

Initialisation and Grammar Design in Grammar-Guided Evolutionary Computation*

Grant Dick

Department of Information Science
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand
grant.dick@otago.ac.nz

Peter A. Whigham

Department of Information Science
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand
peter.whigham@otago.ac.nz

ABSTRACT

Grammars provide a convenient and powerful mechanism to define the space of possible solutions for a range of problems. However, when used in grammatical evolution (GE), great care must be taken in the design of a grammar to ensure that the polymorphic nature of the genotype-to-phenotype mapping does not impede search. Additionally, recent work has highlighted the importance of the initialisation method on GE's performance. While recent work has shed light on the matters of initialisation and grammar design with respect to GE, their impact on other methods, such as random search and context-free grammar genetic programming (CFG-GP), is largely unknown. This paper examines GE, random search and CFG-GP under a range of benchmark problems using several different initialisation routines and grammar designs. The results suggest that CFG-GP is less sensitive to initialisation and grammar design than both GE and random search: we also demonstrate that observed cases of poor performance by CFG-GP are managed through simple adjustment of tuning parameters. We conclude that CFG-GP is a strong base from which to conduct grammar-guided evolutionary search, and that future work should focus on understanding the parameter space of CFG-GP for better application.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Genetic programming**; *Supervised learning by regression*.

KEYWORDS

genetic programming, grammars, grammar design, initialisation

ACM Reference Format:

Grant Dick and Peter A. Whigham. 2022. Initialisation and Grammar Design in Grammar-Guided Evolutionary Computation. In *Proceedings of The Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2022 (GECCO '22)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nmmnnnnn.nmmnnnnn>

**An abridged version of this paper appears in [4]

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 '22, July 9–13, 2022, Boston, USA
© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nmmnnnnn.nmmnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Grammars provide a convenient and powerful mechanism to define the space of possible solutions for a range of problems, and the incorporation of grammars into evolutionary computation has a history spanning over three decades [3, 16, 23]. While a number of methods exist for grammar-guided evolutionary computation (GGEC), most research into the use of grammars in evolution has focused upon grammatical evolution (GE), which recently marked twenty years of research and development[22]. While GE has been applied to a range of problems from regression to evolutionary design and hyperheuristics, a significant portion of GE research has focused on understanding the interaction between its linear representation, genotype-to-phenotype mapping, and the polymorphic treatment of codons within its mapping process. Traditionally, this mapping from linear representation to non-linear phenotype has drawn inspiration from molecular biology, and has been argued to offer benefits of degeneracy, neutrality and diversity preservation. However, previous work has questioned the utility of GE's linear representation; specifically, it is argued that the linear representation leads to low locality in search, and poor performance characteristics that resemble random search on some problems [20, 24, 25]. It is argued that other mechanisms of GGEC, such as context-free grammar genetic programming (CFG-GP) do not demonstrate such limitations, and are thus stronger choices for evolutionary computation that is influenced by grammars.

Understandably, the response to these criticisms of GE has been an increase in work to understand the underlying characteristics of GE search, and to design extensions to GE that improve its search characteristics. Some of this work has explored modifications of the linear representation so that it preserves structural information about the grammar during evolution [1, 6, 7]. Other work has focused on the initialisation process used in GE, and the design of the grammars that are used to describe the problem, and the resulting extensions to GE demonstrate improved performance on a range of benchmark problems [5, 12, 13]. In this latter body of work, the improvements to GE are typically examined without comparison to other grammar-based methods, so the relative merits and utility of these improvements remaining largely unknown. The goal of this paper is to take some of the results of previous work and compare them to the CFG-GP and random search that has been subjected to the same alterations of initialisation and grammar design. After testing on a range of benchmark problems, results suggest that CFG-GP is largely insensitive to the initialisation method used and is able to adequately recover from a poor initial population. The results align with previous work in that, for several of the examined problems, GE's performance is roughly equivalent to random search using

the same initialisation routines and grammar designs. Additionally, on the two examples where CFG-GP performs relatively poorly, it is shown that potential limitations in the behaviour of CFG-GP may be overcome through more effective parameter tuning, rather than relying upon elaborate modification of the grammar to match the representation. The findings of this paper suggest that future work should place greater emphasis on both the understanding and application of CFG-GP, and that the design of grammars should focus on more effective expression of the problem itself in order to make good solutions easier to discover.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: §2 briefly examines recent developments in GGEC and GE; §3 describes the experimental framework used in this paper; §4 presents the results of experimentation over several benchmark functions using a range of initialisation methods and grammars; §5 assesses the results of the previous section and demonstrates a simple extension to CFG-GP that appears to ease its application to two of the benchmarks; finally, §6 concludes the paper and suggests areas of future research.

