1542	
n^2		0.001	1000	12399	12786	12627.633	93.628	1084	12487	12892	12656.133	81.645	1090	13199	17288	15849.866	957.862	1545	
			250	12486	12903	12637.333	87.959	1104	12480	12844	12657.266	80.585	1084	12744	16524	14889.333	1026.238	1520	
			500	12482	12781	12653.966	81.374	1081	12395	12870	12628.133	107.551	1061	12645	16242	14773.66	1063.271	1499	
0.001	n^2	1000	12463	12812	12624.466	86.244	1068	12522	12814	12670.933	79.292	1052	12505	16241	14854.633	947.947	1507		
			1000	12378	12771	12625.333	94.793	1059	12682	16435	12650.733	93.281	1070	12457	17872	15214.1	900.65	1513	
			1000	12378	12771	12625.333	94.793	1059	12682	16435	12650.733	93.281	1070	12457	17872	15214.1	900.65	1513	




(a) SW-GSEMO



(b) ASW-GSEMO

Figure 1: Optimization process for ca-HepPh with IID weights using sampling-based evaluation



(a) $\alpha = 1e - 1$



(b) $\alpha = 1e - 3$

Figure 2: The weights obtained by ASW-GSEMO using different approaches in ca-HepPh with IID weights

applied, suggesting its effectiveness in finding more comprehensive solutions.

We also note that the sampling size T_{sp} does not significantly impact the results of the algorithms, and there is minimal difference

in the outcomes for different values of α . This observation suggests that the influence of uncertainty is reduced when the dispersion is as large as the expected weight. However, in the case of the ASW-GSEMO, the results and the value of $|V'|$ obtained with the larger bound are slightly lower than those from the smaller bound, indicating that the ASW-GSEMO may not fully converge within 1.5 million iterations.

Furthermore, Table 2 displays the average population sizes obtained by the algorithms in the graph ca-AstroPh. It reveals that the population size of the ASW-GSEMO is significantly larger than that of the other algorithms when the graph becomes larger, and the population size from the SW-GSEMO is very similar to that of the GSEMO. This finding supports the notion that the performance of the ASW-GSEMO is better than others and the SW-GSEMO struggles to achieve better results than the GSEMO when the expected weight is larger.

Table 2: Average number of trade-off solutions obtained by different algorithms in ca-AstroPh with IID weights

Graph	B	α	T_{sp}	GSEMO	SW-GSEMO	ASW-GSEMO		
ca-AstroPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	250	1819	1826	3334		
			500	1822	1860	3402		
			1000	1838	1823	3373		
		0.001	1000	1831	1835	3294		
			n^2	0.1	250	1845	1822	2971
				500	1821	1844	2865	
	0.001	1000	1836	1832	2902			
		1000	1840	1847	2917			

Table 3: Results for MCP with IID weights using surrogates

Graph	B	α	ASW-GSEMO with W_{cheb}			ASW-GSEMO with W_{chen}				
			mean	std	p-value	mean	std	p-value		
ca-GrQc	$n^2/2$	0.1	4137.9	19.871	0.314	4138.8	16.383	0.51		
		0.001	4137.933	17.914	0.332	4138.3	23.629	0.505		
		n^2	0.1	4122.433	14.247	0.0002	4122.133	17.753	0.0002	
	0.001	4130.366	19.062	4.191	4118.3	23.179	0.004			
		ca-HepPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	10844.133	205.511	0	10851.4333	226.556	0
				0.001	10926.833	122.11	0	10839.6	189.793	0
n^2	0.1		10547.133	242.735	0	10364.033	406.008	0		
	0.001	10715.266	253.327	0	10551.5	305.352	0			
ca-AstroPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	17058.3	324.184	0	16759.1	554.048	0		
		0.001	17183.4	180.035	0	17061.1	412.126	0		
		n^2	0.1	16146.333	622.756	0	15978.4	715.088	0	
	0.001	16594.866	322.304	0	16074	623.282	0			

Figures 1a and 1b illustrate the optimization processes of the SW-GSEMO and ASW-GSEMO, respectively, in the graph ca-HepPh. They present the relationship between the sampling-based weight and the function value of the solution selected into the population. The solutions are labeled to show whether their parents are within the corresponding windows of the algorithms. It is evident that the SW-GSEMO has difficulty capturing individuals within the sliding window, resulting in many search points positioned far from the Pareto front. Conversely, after the ASW-GSEMO adjusts the window length at the start, it captures more individuals in the enhanced window. Consequently, most of the solutions generated by the ASW-GSEMO are closer to the Pareto front, which provides evidence of why the performance of the ASW-GSEMO is better.

