

On the Easiest and Hardest Fitness Functions

Jun He*

Department of Computer Science
Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DB, U.K.

Tianshi Chen†

Institute of Computing Technology
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

Xin Yao‡

CERCIA, School of Computer Science
University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK.

December 7, 2019

Abstract

The hardness of fitness functions is an important research issue in evolutionary computation. In theory, the study of the hardness of fitness functions can help understand the ability of evolutionary algorithms (EAs). In practice, the study may provide a guideline to the design of benchmarks. The aim of this paper is to answer the question: what are the easiest and hardest fitness functions with respect to an EA and how will such functions be constructed? In the paper, the easiest fitness (and hardest) fitness functions have been constructed to any given elitist (1+1) EA for maximising any class of fitness functions with the same optima. In terms of the time-fitness landscape, the unimodal functions are the easiest and deceptive functions are the hardest. The paper also reveals that a fitness function, that is easiest to one EA, may become the hardest to another EA, and vice versa.

1 Introduction

Which fitness functions are easy for an EA and which are not? This is an important research issue in evolutionary computation. In theory, the study of the hardness of fitness functions can help understand the ability of EAs. In practice, the study may provide a guideline to the design of benchmarks.

The hardness is linked to used EAs. This has been observed by many researchers before. A non-deceptive function may be difficult to an EA [1], and a deceptive function may be easy [2]. A multi-modal function may be easy-to-solve [3]. A unimodal function may be difficult for certain EAs but easy for others [4]. However it is intractable to design a measure that can predict the hardness of a function efficiently [5, 6].

The aim of the current paper is to answer the question: how to construct the easiest and hardest fitness function with respect to an EA for maximising a class of fitness functions with the same optima? The definition of the easiest and hardest fitness functions will be given in next section. Another purpose is to demonstrate how a fitness function, that is easiest to one EA, could become the hardest to another EA, and vice versa.

The study is different from No Free Lunch theorems [7, 8], which state that any two EAs are equivalent when their performance is averaged across all possible fitness functions. We don't intend to investigate the easiest and hardest functions among all possible fitness functions, instead only in a class of fitness functions with the same optima.

*email: jun.he@ieee.org

†email: chentianshi@ict.ac.cn.

‡email: x.yao@cs.bham.ac.uk.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 defines the easiest and hardest fitness functions, and establishes criteria of determine whether a fitness function is the easiest and hardest. Sections 3 and 4 construct the easiest and hardest functions. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Easiest and Hardest Fitness Functions

2.1 Definition of Easiest and Hardest Fitness Functions

Consider the problem of maximizing a class of fitness functions with the same optima. An instance of the problem is to maximize a fitness function $f(x)$:

$$\max\{f(x); x \in S\}, \text{ subject to constraint(s)}, \quad (1)$$

where S is a finite set. The optimal set is denoted by S_{opt} and the non-optimal set by S_{non} . Without lose of generality, the function $f(x)$ takes $L + 1$ finite values $f_0 > f_1 > \dots > f_L$.

For simplicity of analysis, we only investigate elitist (1+1) EAs and will not discuss other types of EAs such as non-elitist EAs, population-based EAs and adaptive EAs. The procedure of such an elitist (1+1) EA is described as follows.

```

1: input: fitness function  $f(x)$ ;
2: initialize parent  $\phi_0$ ;
3: generation counter  $t \leftarrow 0$ ;
4: while the maximum value of  $f(x)$  is not found do
5:   child  $\phi_{t,m} \leftarrow$  is mutated from parent  $\phi_t$ ;
6:   if  $\phi_{t,m}$  is an infeasible point then
7:     next generation parent  $\phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \phi_t$ ;
8:   else if  $f(\phi_{t,m}) > f(\phi_t)$  then
9:     next generation parent  $\phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \phi_{t,m}$ ;
10:  else
11:    next generation parent  $\phi_{t+1} \leftarrow \phi_t$ ;
12:  end if
13:   $t \leftarrow t + 1$ ;
14: end while
15: output: the maximal value of  $f(x)$ .

```

The above (1+1) EA uses *elitist selection*: the parent is replaced by the child only in case when the child is fitter. Therefore the best found solution is always preserved.

Let $G(x)$ denote the expected number of generations for an EA to find an optimal solution for the first time when starting at x (called *expected hitting hitting time*), and $T(x)$ the expected number of fitness evaluations (often called the *expected runtime*). In (1+1) EAs, $G(x) = T(x)$. Thereafter $G(x)$ is used for runtime too in the paper. For simplicity of analysis, we restrict our discussion to those EAs whose expected runtime is finite (convergent EAs).