2 RECENT WORK IN GRAMMAR-GUIDED EVOLUTIONARY COMPUTATION

The use of grammars in evolutionary computation has a long-established track record, and previous work provides a thorough review of this research [10]. More recent work on GGEC has examined potential limitations of grammatical evolution, focusing on locality and problems with the genotype-to-phenotype mapping. Indeed, some work has gone so far as to suggest that GE's behaviour on many problems is roughly equivalent to random search. In response to this criticism, new flavours of grammatical evolution have been developed, aimed at creating more direct and structure preserving representations [1, 7]. The resulting solutions incorporate derivation tree information into the representation, creating derivatives of GE that more closely resemble CFG-GP. Other work has provided greater understanding of the mapping process of linear genotypes and has led to developments in grammar design and initialisation to improve the performance of standard GE [12, 13].

2.1 Initialisation

The limitations of straight random initialisation of genotypes was identified early in the history of grammatical evolution. Subsequent work in GE focused on developing initialisation methods that operated in the phenotype space and back-fitted the resulting derivations into a linear representation [21]. The resulting 'sensible' initialisation essentially re-implemented the ramped-half-and-half method from standard genetic programming into GE, and presented the first work that begins to blur the separation of genotype and phenotype in GE.¹

Following this work on sensible initialisation, work in GE has examined the use of probabilistic tree creation (PTC) methods for initialisation. Like sensible initialisation, PTC works in the phenotype (i.e., derivation tree) space and in the context of GE the resulting solution is then back-mapped into a linear representation. In PTC, the leaves of a tree are developed in a more breadth-like

manner than the depth-first approach typically used in genetic programming [8]. Results in grammatical evolution have suggested that a strongly-typed version of PTC, named PTC2, can significantly improve the performance of GE [5, 12]. This is particularly interesting, as previous work has suggested that neither PTC nor PTC2 greatly improve upon standard initialisation routines in genetic programming [9]. Theories to explain the success of PTC2 in grammatical evolution remain elusive, while its behaviour in other search mechanisms (such as random search or CFG-GP) remains unknown.

2.2 Grammar Design

The purpose of a grammar is to define the structure and syntactical properties of the language used to express solutions to a given problem. Ideally, grammar design should focus on efficient and elegant expression of language, and preserving modularity in solutions. From the context of evolutionary search, the design of the grammar should be agnostic to the representation used to search the space of solutions. However, it was identified early in GE research that the design of the grammar itself plays a significant role in the effectiveness of GE on a given problem [11]. The polymorphic nature of the genotype-to-phenotype mapping in GE means that careful design of grammar productions is required to avoid search bias.² Indeed, even small changes in grammar design can have significant impact on search, making comparisons of results on the same problem across different papers difficult [19].

To reduce the mismatch between linear representations and grammar productions, recent work has suggested the following steps [13]:

- (1) *Balancing* – grammars should be designed to ensure equal probability of termination or expansion during mapping. Where an imbalance between termination and expansion exists, the rarer productions can be duplicated to provide this balance.
- (2) *Unlinking* – the use of modulo arithmetic in GE's mapping process creates linkages between the productions of different non-terminals, meaning that certain codon values in the representation are only able to represent specific subsets of productions. Unlinking can be done by duplication of productions in non-terminals to effectively create a Cartesian product of productions indices, resulting in codon values that are potentially more expressive during mapping.
- (3) *Eliminating non-terminals* – the non-terminals define the structural elements of the grammar, and can be used to create modularity in the search, or to form salient end-user documentation of the nature of the grammar. However, previous work in GE has identified that having excessive non-terminals in the grammar interacts with GE's polymorphic interpretation of codons during mapping, and may lead to fragile search. The solution is to fold the productions of the grammar into a single global non-terminal, with the resulting grammar closely resembling that of the implicit 'closure' grammar used in standard genetic programming. This may

¹Although it is essentially a grammar-aware version of ramped-half-and-half initialisation, we use the name 'sensible initialisation' throughout this paper to remain consistent with previous work [12, 21].