Table 4: Final Population size and average of $|V'|$ for MCP with IID weights using Surrogates

Graph	B	α	ASW-GSEMO with W_{cheb}		ASW-GSEMO with W_{chen}	
			pop_size	$ V' $	pop_size	$ V' $
ca-GrQc	$n^2/2$	0.1	796	801	791	799
		0.001	792	797	796	795
	n^2	0.1	783	793	793	801
		0.001	786	808	793	804
ca-HepPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	1555	1517	1522	1536
		0.001	1532	1559	1566	1570
	n^2	0.1	1509	1563	1480	1593
		0.001	1422	1496	1404	1478
ca-AstroPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	1650	1756	1587	1748
		0.001	1796	1836	1740	1749
	n^2	0.1	1789	1755	1610	1708
		0.001	1680	1780	1754	1737

5.2.2 Sampling VS. Surrogate. The results obtained from the ASW-GSEMO algorithm using surrogate functions are presented in Table 3. This table also includes statistical p-values comparing the sampling-based approach with two different surrogate approaches respectively. For the ca-Grac graph, which has a smaller number of nodes and a lower bound, the p-values are less than 0.05. This suggests that the performance of the ASW-GSEMO with the sampling method is comparable to that with the surrogates. However, for larger graphs and bounds, the performance of the ASW-GSEMO with the sampling method is not as good as to that with the surrogates. These findings indicate that while the algorithm with the sampling-based evaluation is as effective as the surrogate methods in instances with smaller expected weights and tighter bounds, it slightly does not perform as efficiently compared to the surrogates in cases with larger bounds and graphs, especially with fewer iterations. Table 4 in the appendix displays the average population size and the average number of elements in the final best solution across different instances. According to Tables 1 and 4, the ASW-GSEMO with the sampling-based approach tends to yield more individuals but fewer elements in the final best solution.


The surrogate weights of solutions in the population obtained from the sampling-based method in each iteration are calculated, and a portion of these results are visualized in Figures 2a and 2b. These figures reveal that while the weights evaluated by different methods are similar when the probability is larger, there is a significant discrepancy between the weights evaluated by the surrogate based on one-sided Chebyshev's inequality and other approaches when the probability is smaller. Additionally, they indicate that the evaluated weights of the solutions do not reach the bound, suggesting incomplete convergence. The trend of increasing weights implies that the weights evaluated by the surrogate based on one-sided Chebyshev's inequality would likely reach the bound first upon full convergence.

5.3 The Result on Uniform Weights with Same Dispersion


Here, we examine the performance of the ASW-GSEMO on MCP under uniform weights with the same dispersion, comparing it against to other fast Pareto optimization algorithms. We also visualize the process of the ASW-GSEMO to demonstrate the functioning of its

Table 5: Results for the maximum coverage problem with uniform weights using sampling-based evaluation