Definition 1. Given an EA for maximising a class of fitness functions with the same optima. A function $f(x)$ in the class is said to be the *easiest* to the EA if starting from any initial point, the runtime of the EA for maximising $f(x)$ is no more than the runtime for maximising any fitness function $g(x)$ in the class.

A function $f(x)$ in the class is said to be the *hardest* to the EA if starting from any initial point, the runtime of the EA for maximising $f(x)$ is no less than the runtime for maximising any fitness function $g(x)$ in the class.

The definition of the easiest and hardest functions is based on a point-by-point comparison of the EA's runtime for solving two fitness functions. It is irrelevant to polynomial or exponential time, thus it is different from easy and hard function classes [10, 11], which say a fitness function is easy to an EA if the runtime is polynomial or hard if the runtime is polynomial.

2.2 Criteria of Determining Easiest and Hardest Functions

Before we establish the criteria, we briefly review drift analysis [12] which is our tool. The sequence $\{\phi_t, t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ is formalised as a *homogeneous Markov chain* [9]. The mutation transition probability of going from a point x to another point y is denoted by

$$P_m(x, y) = P(\phi_{t,m} = y \mid \phi_t = x). \quad (2)$$

The transition probability of going from x to y is denoted by

$$P(x, y) = P(\phi_{t+1} = y \mid \phi_t = x).$$

In drift analysis, a distance function $d(x)$ is used to measure how far a point x is away from the optima. It is non-negative at any point and equals to 0 at any optimum. *Drift* represents the progress rate of moving towards the optima per generation. Drift at a point x is defined by

$$\Delta(x) = \sum_y P(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)).$$

The drift can be split into two parts: the positive drift and negative drift.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^+(x) &= \sum_{y:d(x)>d(y)} P(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)). \\ \Delta^-(x) &= \sum_{y:d(x)<d(y)} P(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)). \end{aligned}$$

The following lemmas [9, 10] are used in the analysis afterwards.

Lemma 1. ([9, Theorem 2]) *If the drift satisfies that $\Delta(x) \geq 1$ for any point x , then the expected hitting time satisfies that $G(x) \leq d(x)$ for any point x .*

Lemma 2. [9, Theorem 3] *If the drift satisfies that $\Delta(x) \leq 1$ for any point x , then the expected hitting time satisfies that $G(x) \geq d(x)$ for any point x .*

Lemma 3. [10, Lemma 4] *Let the distance function $d(x) = G(x)$, then the drift satisfies $\Delta(x) = 1$ for any non-optimal point x .*

Lemma 4. [9, Theorem 4] *For any elitist (1+1) EA, its expected hitting time is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} G(x) &= 0, & \text{if } f(x) &= f_0. \\ G(x) &= \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P(x, y)}, & \text{if } f(x) &= f_1. \\ G(x) &= \frac{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \sum_{y \in S_k} P(x, y)G(y)}{\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \sum_{y \in S_k} P(x, y)}, & \text{if } f(x) &= f_l, \\ & & l &= 2, \dots, L. \end{aligned}$$

Next we establish a criterion of determining whether a fitness function is the easiest to a (1+1) EA.

Theorem 1. *Given an elitist (1+1) EA, and a class of fitness functions with the same optima, let $G(x)$ denote the expected runtime for maximising $f(x)$. If the following monotonically decreasing condition holds:*

- *for any two non-optimal points x and y such that $G(x) < G(y)$, it has $f(x) > f(y)$,*

then $f(x)$ is the easiest in the fitness function class.

Proof. Let $g(x)$ be a fitness function in the function class. $\{\phi_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ denotes the Markov chain for maximising $f(x)$, and $\{\psi_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ the chain for maximising $g(x)$. $G_f(x)$ and $G_g(x)$ denote the runtime of the (1+1) EA for maximising $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ respectively. Set the distance function

$$d(x) = G_f(x).$$

For the Markov chain $\{\phi_t\}$, denote the drift at the point x by $\Delta_\phi(x)$. Notice that $d(x) = G_f(x)$, then we apply Lemma 3 and get for any non-optimal point x

$$\Delta_\phi(x) = \sum_y P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) = 1.$$

The monotonically decreasing condition says that for any two points x and y such that $G_f(x) < G_f(y)$ (equivalently $d(x) < d(y)$), it gives $f(x) > f(y)$. Then for the Markov chain $\{\phi_t\}$, there is no negative drift due to elitist selection.

$$\Delta_\phi^-(x) = \sum_{y:d(x) < d(y)} P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) = 0.$$

For the Markov chain $\{\psi_t\}$, let's estimate its positive drift.