²Here, *bias* refers to tendency towards certain productions in the grammar due to the nature of the linear representation, rather than the more usual definition of *grammatical bias* domain knowledge is incorporated into search through special productions.

Table 1: The major parameter settings used throughout all experiments.

Parameter	Setting		
	GE	Random Search	CFG-GP
Population Size	500	25050	500
Generations	50	1	50
Elitism	1%	-	1%
Tournament Size	1%	-	1%
Crossover Rate	0.5	-	0.9
Mutation Rate	1 per individual	-	0.1
Random Initialisation	31 codons	31 codons	max depth 6
Sensible Initialisation	max depth 6	max depth 6	max depth 6
PTC2 Max Expansions	31	31	31
Maximum Tree Depth	-	-	17
Maximum Mutation Depth	-	-	4
Maximum Wrapping Events	0	0	-

produce an imbalance of recursive productions, but this can be balanced by further duplication of productions that lead to termination.

- (4) *Removing grammar biases* – the nature of the way that grammars are designed means that not all terminals are sampled at equal rates. Again, this can be remedied through careful alignment of production choices and duplication of productions as necessary.
- (5) *Prefix notation* – certain grammar designs, particularly those used in symbolic regression, have the choice of using infix or prefix notation. Previous work has noted that using an infix notation may have lower locality compared to a prefix notation due to the required operator precedence rules.
- (6) *Compromise grammars* – all of the previously mentioned steps may induce changes that cause the size and complexity of the grammar to grow exponentially. A useful compromise to these steps is to reintroduce a single non-terminal to express constants and variables in the problem. This has some negative impact on crossover locality, but results in a grammar that is significantly smaller and easier to interpret.

In previous work, the grammars that result from these modifications are labelled g1-g6, with g0 denoting the unmodified grammar that is typically encountered in previous work [13]. We adopt this notation in this paper.

It is interesting to note that the first three proposed remedies are a consequence of two factors: GE’s polymorphic interpretation of codons during mapping, and GE’s lack of structure preserving operators during search that induces this polymorphic interpretation. Additionally, these modifications (particularly the steps that eliminate non-terminals and remove bias) substantially increase the number of productions in the grammar by multiple orders of magnitude (e.g., from 22 to 3300 in the *Keijzer-6* problem that is examined later in this paper), which may have significant implications on methods that use grammar productions directly to create and modify solutions (e.g., PTC2 initialisation). Finally, it should be noted that the third step (removal of non-terminals) can only be applied in domains where the solution lacks modularity, so is

precluded from domains where structure is important (e.g., in the evolution of hyperheuristics [2]).

3 SETUP

Previous work has examined GE’s behaviour on a number of benchmark problems using a range of grammar designs and initialisation methods [13]. To provide a more complete picture for grammar-guided evolutionary computation in general, we repeat a number of these experiments, but this time include random search (where a initialisation method is run for a given number of times and the best solution found in all of these samples is returned) and CFG-GP. We reuse problems and algorithm settings from previous work to provide a fair comparison [13, 25]. Algorithm parameters used in this study are described in Table 1: for Sensible Initialisation and PTC2, the minimum depth and expansion parameter values were determined by inspecting the productions in the grammar. We focus on the problems that received the most attention in the previous study, and whose grammars were fully provided: *Keijzer-6*, *Vladislavleva-4*, and the hard *Shape* problem. Details of these problems can be found in the previous work and are omitted for space reasons [13]. In addition, we examine four regression problems used in previous work: *Boston Housing*, *Dow Chemical*, *Forest Fires*, and *Tower*. We explored two grammar designs for the regression problems, a structured grammar (g0) that would be typical of that used in grammar-guided search, and a ‘compromise’ design (g6) that is informed by the processes suggested in the previous section. The two grammars are presented in Figure 1. Finally, we also examine the *Santa Fe Trail* problem, as it has been the subject of several examples of previous work on grammar design [5, 15, 18, 19]. We examined four of these grammars from previous work (g0-g3), and these are presented in Figure 2. In addition, we designed a novel grammar (g4) for this problem that was informed by inspection of the other grammars and the resulting solutions that were evolved through their use. This final grammar was used to demonstrate the benefits of grammar design where the emphasis is on clearer and more effective definition of the language, rather than modification of the grammar to suit algorithmic requirements. We acknowledge that use of the *Santa Fe Trail* problem specifically as a benchmark

```

<prog> ::= <expr>
<expr> ::= <op> <expr> <expr> | <trans> <expr>
          | <erc> | <var>
<op>    ::= + | * | - | pdiv
<trans> ::= sin | cos | sqr | log
<erc>   ::= <GECodonValue{-1.000 : 1.000 : 0.001}>
<var>   ::= x1 | x2 | ... | xn