Graph	B	α	T_{sp}	GESMO						SW-GESMO					ASW-GESMO				
				Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V $	Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V $	Min	Max	Mean	std	$ V $	
ca-GrQc	$n^2/2$	0.1	250	3595	3685	3633.766	24.418	828	3570	3694	3638.366	27.451	823	3996	4158	4131.2	38.78	810	
			500	3568	3688	3636.4	25.197	835	3607	3677	3643.166	21.069	797	3813	4156	4121.8	65.746	819	
			1000	3594	3668	3628.7	19.645	818	3552	3684	3622.233	25.422	790	3907	4155	4110.766	72.816	819	
		0.001	1000	3599	3714	3635.366	25.293	809	3593	3687	3634.666	23.328	808	3880	4157	4133.366	49.421	817	
			250	3588	3685	3638.666	24.57	811	3605	3662	3634	16.923	808	3843	4150	4072.466	59.972	805	
			500	3582	3706	3640.2	25.511	814	3595	3668	3632.466	21.3	794	3793	4141	4064.533	73.632	806	
	0.001	1000	3596	3676	3633.333	19.082	822	3596	3656	3628.066	18.467	790	3813	4147	4053.533	94.099	813		
		250	3585	3677	3634.3	24.822	817	3582	3686	3629.466	22.192	789	3854	4145	4071.2	66.501	815		
		500	3585	3677	3634.3	24.822	817	3582	3686	3629.466	22.192	789	3854	4145	4071.2	66.501	815		
	ca-HepPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	250	7929	8154	8022.7	61.173	983	7957	8156	8053.933	58.424	986	9235	10978	10441.6	412.405	1382
				500	7940	8116	8028.6	50.631	995	7921	8127	8012.066	52.695	991	8173	11004	10065	672.44	1336
				1000	7843	8210	8031.266	69.873	997	7869	8071	8000.333	55.976	995	8079	11038	10206.266	724.934	1383
0.001			1000	7871	8103	8015.333	56.041	1002	7861	8155	8028.333	75.37	1004	8554	10967	10398.4	505.33	1354	
			250	7894	8158	8021	59.575	998	7936	8111	8009.066	45.386	993	8297	10572	9596.766	688.814	1390	
			500	7910	8129	8024.7	52.235	997	7945	8146	8050.433	46.745	999	8174	10539	9604.633	712.598	1432	
0.001		1000	7957	8152	8052.633	57.413	986	7927	8180	8029.3	58.182	994	8118	10527	9636.133	682.395	1381		
		250	7890	8197	8031.8	66.824	996	7927	8180	8029.3	58.182	994	8224	10594	9850	709.575	1358		
		500	7890	8197	8031.8	66.824	996	7927	8180	8029.3	58.182	994	8224	10594	9850	709.575	1358		
ca-AstroPh		$n^2/2$	0.1	250	12428	12763	12580.533	86.087	1043	12506	12728	12605.4	58.133	1038	12856	17055	16003.333	970.202	1652
				500	12446	12785	12593.433	76.587	1052	12448	12823	12579.8	97.399	1072	12830	17239	15898.2	1181.282	1672
				1000	12362	12750	12541.833	85.384	1041	12373	12725	12560.566	88.95	1044	12890	17262	15334.866	1356.371	1510
	0.001		1000	12378	12758	12584.733	93.7	1049	12360	12732	12570.066	96.854	1059	12522	17359	15548.466	1262.312	1536	
			250	12412	12763	12588.366	80.192	1041	12479	12828	12633.033	79.822	1048	12858	16796	15408.966	875.922	1656	
			500	12433	12725	12574.733	86.624	1040	12455	12838	12599.533	94.084	1030	12744	16484	14670.4	1025.452	1420	
	0.001	1000	12373	12922	12599.466	101.935	1051	12365	12741	12562.566	93.338	1042	12653	16377	14897.533	1045.866	1450		
		250	12446	12763	12565.233	81.569	1040	12423	12838	12601.166	98.533	1053	12593	16572	15047.433	1109.39	1506		
		500	12446	12763	12565.233	81.569	1040	12423	12838	12601.166	98.533	1053	12593	16572	15047.433	1109.39	1506		



(a) SW-GSEMO



(b) ASW-GSEMO

Figure 3: Optimization process for ca-HepPh with uniform weights using sampling-based evaluation

window mechanism. Additionally, we investigate the differences between various methods of evaluating chance constraints.

5.3.1 Results comparison and Visualization of ASW-GSWMO. Table 5 presents the results of different algorithms, including the average number of elements in the best solution. These findings reflect the same outcomes observed when the algorithm was tested on a problem featuring IID weights. In this setting, the ASW-GSEMO selects a greater number of elements for the solution, beating the performance of other algorithms. This superior performance is noted despite a higher standard deviation, which results from the unstable size of the adaptive window. The results also show that the sampling size T_{sp} does not significantly affect the final outcomes for both algorithms, and the disparity between results for different values of α is small.

Figures 3a and 3b are visualized to represent the correlation between sampling-based weights and the corresponding values of the function. Analysis of Figures 3a and 3b reveals that the SW-GSEMO faces challenges in incorporating solutions into the window during the optimization process. In contrast, the ASW-GSEMO performs effectively, successfully capturing a larger number of individuals proximate to the Pareto front. However, it is also observed that the ASW-GSEMO struggles to include certain individuals when the weights reach a certain level in later iterations. This challenge originates from the initial weights of the solutions not meeting the lower bound of the window, complicating the process for the escalating weights to align with the window as the iterations progress. With additional iterations, these challenges can be mitigated and potentially resolved.