$$\Delta_\psi^+(x) = \sum_{y:d(x) > d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)).$$

According to the monotonically decreasing condition, for any pair (x, y) such that $G_f(x) > G_f(y)$ (equivalently $d(x) > d(y)$), it has $f(x) < f(y)$. Notice that for any pair (x, y) such that $f(x) < f(y)$, either $g(x) < g(y)$ or $g(x) \geq g(y)$. In the former case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) = P_\psi(x, y)$. In the latter case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) \geq P_\psi(x, y)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{y:d(x) > d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) \\ & \leq \sum_{y:d(x) > d(y)} P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)). \end{aligned}$$

So it gives

$$\Delta_\psi^+(x) \leq \Delta_\phi^+(x) = 1.$$

Next let's estimate the negative drift $\Delta_\psi^-(x)$, which is always non-positive. Thus

$$\Delta_\psi^-(x) \leq \Delta_\phi^-(x) = 0.$$

Then the drift for the two chains satisfies

$$\Delta_\psi(x) \leq \Delta_\phi(x) = 1.$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that for any non-optimal point x

$$G_g(x) \geq d(x) = G_f(x),$$

then we finish the proof. □

Now we give an intuitive explanation of the theorem. We regard $G(x)$ (runtime) as a distance between a point x and the optima. It is completely different from the neighbourhood-based distance such as the Hamming distance. Time is seldom used as a distance measure in evolutionary computation but popular in our real life. Taking runtime as the distance, we may visualise the monotonically decreasing condition through a *time-fitness landscape* (see Figure 1), where the x -axis is the runtime and the y -axis is the fitness. From the figure it is clear that the landscape is *unimodal*: the closer a point is to the optima, the higher its fitness is. The unimodal property implies that no negative drift exists, which plays a key role in the proof. The theorem states that a unimodal time-fitness landscape is the easiest. Nevertheless this assertion could not be established if using a neighbourhood-based distance. Recalling that we mentioned in the introduction section, a unimodal function in the context of neighbourhood-based distance is not always easy.

In the following we give an example to show the application of the above theorem.




Figure 1: A unimodal time-fitness landscape.

Example 1. Consider an instance class of the 0-1 knapsack problem described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_i, \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where $v_i > 0$ is the value of the i^{th} item, $w_i > 0$ its weight, and C the knapsack capacity such that $C = w_1 + \dots + w_n$. A solution is represented by a binary string $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. The unique optimum is $(1, \dots, 1)$. This function class is equivalent to so called linear functions [10]. A (1+1) EA using bitwise mutation (denoted by EA-1) is applied to solve this problem.

- Flip each bit independently with flipping probability $\frac{1}{n}$.

Let's investigate a special instance in the class: $v_1 = \dots = v_n$. It is equivalent to the One-Max fitness function. It is obvious for any x and y , if the runtime satisfies $G(x) < G(y)$, then the fitness satisfies $f(x) > f(y)$. Applying Theorem 1, we know the One-Max function is the easiest among linear functions. The runtime of EA-1 is $\Theta(n \ln n)$.

In a similar way, we establish a criterion of determining whether a fitness function is the hardest to a (1+1) EA.

Theorem 2. *Given an elitist (1+1) EA, and a class of fitness function with the same optima, let $G(x)$ denote the expected runtime for maximising $f(x)$. If the following monotonically increasing condition holds:*

- *for any two non-optimal points x and y such that $G(x) < G(y)$, it has $f(x) < f(y)$,*

then $f(x)$ is the hardest in the class.

Proof. Let $g(x)$ be a fitness function in the function class. $\{\phi_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ denotes the Markov chain for maximising $f(x)$, and $\{\psi_t, t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ the chain for maximising $g(x)$. $G_f(x)$ and $G_g(x)$ denote the runtime for maximising $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ respectively. Set the distance function

$$d(x) = G_f(x). \tag{3}$$

For the chain $\{\phi_t\}$, its drift is denoted by $\Delta_\phi(x)$. Applying Lemma 3, we get for any non-optimal point x ,

$$\Delta_\phi(x) = \sum_y P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) = 1.$$

For the chain $\{\psi_t\}$, its drift is denoted by $\Delta_\psi(x)$. Let's estimate its positive drift.

$$\Delta_\psi^+(x) = \sum_{y: d(x) > d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)).$$

