

## Editorial: Special Issue on Understanding Complexity in Multiobjective Optimization

Greco, Salvatore; Klamroth, Kathrin; Knowles, Joshua; Rudolph, Günter

DOI:

[10.1002/mcda.1609](https://doi.org/10.1002/mcda.1609)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Greco, S, Klamroth, K, Knowles, J & Rudolph, G 2017, 'Editorial: Special Issue on Understanding Complexity in Multiobjective Optimization', *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, vol. 24, no. 1-2, pp. 3-4.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/mcda.1609>

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

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Greco, S., Klamroth, K., Knowles, J., and Rudolph, G. (2017) Editorial: Special issue on understanding complexity in multiobjective optimization. *J Multi-Crit Decis Anal*, 24: 3–4., which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mcda.1609>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

### **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.

# Understanding Complexity in Multiobjective Optimization

Salvatore Greco<sup>1,2</sup>, Kathrin Klamroth<sup>3</sup>, Joshua Knowles<sup>4</sup>, Günter Rudolph<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Economics and Business, University of Catania, Corso Italia, 55, 95129 Catania, Italy

<sup>2</sup>University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth Business School, Centre of Operations Research and Logistics (CORL), Richmond Building, Portland Street, Portsmouth PO1 3DE, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Wuppertal, Germany

<sup>4</sup>School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>5</sup>Department of Computer Science, TU Dortmund University, Germany

This special issue of *JMCDA* was inspired by the work of three Dagstuhl seminars aimed at strengthening the links between the scientific communities of Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) and Evolutionary Multiobjective Optimization (EMO). These three Dagstuhl seminars were devoted to the following topics:

- Hybrid and Robust Approaches to Multiobjective Optimization (January 18-23 2009; <http://www.dagstuhl.de/09041>);
- Learning in Multiobjective Optimization (January 22-27 2012; <http://www.dagstuhl.de/12041>);
- Understanding Complexity in Multiobjective Optimization (11-16 January 2015: <http://www.dagstuhl.de/15031>).

From the above seminars arose clearly the need for better understanding the complexity of multiobjective optimization. As recent work has sometimes shown, there are opposing views regarding how problems scale and grow in difficulty dependent on their features and challenges. On the one hand, we know that multiobjective optimization problems are complex problems by their very nature; optimization problems that are easy to solve in the single objective case are often intractable and highly complex already in the biobjective case. Moreover, recent work has pointed to further fundamental limitations in multiobjective optimization as we scale up to many objectives. On the other hand, a multiobjective perspective can in a sense also help reduce complexity. For example, it often leads to a better understanding of a problem and hence supports the decision making process. Moreover, adding objectives to a problem does not always make it harder, because decomposing it can reduce the presence of local optima. And multiobjective approaches can also be used to support constraint handling, to model robustness criteria, or to approach bilevel optimization problems, simplifying these aspects. Further afield, too, in the machine learning community, we are seeing that the multiobjective optimization perspective is being used to get at the root of ill-posed problems in dimensionality reduction, pattern recognition and classification.

From the MCDM point of view, we observe that there is an intrinsic complexity in the process of understanding the optimization problem and building preferences on the solutions proposed by the multiobjective optimization. At the beginning of the decision process the Decision Maker (DM) has a rather vague idea of the decision problem at hand and, consequently, also the preferences are incomplete, approximate, uncertain or fuzzy.

Thus, better understanding complexity in multiobjective optimization is of central importance for the two communities, MCDM and EMO, and several related disciplines. It would enable us to wield existing methodologies with greater knowledge, control and effect, and should, more importantly, provide the foundations and impetus for the development of new, principled methods, in this area.

This special issue contains six papers that briefly we introduce in the following.

Richard Allmendinger, Michael T. M. Emmerich, Jussi Hakanen, Yaochu Jin and Enrico Rigoni consider surrogate assisted multicriteria optimization. Surrogates are efficient computational models used to approximate the individual objective functions, multiple objectives simultaneously, and even the entire Pareto front. After discussing basic questions such as what to approximate, where to use surrogates, and how to manage the surrogate outcomes of a simulation or physical experiment, the paper explores emerging complexity-related topics in surrogate-assisted multicriteria optimization, proposing several promising future research directions and prospective solutions both from a theoretical and an industrial point of view.

Fritz Bökler, Matthias Ehrgott, Christopher Morris and Petra Mutzel investigate complexity for multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems, taking into consideration output-sensitive complexity of an algorithm for a general enumeration problem, that is the property that its running time is bounded by a polynomial in the input and the output size. The paper shows that output-sensitive complexity is able to separate efficiently solvable from presumably not efficiently solvable problems, proving also that multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems does not admit an output-sensitive algorithm under weak complexity theoretic assumptions as  $P \neq NP$ .

Rodrigo Lankaites Pinheiro, Dario Landa-Silva and Jason Atkin present a technique that supports understanding the relationships between objectives in a multiobjective optimization through a visualization and analysis of the local and global relationships between objectives. The advantages of the proposed technique are shown in experiments on three different combinatorial optimization problems (multiobjective multidimensional knapsack problem, multiobjective nurse scheduling problem and multiobjective vehicle routing problem with time windows). Richard Allmendinger, Matthias Ehrgott, Xavier Gandibleux, Martin Josef Geiger, Kathrin Klamroth and Mariano Luque propose a detailed view of navigation that is the interactive procedure of traversing through a set of points (the navigation set) in the objective space guided by a decision maker, with the ultimate goal of identifying the single most-preferred Pareto optimal solution. The authors describe a general framework to capture a wide range of navigation methods taking also into account real-world problems to which these methods have been applied and highlighting directions of future research.

Kathrin Klamroth, Sanaz Mostaghim, Boris Naujoks, Silvia Poles, Robin Purshouse, Guenter Rudolph, Stefan Ruzika, Serpil Sayin, Margaret M. Wiecek and Xin Yao consider complex systems composed of strongly interrelated subsystems or subproblems with single or multiple objectives that are usually not sequentially ordered or obviously decomposable. In the literature, these systems are also referred to as “interwoven systems” or “systems of systems”. Due to the correlation between the components, the overall system performance does not equal the simple sum of their performances, and inclusion of complex synergy may imply possible inaccuracies in the model and prohibitively expensive computations. The authors review recent developments in this field and present a preliminary mathematical model of an interwoven system introducing some approaches to its multiobjective optimization.

José Rui Figueira, Carlos Fonseca, Pascal Halffmann, Kathrin Klamroth, Luís Paquete, Stefan Ruzika, Britta Schulze, Michael Stiglmayr and David Willems start from the consideration that despite the fact that in general multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems are known to be hard problems because very often they are NP-complete and intractable, there are also variants or cases of multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems that are easy. The article focuses on particular cases of multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems, which are polynomially solvable, aiming at categorizing them, explaining their polynomial solvability in terms of general structural properties, and exploring the grey zone between easy and hard multiobjective combinatorial optimization problems.

We believe that these six articles give a valuable contribution to the discussion on complexity of multiobjective optimization, proposing new perspectives both from the theoretical and the applicative point of view, and confirming the wealth of interesting work there is still to do in this domain.