```

(a) g0: structured grammar

```

<expr> ::= + <expr> <expr> | <term>
          | * <expr> <expr> | <term>
          | - <expr> <expr> | <term>
          | pdiv <expr> <expr> | <term>
          | sin <expr> | cos <expr>
          | sqr <expr> | log <expr>
<term> ::= <GECodonValue{-1.000 : 1.000 : 0.001}>
          | x1 | x2 | ... | xn

```

(b) g6: 'compromise' grammar with reduced non-terminal set

Figure 1: The grammars used for the four regression problems. The `<GECodonValue{-1.000 : 1.000 : 0.001}>` terminal has a different interpretation between GE-based and derivation tree-based methods. For GE, this takes the codon value and maps it into a numeric constant in the interval $[-1, 1]$, as in previous work [14]. In tree-based methods, `<GECodonValue{-1.000 : 1.000 : 0.001}>` generates a random constant in the interval $[-1, 1]$ during tree construction, and embeds this value as a terminal in the derivation tree. In both cases, the resulting constant is rounded to three decimal places.

is dubious, but we include it here primarily as a tool to examine potential issues (and subsequent remedies) with the use of CFG-GP.

The source code used in all experiments is available online.³

4 RESULTS

All results in Figures 3–12 are presented with 95% confidence intervals around the relevant statistic as shaded regions. Out-of-sample test cases are also reported for the symbolic regression problems, however our emphasis in this paper is to examine the training (i.e., *search*) behaviour of the methods: while generalisation performance of the evolved models is the primary statistic of interest in terms of application, in this paper we make no attempt to control overfitting through regularisation or other means. Therefore, high test errors could be equally attributable to either overfitting (i.e., very strong search during training) or underfitting (i.e., weak search during training).

The results of experiments on the *Keijzer-6* problem are shown in Figure 3. Confirming the results of previous work, GE is particularly sensitive to both initialisation and grammar design on this problem. Interestingly, the behaviour of random search is characteristically similar to that of GE, while the behaviour of CFG-GP on this problem appears to be largely unaffected by the choice of initialisation. CFG-GP also appears to be somewhat more robust to

changes to the grammar than both GE and random search. The test performances of the best-trained individuals for this problem are presented in Figure 4 and are generally consistent with the trend observed during the training phase.

The results of experiments on the *Vladislavleva-4* problem are shown in Figures 5 and 6. Compared to the *Keijzer-6* problem, there is far more consistency in training across all methods on this problem. However, there appears to be a slight increase in performance by using CFG-GP in later generations. Across all three methods, there seems to be little impact on performance (in terms of final solution quality) by changing the initialisation method. On inspection of the solutions produced by GE and Random Search, they tend to be very short (no more than three terminals) and are discovered early in the run. In contrast, solutions CFG-GP tend to be larger and more expressive: however, the grammar in this problem tends to encourage the unconstrained use of power functions, which means that very high test errors are quickly obtained frequently, particularly so for CFG-GP.