According to the monotonically increasing condition, for any pair (x, y) such that $G_f(x) > G_f(y)$ (equivalently $d(x) > d(y)$), it has $f(x) > f(y)$. Notice that for any pair (x, y) such that $f(x) > f(y)$, either $g(x) > g(y)$ or $g(x) \leq g(y)$. In the former case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) = P_\psi(x, y)$. In the later case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) \geq P_\psi(x, y)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{y:d(x)>d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) \\ & \leq \sum_{y:d(x)>d(y)} P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)). \end{aligned}$$

It gives

$$\Delta_\psi^+(x) \leq \Delta_\phi^+(x).$$

Next let's estimate the negative drift $\Delta_\psi^-(x)$.

$$\Delta_\psi^-(x) = \sum_{y:d(x)<d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)).$$

According to the monotonically increasing condition, for any pair (x, y) such that $G_f(x) < G_f(y)$ (equivalently $d(x) < d(y)$), it has $f(x) < f(y)$. Notice that for any pair (x, y) such that $f(x) < f(y)$, either $g(x) \leq g(y)$ or $g(x) > g(y)$. In the former case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) = P_\psi(x, y)$. In the later case, the transition probabilities satisfy that $P_\phi(x, y) \leq P_\psi(x, y)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{y:d(x)>d(y)} P_\psi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)) \\ & \leq \sum_{y:d(x)>d(y)} P_\phi(x, y)(d(x) - d(y)). \end{aligned}$$

It gives

$$\Delta_\psi^-(x) \leq \Delta_\phi^-(x).$$

The total drift satisfies

$$\Delta_\psi(x) \geq \Delta_\phi(x) = 1.$$

It follows from Lemma 1 that for any non-optimal point x

$$G_g(x) \leq d(x) = G_f(x),$$

then we finish the proof. \square

The monotonically increasing condition reveals a characteristic of the hardest fitness function. Taking runtime as the distance, we visualise the condition using a time-fitness landscape (see Figure 2). The landscape is *deceptive*: the closer a point is, the lower its fitness is. On the deceptive time-fitness landscape, the drift to the optima is the smallest. This plays a key role in the proof. The above theorem states that any deceptive time-fitness landscape is the hardest. Nevertheless using a neighbourhood-based distance, it is impossible to establish a similar result under a similar condition. Recalling that we mentioned in the introduction section, a deceptive function is not always hard.

In the following we use an example to show the application of the above theorem.

Example 2. Consider an instance class of the 0-1 knapsack problem given as follows. The value of items satisfies $v_1 > v_2 + \dots + v_n$, and the weight of items satisfies $w_1 > w_2 + \dots + w_n$, the knapsack capacity $C = w_1$. The unique optimum is $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$. We apply EA-1 to solve the problem. Let's investigate a special instance in the class: $v_2 = \dots = v_n$ and $w_2 = \dots = w_n$. It is obvious for any non-optimal points x and y , if the runtime satisfies $G(x) < G(y)$, then the fitness satisfies $f(x) < f(y)$. Applying Theorem 2, we know the fitness function related to this instance is the hardest in the class. The runtime for solving this instance is $\Theta(n^n)$.




Figure 2: A deceptive time-fitness landscape.

Although our main intention is to study a fitness function class with the same optima, it is possible to extend the discussion to a fitness function class with the same number of optima. If we put the results in the above two examples together, then we will get the easiest and hardest fitness functions when EA-1 is applied to solve the 0-1 knapsack problem with one optimum. The runtime of EA-1 is between $\Theta(n \ln n)$ and $\Theta(n^n)$.

Note: the monotonically increasing condition is a sufficient condition for a fitness function being the hardest, but not necessary. The reason is trivial. Suppose that a function class includes only one function which satisfies the monotonically increasing condition, then the fitness is the easiest in the class due to no other functions. The same is true for the monotonically decreasing condition for the easiest functions.

3 Construction of Easiest and Hardest Fitness Functions

3.1 Construction of Easiest Fitness Functions

Following the monotonically decreasing condition, we may construct the easiest function. Consider an elitist (1+1) EAs (denoted by EA-I) for maximising a class of fitness functions with the same optimal set. We construct the easiest function $f(x)$ in the class which satisfies the monotonically decreasing condition.

