

# Final Report on CEC'09 MOEA Competition

Qingfu Zhang<sup>1</sup> and Ponnuthurai N. Suganthan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of CS & EE, University of Essex, UK

<sup>1</sup> School of EEE, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

# Test Instances

Q. Zhang, A. Zhou, S. Zhao, P. N. Suganthan, W. Liu and S. Tiwari, *Multiobjective Optimization Test Instances for the CEC 2009 Special Session and Competition*, Working Report, CES-887, School of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering, University of Essex, 2008

- 13 unconstrained instances
- 10 constrained instances (only the first 7 instances were used for ranking, since there were typos in the last 3 instances in earlier versions, which have been corrected in the current version).

# Entries

Algorithm	Tested on Constrained MOP?	Authors
AMGA	No	Santosh Tiwari et al, Clemson University
DECMOSA-SQP	Yes	Ales Zamuda et al UM FERI
DMOEADD	Yes	Minzhong Liu et al, Wuhan University
GDE3	Yes	Saku Kukkonen et al, Lappeenranta University of Technology
LiuLiAlgorithm	Yes	Hai-Lin Liu, Guangdong University of Technology
MOEADGM	Yes	Chih-Ming Chen et al. National Chiao Tung University,
MOEP	No	B Y. Qu et al. Nanyang Technological university
MTS	Yes	Lin-YU Tseng et al, National Chung Hsing University
NSGAIILS	Yes	Karthik et al, Helsinki School of Economics
OMOEAI	No	Song Gao et al, China University of Geosciences
OWMOSaDE	No	Vicky Ling Huang, Nanyang Technological University
MOEAD	No	Qingfu Zhang et al, University of Essex
ClusteringMOEA	No	Yuping Wang, et al, Xidian University

13 for unconstrained MOP, and 7 for unconstrained MOP

# Performance Metric

- IGD value is used to measure algorithm performances
- The maximal no of the final solutions for computing the IGD
  - 100 for two objectives
  - 150 for three objectives
  - 800 for five objectives
- The maximal function evaluations: 300K
- 30 independent runs on each instance should be run.
- The mean/dev of IGD should be reported.

## Experimental Results (IGD value) on Unconstrained Test Instances

rank	UF1		UF2		UF3	
1	MOEAD	0.00435	MTS	0.00615	MOEAD	0.00742
2	GDE3	0.00534	MOEADGM	0.0064	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.01497
3	MOEADGM	0.0062	DMOEADD	0.00679	DMOEADD	0.03337
4	MTS	0.00646	MOEAD	0.00679	MOEADGM	0.049
5	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.00785	OWMOSaDE	0.0081	MTS	0.0531
6	DMOEADD	0.01038	GDE3	0.01195	ClusteringMOEA	0.0549
7	NSGAIILS	0.01153	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.0123	AMGA	0.06998
8	OWMOSaDE	0.0122	NSGAIILS	0.01237	DECMOSA-SQP	0.0935
9	ClusteringMOEA	0.0299	AMGA	0.01623	MOEP	0.099
10	AMGA	0.03588	MOEP	0.0189	OWMOSaDE	0.103
11	MOEP	0.0596	ClusteringMOEA	0.0228	NSGAIILS	0.10603
12	DECMOSA-SQP	0.07702	DECMOSA-SQP	0.02834	GDE3	0.10639
13	OMOEAll	0.08564	OMOEAll	0.03057	OMOEAll	0.27141

rank	UF4		UF5		UF6	
1	MTS	0.02356	MTS	0.01489	MOEAD	0.00587
2	GDE3	0.0265	GDE3	0.03928	MTS	0.05917
3	DECMOSA-SQP	0.03392	AMGA	0.09405	DMOEADD	0.06673
4	AMGA	0.04062	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.16186	OMOEAll	0.07338
5	DMOEADD	0.04268	DECMOSA-SQP	0.16713	ClusteringMOEA	0.0871
6	MOEP	0.0427	OMOEAll	0.1692	MOEP	0.1031
7	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.0435	MOEAD	0.18071	DECMOSA-SQP	0.12604
8	OMOEAll	0.04624	MOEP	0.2245	AMGA	0.12942
9	MOEADGM	0.0476	ClusteringMOEA	0.2473	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.17555
10	OWMOSaDE	0.0513	DMOEADD	0.31454	OWMOSaDE	0.1918
11	NSGAIILS	0.0584	OWMOSaDE	0.4303	GDE3	0.25091
12	ClusteringMOEA	0.0585	NSGAIILS	0.5657	NSGAIILS	0.31032
13	MOEAD	0.06385	MOEADGM	1.7919	MOEADGM	0.5563