Figure 4: The weights obtained by ASW-GSEMO using different evaluation approaches in ca-HepPh with uniform weights

5.3.2 *Sampling VS. Surrogate.* Table 6 presents the outcomes and the average number of elements in the best solutions produced by the ASW-GSEMO. In addition, it includes calculated p-values comparing the results obtained from surrogate and sampling-based methods. These results indicate that the performance of the algorithm using the sampling-based approach is as same as that of the surrogate method, as evidenced by the fact that the p-values for most cases are below 0.05. Furthermore, it is observed that the ASW-GSEMO employing the surrogate method yields solutions with fewer elements compared to those generated using the sampling-based approach. The influence of variations in α on performance is also minimal, with the results from different surrogate models showing little difference.

Table 6: Results for MCP with uniform weights using surrogates

Graph	B	α	ASW-GSEMO with W_{cheb}				ASW-GSEMO with W_{chen}			
			mean	std	p-value	$ V^* $	mean	std	p-value	$ V^* $
ca-GrQc	$n^2/2$	0.1	4118.8	105.604	0.08	832	4119.7	75.798	0.06	823
		0.001	4135.933	62.66	0.01	828	4128.533	63.671	0.47	829
	n^2	0.1	4023.1	113.816	0.49	810	3975.466	143.403	0.04	812
		0.001	4011.333	126.258	0.29	809	4010.4	101.057	0.3	812
ca-HepPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	9863.866	659.327	0.012	1226	10068.233	615.116	0.15	1284
		0.001	10191.733	705.729	0.18	1108	10073.133	722.789	0.02	1166
	n^2	0.1	9489.7	619.521	0.3	1162	9463.933	803.496	0.47	1153
		0.001	10023.833	480.342	0.84	1193	9431.233	810.004	0.01	1253
ca-AstroPh	$n^2/2$	0.1	15720.733	1155.778	0.25	1562	15162.233	1375.531	0.72	1476
		0.001	16019.066	998	0.14	1438	15834.766	775.831	0.57	1586
	n^2	0.1	14374.766	1239.76	0.09	1292	13635.633	1485.423	0.01	1155
		0.001	15083.133	956.011	0.88	1143	14354.866	1515.53	0.91	1106

Figures 4a and 4b illustrate how the evaluated sampling-based weights evolve over increasing iterations. These figures also include the surrogate weights calculated for the generated solutions, derived through various approaches. Notably, the figures demonstrate how the window in the ASW-GSEMO adjusts its size initially and then progresses alongside the weight scale. A notable finding is that the weight evaluated using the surrogate method based on one-sided Chebyshev’s inequality generally appears larger than that determined by other evaluation techniques. This tendency is especially pronounced when α is small, a trend that is consistent

with observations made in previous settings. The sampling weights, on the other hand, are found to be closely aligned with the surrogate weights calculated using the Chernoff bound. Consequently, as the number of iterations increases, the algorithm employing the surrogate based on one-sided Chebyshev’s inequality is likely to reach the bound earlier than other methods.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, our investigation focuses on the ASW-GSEMO utilizing a sampling evaluation approach for chance-constrained monotone submodular problems, specifically those with IID weights and uniform weights of identical dispersion. In both settings, we assign larger values to the expected weight and dispersion. Our experimental findings reveal that the ASW-GSEMO outperforms other algorithms like the GSEMO and SW-GSEMO in solving the maximum coverage problem, especially in cases with larger bounds. Visual analyses show that the ASW-GSEMO is adept at incorporating a higher number of individuals within its adaptive window. Additionally, it is observed that the algorithm’s performance with a sampling-based evaluation is comparable in quality to that achieved with surrogate evaluations.

For future work, there is room for improvement in the algorithm’s functionality, particularly regarding the window’s performance in later iterations. Exploring the algorithms under different generalized settings and with various problems presents an interesting and valuable direction for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) through grant FT200100536.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shabbir Ahmed and Alexander Shapiro. 2008. Solving chance-constrained stochastic programs via sampling and integer programming. In *State-of-the-art decision-making tools in the information-intensive age*. Informs, 261–269.
- [2] Saba Sadeghi Ahouei, Jakob de Nobel, Aneta Neumann, Thomas Bäck, and Frank Neumann. 2024. Evolving reliable differentiating constraints for the chance-constrained maximum coverage problem. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024*. ACM. To appear.