1. Set $S_0 = S_{\text{opt}}$. Set $m_0 = 0$.
2. Set S_1 to be the set consisting of all points such that

$$\arg \min_{x \in S \setminus S_0} \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)}.$$

Denote

$$m_1 = \min_{x \in S \setminus S_0} \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)}. \quad (4)$$

3. Suppose that for $k = 0, 1, \dots, l$, the set S_k has been defined. Set S_{l+1} be the set consisting of all points such that

$$\arg \min_{x \in S \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^l S_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y)}.$$

Denote

$$m_{l+1} = \min_{x \in S \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^l S_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y)}. \quad (5)$$

4. Repeat the above step until any points are covered by a subset S_k . Then there exists some integer $L > 0$ and

$$S = \cup_{k=0}^L S_k.$$

5. Choose $L + 1$ numbers f_0, \dots, f_L such that $f_0 > \dots > f_L$. Set a fitness function $f(x)$ as follows: for any $x \in S_k$ where $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$,

$$f(x) = f_k, \quad (6)$$

Lemma 5. *The mean runtime of EA-I for maximising the above functions $G(x) = m_k$, for $x \in S_k, k = 0, \dots, L$.*

Proof. Let $x \in S_k$ and $y \in S_l$ where $k \leq l$. From the construction procedure of $f(x)$, the inequality holds: $f(x) = f_k \geq f(y) = f_l$. Since EA-I uses elitist selection, the transition probability of going from x to y is 0.

According to Theorem 4, the expected runtime $G(x)$ (where $x \in S_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, L$) equals to

$$G(x) = \frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)}.$$

Comparing it with (4) and (5), we get $G(x) = m_k$. □

Lemma 6. *Given EA-I and the fitness function $f(x)$ constructed above, the monotonically decreasing condition holds.*

Proof. First we prove a fact: for $x \in S_{k+1}, y \in S_k$ where $k = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1$, it holds $G(x) > G(y)$. We prove this fact by induction.

For any $x \in S_1, y \in S_0$, it is trivial that $G(x) > G(y)$.

Suppose that for any $x \in S_k, y \in S_{k-1}$ (where $k \geq 1$), it holds $G(x) > G(y)$.

For any $x \in S_{k+1}, y \in S_k$, from the definition of S_k and $G(y)$, we know

$$G(y) = \min_{x \in S \setminus \cup_{j=0}^k S_j} \frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) G(z)}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z)},$$

then we have for any $x \in S_{k+1}$

$$G(y) < \frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) G(z)}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z)}.$$

$$G(y) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) < 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) G(z).$$

$$G(y) \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) < 1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) G(z).$$

$$G(y) < \frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z) G(z)}{\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{z \in S_j} P_m(x, z)} = G(x).$$

By induction, we have proven that for $x \in S_{k+1}, y \in S_k$ where $k = 0, \dots, L - 1$, it holds $G(x) > G(y)$.

Furthermore, from Lemma 5, for any $x \in S_l, y \in S_k$ where $l > k$,

$$G(x) = m_l > G(y) = m_k.$$

Secondly for any two points x and y such that $G(x) > G(y)$, we know there exists some k and l where $k < l$ and $x \in S_k$ and $y \in S_l$. Then we have $f(x) = f_k < f(y) = f_l$. This is the desired conclusion. □

Then we come to the theorem that indicates $f(x)$ is the easiest to EA-I.

Theorem 3. $f(x)$ is the easiest function in the function class with respect to EA-I.

Proof. The conclusion is drawn from Theorem 1 and the above lemma. \square

The above theorem provides an approach to design the easiest fitness functions in the class. The idea behind the construction procedure is simple: we construct a function which is unimodal on the time-fitness landscape. Obviously the number of the easiest functions is infinite.

3.2 Construction of Hardest Fitness Functions

The monotonically decreasing condition provides an idea to construct the hardest function. Still consider EA-I for maximising a class of fitness functions with the same optimal set. We construct the hardest fitness function $f(x)$ in this class which satisfies the monotonically increasing condition.

1. Set $S_0 = S_{\text{opt}}$. Denote $m_0 = 0$.
2. Set S_1 to be the set of all points such that

$$\arg \max_{x \in S \setminus S_0} \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)}.$$

Denote

$$m_2 = \max_{x \in S \setminus S_0} \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)}. \quad (7)$$

3. Suppose that the sets S_0, \dots, S_l have been defined. Then define S_{l+1} to be the set of all points such that

$$\arg \max_{x \in S \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^l S_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y)}.$$

Denote

$$m_{l+1} = \max_{x \in S \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^l S_k} \frac{1 + \sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{k=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_k} P_m(x, y)}. \quad (8)$$

4. Repeat the above step until all points are covered by a subset S_k . Then there exists an integer $L > 0$ and

$$S = \bigcup_{k=0}^L S_k.$$

5. Choose $L + 1$ number f_0, \dots, f_L such that $f_0 > \dots > f_L > 0$. Set the fitness function $f(x)$ to be

$$f(x) = f_k, \quad x \in S_k, k = 0, \dots, L. \quad (9)$$

Lemma 7. The mean runtime of EA-I for maximising the above function $G(x) = m_k$, for $x \in S_k$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 8. For EA-I and the fitness function $f(x)$ constructed above, the monotonically increasing condition holds.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 6. \square

The theorem below shows $f(x)$ is the hardest fitness function in the class.