rank	UF7		UF8		UF9	
1	MOEAD	0.00444	MOEAD	0.0584	DMOEADD	0.04896
2	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.0073	DMOEADD	0.06841	NSGAIILS	0.0719
3	MOEADGM	0.0076	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.08235	MOEAD	0.07896
4	DMOEADD	0.01032	NSGAIILS	0.0863	GDE3	0.08248
5	MOEP	0.0197	OWMOSaDE	0.0945	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.09391
6	NSGAIILS	0.02132	MTS	0.11251	OWMOSaDE	0.0983
7	ClusteringMOEA	0.0223	AMGA	0.17125	MTS	0.11442
8	DECMOSA-SQP	0.02416	OMOEAll	0.192	DECMOSA-SQP	0.14111
9	GDE3	0.02522	DECMOSA-SQP	0.21583	MOEADGM	0.1878
10	OMOEAll	0.03354	ClusteringMOEA	0.2383	AMGA	0.18861
11	MTS	0.04079	MOEADGM	0.2446	OMOEAll	0.23179
12	AMGA	0.05707	GDE3	0.24855	ClusteringMOEA	0.2934
13	OWMOSaDE	0.0585	MOEP	0.423	MOEP	0.342

rank	UF10	UF11	UF12	UF13
1	MTS 0.15306	MOEAD 0.11032	MOEAD 146.78	MOEAD 1.8489
2	DMOEADD 0.32211	LiuLiAlgorithm 0.13254	NSGAIILS 158.05	MTS 1.9079
3	AMGA 0.32418	NSGAIILS 0.1752	GDE3 202.12	DECMOSA/ 1.9178
4	MOEP 0.3621	GDE3 0.23425	MTS 305.2	DMOEAD[ 1.9971
5	DECMOSA-SQP 0.36985	DECMOSA-SQP 0.38304	LiuLiAlgorithm 444.82	MOEP 2.0145
6	ClusteringMOEA 0.4111	OWMOSaDE 0.3951	DMOEADD 477.65	LiuLiAlgori 2.2884
7	GDE3 0.43326	MOEP 0.4337	OWMOSaDE 734.56	GDE3 3.2057
8	LiuLiAlgorithm 0.44691	MTS 0.45505	MOEP 885.89	NSGAIILS 3.2323
9	MOEAD 0.47415	DMOEADD 1.20328	DECMOSA-SQP 943.35	OWMOSaI 3.2573
10	MOEADGM 0.5646	ClusteringMOEA 1.2401	ClusteringMOEA 1039.36	ClusteringI 3.4043
11	OMOEAI 0.62754			
12	OWMOSaDE 0.743			
13	NSGAIILS 0.84468			



# Experimental Results on Constrained Instances

rank	CF1		CF2		CF3		CF4	
1	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.00085	DMOEADD	0.0021	DMOEADD	0.056305	DMOEADD	0.00699
2	NSGAIILS	0.00692	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.0042	MTS	0.10446	GDE3	0.00799
3	MOEADGM	0.0108	MOEADGM	0.008	GDE3	0.127506	MTS	0.01109
4	DMOEADD	0.01131	NSGAIILS	0.01183	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.182905	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.01423
5	MTS	0.01918	GDE3	0.01597	NSGAIILS	0.23994	NSGAIILS	0.01576
6	GDE3	0.0294	MTS	0.02677	MOEADGM	0.5134	MOEADGM	0.0707
7	DECMOSA-SQP	0.10773	DECMOSA-SQP	0.0946	DECMOSA-SQP	1000000	DECMOSA-SQP	0.15265

rank	CF5		CF6		CF7	
1	DMOEADD	0.01577	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.013948	DMOEADD	0.01905
2	MTS	0.02077	DMOEADD	0.01502	MTS	0.02469
3	GDE3	0.06799	MTS	0.01616	GDE3	0.04169
4	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.10973	NSGAIILS	0.02013	LiuLiAlgorithm	0.10446
5	NSGAIILS	0.1842	GDE3	0.06199	NSGAIILS	0.23345
6	DECMOSA-SQP	0.41275	DECMOSA-SQP	0.14782	DECMOSA-SQP	0.26049
7	MOEADGM	0.5446	MOEADGM	0.2071	MOEADGM	0.5356

# Final Rank

- Each team ranked others.
- Based on these individual ranking, lexicographic order was used to generate the final ranks.

Unconstrained MOP

Final Ranking	Algorithm
1	MOEA/D
2	MTS
3	DMOEADD
4	LiuLi
5	GDE3

Constrained MOP

Final Ranking	Algorithm
1	DMOEADD
2	LiuLi
3	MTS