

# Non-elitist evolutionary algorithms excel in fitness landscapes with sparse deceptive regions and dense valleys

Dang, Duc-Cuong; Eremeev, Anton; Lehre, Per Kristian

DOI:

[10.1145/3449639.3459398](https://doi.org/10.1145/3449639.3459398)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Other version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Dang, D-C, Eremeev, A & Lehre, PK 2021, Non-elitist evolutionary algorithms excel in fitness landscapes with sparse deceptive regions and dense valleys. in F Chicano (ed.), *GECCO '21: Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO), Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), New York, pp. 1133–1141, 2021 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2021, Virtual, Online, France, 10/07/21.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3449639.3459398>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

## General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

## Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# Corrigendum to “Non-elitist Evolutionary Algorithms excel in Fitness Landscapes with Sparse Deceptive Regions and Dense Valleys” (GECCO 2021)

Duc-Cuong Dang, Anton Eremeev and Per Kristian Lehre

January 31, 2022

## Abstract

We describe three minor corrections required for (Dang, Eremeev, and Lehre, GECCO2021). All the theorems remain unchanged, except that Theorem 11 requires an additional assumption that the selection mechanism is  $f$ -monotone.

## Required Correction 1

The following small correction is required in Definition 2: Replace

$$\forall r \in [n]$$

with

$$\forall r \in [n - 1]$$

in conditions (SP1) and (SP2).

## Explanation

To see why  $r = n$  needs to be excluded from the definition, assume that  $x \in B$ . If the complement bitstring  $\bar{x}$  is member of  $B$ , then for  $r = n$

$$|S_r(x) \cap B| = 1 > \varepsilon \binom{n}{r}.$$

which violates condition (SP1) for any  $\varepsilon < 1$ . If  $\bar{x}$  is not member of  $B$ , then for  $r = n$

$$|S_r(\bar{x}) \cap B| = 1 = \omega \left( \frac{1}{n} \binom{n}{r} \right),$$

which violates condition (SP2).

## Required Correction 2

The following property must be assumed for the selection mechanism used in Theorem 11: It has to be *f-monotone*. This is a natural property of common selection mechanisms which says: for two individuals  $x$  and  $y$  with  $f(x) \geq f(y)$ , the probability of selecting  $x$  must be at least that of selecting  $y$ .

The following misprints also should be corrected:

(i) in the formulation of Lemma 4, the right-hand side of the inequality  $\Pr(p_{\text{mut}}(x) \in B \mid x \in B) \leq \rho$  should read  $\rho + O(n^{-n})$

(ii) in the proof of Theorem 11 in the first block of equations,  $\beta(0, \gamma)\varepsilon$  should be changed to  $\beta(0, \gamma)\rho$ .

## Explanation

The monotonicity implies that  $\beta(\psi_1, \psi_1 + \gamma) \geq \beta(\psi_2, \psi_2 + \gamma)$  for any  $\psi_1 < \psi_2$ , and this is used when applying conditions (SM0) and (SM2b) in the proof of Theorem 11. Except for the above mentioned misprints, no change in the proof is required. Note that with the added assumption, it is possible to relax (SM2b) to only hold for  $\psi = \psi_0$  (instead of the whole interval  $\psi \in [0, \psi_0]$ ).

## Required correction 3

In the proof of Lemma 14,

$$\delta := \frac{1}{3000}$$

should read

$$\delta := \frac{1}{30000}.$$