Theorem 4. $f(x)$ is the hardest function in the function class with respect to EA-I.

Proof. The conclusion is drawn from Theorem 2 and the above lemma. \square

The above theorem provides an approach to design the hardest fitness functions in the class. The idea behind the construction procedure is straightforward: we construct a function which is deceptive on the time-fitness landscape.

Note: in the construction of the easiest and hardest functions, we don't restrict the representation of fitness functions. Nevertheless the approach may fail if the fitness function class must satisfy a special constraint, for example, all fitness functions in the class must be linear or quadratic. This research question is left for future.

3.3 Case Study: Pseudo-Boolean Optimisation

So far we have introduced a general approach of constructing the easiest and hardest fitness functions. Now we demonstrate its application in pseudo-Boolean optimisation via a case study.

Example 3. Consider the class of all pseudo-Boolean functions with the same optima at $(0, \dots, 0)$ and $(1, \dots, 1)$.

$$\max\{f(x); x \in \{0, 1\}^n\}. \quad (10)$$

Let $H(x)$ denote the Hamming distance between x and the optima, and $\lceil 0.5n \rceil$ the maximum integer no more than $0.5n$. We apply EA-1 to solve the problem.

According to Subsection 3.1, the easiest fitness function to EA-1 is constructed as follows.

- Let S_l be the set of all points x such that $H(x) = l$ for $l = 0, \dots, \lceil 0.5n \rceil$.
- Choose $\lceil 0.5n \rceil + 1$ numbers $f_0, \dots, f_{\lceil 0.5n \rceil}$ such that $f_0 > \dots > f_{\lceil 0.5n \rceil}$. Set the fitness function $f(x) = f_l$, for $x \in S_l$.

An example of the easiest function to EA-1 is the function, called the Two-Max function.

$$f(x) = n - H(x). \quad (11)$$

The runtime of EA-1 for maximising the easiest function is $\Theta(n \log n)$.

According to Subsection 3.2, the hardest fitness function to EA-1 is constructed as follows.

- Let S_0 be the set of all points x such that $H(x) = 0$.
Let S_l be the set of all points x such that $H(x) = \lceil 0.5n \rceil - l + 1$ for $l = 1, \dots, \lceil 0.5n \rceil$.
- Choose $\lceil 0.5n \rceil + 1$ numbers $f_0, \dots, f_{\lceil 0.5n \rceil}$ such that $f_0 > \dots > f_{\lceil 0.5n \rceil}$. Set the fitness function $f(x) = f_l$, for $x \in S_l$.

An example of the hardest function to EA-1 is that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \lceil 0.5n \rceil + 1, & \text{if } H(x) = 0; \\ H(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The runtime of EA-1 for maximising the hardest fitness function is $\Theta(n^{0.5n})$.

The easiest and hardest fitness functions may change as EAs. Let's see a modification of EA-1: we change the flipping probability from $\frac{1}{n}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ and denote the new EA by EA-2. According to Subsections 3.1 and 3.2, we construct a fitness function $f(x)$ as follows.

- Let S_0 be the set of all points x such that $H(x) = 0$ and S_1 be the set of all other points.
- Choose f_0 and f_1 such that $f_0 > f_1$. Set the fitness function $f(x) = f_l$, for $x \in S_l, l = 0, 1$.

Then the above function $f(x)$ is the easiest and hardest to EA-2 simultaneously. The runtime of EA-2 for maximising them is $\Theta(0.5^n)$.

Table 1 compares the runtime of EA-1 and EA-2. From the table we see that using the flipping probability $\frac{1}{n}$ is better than using the flipping probability $\frac{1}{2}$ for the easiest functions, but worse for the hardest functions. This gives a complete understanding of the two EAs' ability for solving pseudo-Boolean fitness functions with two optima.

Table 1: A Comparison of Runtime between EA-1 and EA-2 in pseudo-Boolean Functions with Two Optima

flipping probability	easiest functions	hardest functions
$1/n$	$\Theta(n \ln n)$	$\Theta(n^{0.5n})$
$1/2$	$\Theta(0.5^n)$	$\Theta(0.5^n)$

The easiest and hardest fitness functions may be applied in the design of benchmarks. In practice, benchmarks plays an essential role of comparing two EAs. According to No Free Lunch theorems, benchmarks cannot be drawn from all possible fitness functions at random. Instead we should select benchmarks from a class of fitness functions, for example, fitness functions with the same optima. In order to conduct a fair comparison, benchmarks should include the easiest and hardest fitness with respect to each of the two EAs at least.