- [3] Hiran Assimi, Oscar Harper, Yue Xie, Aneta Neumann, and Frank Neumann. 2020. Evolutionary bi-objective optimization for the dynamic chance-constrained knapsack problem based on tail bound objectives. In *ECAI 2020 - 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence 2020 (Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol. 325)*. IOS Press, 307–314.
- [4] Benjamin Doerr, Carola Doerr, Aneta Neumann, Frank Neumann, and Andrew Sutton. 2020. Optimization of chance-constrained submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 1460–1467.
- [5] Thilina Pathirage Don, Aneta Neumann, and Frank Neumann. 2024. The chance constrained travelling thief problem: Problem formulations and algorithms. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024*. ACM. To appear.
- [6] Vanja Doskoč, Tobias Friedrich, Andreas Göbel, Aneta Neumann, Frank Neumann, and Francesco Quinzan. 2020. Non-Monotone Submodular Maximization with Multiple Knapsacks in Static and Dynamic Settings 1. In *ECAI 2020*. IOS Press, 435–442.
- [7] Samir Khuller, Anna Moss, and Joseph Seffi Naor. 1999. The budgeted maximum coverage problem. *Information processing letters* 70, 1 (1999), 39–45.
- [8] Andreas Krause and Daniel Golovin. 2014. Submodular function maximization. *Tractability* 3, 71-104 (2014), 3.
- [9] James Luedtke and Shabbir Ahmed. 2008. A sample approximation approach for optimization with probabilistic constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 19, 2 (2008), 674–699.
- [10] George L Nemhauser and Laurence A Wolsey. 1978. Best algorithms for approximating the maximum of a submodular set function. *Mathematics of operations research* 3, 3 (1978), 177–188.
- [11] George L Nemhauser, Laurence A Wolsey, and Marshall L Fisher. 1978. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I. *Mathematical programming* 14, 1 (1978), 265–294.
- [12] Arkadi Nemirovski and Alexander Shapiro. 2006. Scenario approximations of chance constraints. *Probabilistic and randomized methods for design under uncertainty* (2006), 3–47.
- [13] Aneta Neumann, Jakob Bossek, and Frank Neumann. 2021. Diversifying greedy sampling and evolutionary diversity optimisation for constrained monotone submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 261–269.
- [14] Aneta Neumann and Frank Neumann. 2020. Optimising monotone chance-constrained submodular functions using evolutionary multi-objective algorithms. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*. Springer, 404–417.
- [15] Aneta Neumann, Yue Xie, and Frank Neumann. 2022. Evolutionary algorithms for limiting the effect of uncertainty for the knapsack problem with stochastic profits. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN XVII - 17th International Conference, PPSN 2022, Proceedings, Part I (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 13398)*. Springer, 294–307.
- [16] Frank Neumann and Carsten Witt. 2023. Fast Pareto Optimization Using Sliding Window Selection. In *ECAI 2023*. IOS Press, 1771–1778.
- [17] Ishara Hewa Pathirana, Frank Neumann, Denis Antipov, and Aneta Neumann. 2024. Effective 2- and 3-objective MOEA/D approaches for the chance constrained knapsack problem. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024*. ACM. To appear.
- [18] Ishara Hewa Pathirana, Frank Neumann, Denis Antipov, and Aneta Neumann. 2024. Using 3-objective evolutionary algorithms for the dynamic chance constrained knapsack problem. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024*. ACM. To appear.
- [19] Alejandra Peña-Ordieres, James R Luedtke, and Andreas Wachter. 2020. Solving chance-constrained problems via a smooth sample-based nonlinear approximation. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 30, 3 (2020), 2221–2250.
- [20] Kokila Perera and Aneta Neumann. 2024. Multi-objective evolutionary algorithms with sliding window selection for the dynamic chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2024*. ACM. To appear.
- [21] Feng Shi, Xiankun Yan, and Frank Neumann. 2022. Runtime Analysis of Simple Evolutionary Algorithms for the Chance-Constrained Makespan Scheduling Problem. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*. Springer, 526–541.
- [22] Yue Xie, Oscar Harper, Hiran Assimi, Aneta Neumann, and Frank Neumann. 2019. Evolutionary algorithms for the chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 338–346.
- [23] Yue Xie, Aneta Neumann, and Frank Neumann. 2020. Specific single- and multi-objective evolutionary algorithms for the chance-constrained knapsack problem. In *GECCO '20: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 271–279.
- [24] Yue Xie, Aneta Neumann, Frank Neumann, and Andrew M. Sutton. 2021. Runtime analysis of RLS and the (1+1) EA for the chance-constrained knapsack problem with correlated uniform weights. In *GECCO '21: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 1187–1194.
- [25] Xiankun Yan, Anh Viet Do, Feng Shi, Xiaoyu Qin, and Frank Neumann. 2023. Optimizing Chance-Constrained Submodular Problems with Variable Uncertainties. In *ECAI 2023*. IOS Press, 2826–2833.