4 Mutual Transformation Between the Easiest and Hardest Fitness Functions

4.1 Easiest May Become Hardest

In the above case study, we observe that the easiest and hardest fitness functions may change as EAs. In theory, it is possible to make a mutual transformation between the easiest and hardest functions. In this section we prove this assertion. Let $f(x)$ be an easiest fitness function with respect to EA-I. Now we construct another elitist (1+1) EA (denoted by EA-II) and show $f(x)$ becomes the hardest to the new EA. The mutation operator is constructed as follows.

1. Choose $L + 1$ positive numbers m_0, m_1, \dots, m_L such that $m_0 = 0, m_1 > m_2 > \dots > m_L$.
2. For any $x \in S_0 = S_{\text{opt}}$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability from x to y such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1.$$

3. For any $x \in S_1$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability of going from x to y such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1, \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)} = m_1. \tag{14}$$

4. Suppose that for $k = 0, 1, \dots, l$, $x \in S_k$ and $y \in S$, the mutation transition probability of going from x to y has been defined. Now we define the mutation transition probability from x to y for $x \in S_{l+1}$ and $y \in S$.

For any $x \in S_1$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability from x to y such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1. \tag{15}$$

$$\forall k = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1,$$

$$\frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)} < m_{k+1}. \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)} = m_{l+1}. \tag{17}$$

5. Repeat the above step until $k = L$

Lemma 9. *The expected runtime of EA-II for maximising $f(x)$ equals $G(x) = m_k$, for $x \in S_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, L$.*

Proof. Because the (1 + 1) EA uses elitist selection, we have that for $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$, and $x \in S_k, y \in S_l$ where $k \leq l$, the transition probability of going from x to y is 0. According to Theorem 4, the expected runtime $G(x)$ (where $x \in S_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, L$) equals to

$$G(x) = \frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)},$$

Comparing it with (14) and (17), we obtain $G(x) = m_k$. \square

Lemma 10. *Let $m(X)$ denote the expected runtime of EA-II for maximising $f(x)$. Then the monotonically increasing condition holds.*

Proof. Assume that $x \in S_l, y \in S_k$ for some l and k . From (19) and (22), the runtimes when the initial points at x and y are $G(x) = m_l$ and $G(y) = m_k$ respectively.

Since $G(x) < G(y)$, so from Lemma 9, $m_l < m_k$. Then $k < l$ and

$$f(x) = f_l < f(x) = f_k.$$

which gives the desired result. \square

The following theorem shows $f(x)$ becomes the hardest fitness function to EA-II.

Theorem 5. *$f(x)$ is the hardest function in the function class with respect to EA-II.*

Proof. The conclusion is drawn from Theorem 2 and the above lemma. \square

The above theorem says that the fitness function easiest to one elitist (1+1) EA could become the hardest to another EA.

4.2 Hardest May Become Easiest

Let $f(x)$ be the a hardest fitness function with respect to EA-I. Now we construct another elitist (1+1) EA (denoted by EA-III), and show $f(x)$ becomes the easiest to EA-III. The mutation operator is constructed as follows.

1. Choose $L + 1$ non-negative numbers m_0, m_1, \dots, m_L such that $m_0 = 0 < m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_L$.
2. For any $x \in S_0 = S_{\text{opt}}$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability of going from x to y such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1.$$

3. For any $x \in S_1$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability of going from x to y such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1. \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{y \in S_0} P_m(x, y)} = m_1. \tag{19}$$

4. Suppose that for $k = 0, 1, \dots, l, x \in S_k$ and $y \in S$, the mutation transition probability of going from x to y has been defined. Now we define the mutation transition probability of going from x to y for $x \in S_{l+1}$ and $y \in S$.

For any $x \in S_{l+1}$ and $y \in S$, set the mutation transition probability such that

$$0 < P_m(x, y) < 1. \tag{20}$$

$$\forall k = 0, 1, \dots, l - 1,$$

$$\frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) G(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)} > m_{k+1}. \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{1 + \sum_{j=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y) m(y)}{\sum_{j=0}^l \sum_{y \in S_j} P_m(x, y)} = m_{l+1}. \tag{22}$$

5. Repeat the above step until $k = L$.

Lemma 11. *The expected runtime of EA-III for maximising $f(x)$ is $G(x) = m_k$, for $x \in S_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, L$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 9 □

Lemma 12. *Let $m(X)$ denote the expected runtime of EA-III for maximising $f(x)$. Then the monotonically decreasing condition holds.*

Proof. Follow a proof similar to that of Lemma 10. □

The following theorem shows $f(x)$ becomes the easiest fitness function to EA-III.

Theorem 6. *$f(x)$ is the easiest function in the function class with respect to EA-III.*

Proof. The conclusion is drawn from Theorem 1 and the lemma above. □

We have proven that the easiest fitness function to one EA may become the hardest to another EA and vice versa. Nevertheless while we transfer the hardest into the easiest, perhaps we will transfer another function to the hardest at the same time. Hence in order to compare two EAs in a fair way, benchmarks should include the easiest and hardest function with respect to each of the two EAs.

Note: Although the hardness of a single fitness function is meaningless without specifying the used EA, the hardness of a fitness function class is still meaningful and useful in terms of exponential runtime. For example, we can say that the function class, which consists of fitness functions from all instances in the 0-1 knapsack problem, is hard to any EA if $P \neq NP$.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper presents a rigorous analysis devoted to the easiest and hardest fitness functions with respect to any given elitist (1+1) EA for maximising a class of fitness functions with the same optima. Such fitness functions have been constructed step by step. It is demonstrated that the unimodal functions are the easiest and deceptive functions are the hardest in terms of time-fitness landscapes. Furthermore it reveals that the easiest (and hardest) functions may become the hardest (and easiest) with respect to another elitist (1+1) EA. Therefore without specifying an EA, the hardness of a single fitness function is meaningless.

A potential application of the work is the design of benchmarks. Benchmarks play an essential role in the empirical comparison of two EAs. According to No Free Lunch theorems, the benchmarks can not be chosen randomly from all possible fitness functions. Instead benchmarks must be restricted to a class of fitness functions, for example, with the same optima. A good practice is that benchmarks include at least the easiest and hardest fitness functions with respect to each of the two EAs under comparison.

Another application is the runtime analysis of EAs on a class of fitness functions with the same optima. In general, once the runtime of an EA on the easiest and hardest fitness functions is obtained, it will give an understanding of the performance of the EA on the fitness function class. As shown in the case study, such an analysis provides a complete understanding of two EAs' ability.

Non-elitist EAs, population-based EAs and adaptive EAs are not investigated in this paper. The extension to such EAs will be left for future research. Another question is how we construct the easiest and hardest fitness functions such that a special requirement, for example, all fitness functions must be linear or quadratic.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by EPSRC through grant Nos. EP/I009809/1 and EP/I010297/1. Xin Yao was supported by a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit Award.

References

- [1] M. D. Vose and A. H. Wright, “Stability of vertex fixed points and applications,” in *Foundations of Genetic Algorithms 3*, L. D. Whitley and M. D. Vose, Eds. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1995, pp. 103–114.
- [2] S. W. Wilson, “GA-easy does not imply steepest-ascent optimizable,” in *Proc. of 4th Inter. Conf. on Genetic Algorithms*, R. Belew and L. Booker, Eds. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 1991, pp. 85–89.
- [3] J. Horn and D. E. Goldberg, “Genetic algorithms difficulty and the modality of fitness landscapes,” in *Foundations of Genetic Algorithms 3*, L. D. Whitley and M. D. Vose, Eds. San Mateo: Morgan Kauffman, 1995, pp. 243–269.
- [4] G. Rudolph, “How mutation and selection solve long path problems in polynomial expected time,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 207–211, 1996.
- [5] B. Naudts and L. Kallel, “A comparison of predictive measure of problem difficulty in evolutionary algorithms,” *IEEE Trans. on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2000.
- [6] J. He, C. Reeves, C. Witt, and X. Yao, “A note on problem difficulty measures in black-box optimization: Classification, existence and predictability,” *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 435–443, 2007.
- [7] D. Wolpert and W. Macready, “No free lunch theorems for optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 67–82, 1997.
- [8] D. H. Wolpert and W. G. Macready, “Coevolutionary free lunches,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 721–735, 2005.
- [9] J. He and X. Yao, “Towards an analytic framework for analysing the computation time of evolutionary algorithms,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 145, no. 1-2, pp. 59–97, 2003.
- [10] —, “A study of drift analysis for estimating computation time of evolutionary algorithms,” *Natural Computing*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 21–35, 2004.
- [11] T. Chen, K. Tang, G. Chen, and X. Yao, “Analysis of computational time of simple estimation of distribution algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2010.
- [12] J. He and X. Yao, “Drift analysis and average time complexity of evolutionary algorithms,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 127, no. 1, pp. 57–85, 2001.