Next, we examine the four symbolic regression problems, the results of which are presented in Figures 7 and 8. The intention of these experiments was to examine the theory that reducing non-terminals in the grammar is beneficial to performance. Interestingly, the only problem where this theory is possibly observed is in the *Forest Fires* problem, although the differences observed between grammars are not statistically significant. Interestingly, CFG-GP seems to be the method that benefits from non-terminal reduction the most, whereas on at least the *Boston Housing* and *Tower* problems, both GE and random search seemed to benefit from the added structure provided by the additional non-terminals in the grammar. In both of these cases, GE and random search appear to find good solutions faster using the structured g0 grammar over the compromise g6 grammar. In previous work, non-terminal reduction and bias reduction coincided with a shift from infix to prefix notation, whereas in this work both g0 and g6 grammars use a prefix notation. It is plausible that the change in notation was the motivator for improved performance rather than the other grammar modifications. Aside from observation, it is also noteworthy that all three methods appear to be insensitive to initialisation on these problems, and that again, the performance of GE is very similar to that of random search on all but the *Tower* problem. The test performance on these problems again shows that CFG-GP behaviour is fairly consistent in the presence of changes to initialisation and grammar: generally, CFG-GP offers the best testing performance on three of the four problems, with test performance on the *Forest Fires* being similar to that of *Vladislavleva-4* (CFG-GP errors are due to overfitting, while GE and Random Search exhibit underfitting).

The results of experiments on the *Shape* problem are shown in Figure 9. The results here present an interesting behaviour for CFG-GP, which struggles to find solutions when using the g5 and g6 grammars. As discussed in the next section, this appears to be an interaction between the depth limiting used in CFG-GP and depths of the derivation trees that these grammars need to describe highly fit solutions. In contrast to CFG-GP, initialisation seems to play an important role in the behaviour of random search and GE on this problem.

Finally, Figure 10 shows the evolution of fitness on the *Santa Fe Trail* problem. Again, an interesting observation is made of the

³URL available for final publication.

```

<code>      ::= <line> | <code> <line>
<line>      ::= <expr>
<expr>      ::= <if-statement> | <op>
<if-statement> ::= if (food_ahead()) <if-true> <if-false>
<op>        ::= left(); | right(); | move();
<if-true>    ::= { <expr> }
<if-false>   ::= else { <expr> }

```

(a) g0: used by O'Neill and Ryan [18]

```

<expr>      ::= <line> | <expr> <line>
<line>      ::= if (food_ahead()) { <expr> } else { <expr> } | <op>
<op>        ::= left(); | right(); | move();

```

(b) g1: used by Robilliard et al. [19]

```

<code>      ::= <line> | <code> <line>
<line>      ::= <if> | <op>
<if>        ::= if (food_ahead()) { <line> } else { <line> }
<op>        ::= left(); | right(); | move();

```

(c) g2: used by Whigham et al. [25] and previously by Nicolau et al. to emphasise incorrect grammar design [15]

```

<code>      ::= <expr> | <code> <line>
<expr>      ::= <line> | <line> <expr>
<line>      ::= if (food_ahead()) { <expr> } else { <expr> } | <op>
<op>        ::= left(); | right(); | move();

```

(d) g3: used by Harper [5]

```

<prog>      ::= <c> <c> <c> <c> <c> <c> <c> <c>
<c>         ::= <line> | ' ## the ' emulates a no-op
<line>      ::= if (food_ahead()) <op> else <op>
<op>        ::= left(); | right(); | move();

```

(e) g4: designed through analysis of solutions generated using grammar g0

Figure 2: The grammars used for the *Santa Fe Trail* problem.

performance of CFG-GP on this problem: when using the g0 grammar, search appears to stagnate quickly resulting in poor fitness. A similar observation is made for random search on this problem. As discussed in the next section, this again appears to be a consequence of parameter choice in CFG-GP, this time in the maximum depth of the trees generated in subtree mutation. For the remaining grammars, there is a clear advantage to using CFG-GP over the other two methods. Most interesting, however, is the g4 grammar that was developed specifically for this paper: this grammar was not designed or adapted to better align with any specific representation, but rather to bias search to encourage the discovery of better solutions. As can be seen, using this grammar leads to effective search regardless of chosen method.

5 DISCUSSION

The results in the previous section suggest that two interesting outcomes:

- (1) in agreement with previous work, there seems to be a closer relationship between the behaviour of random search and GE than there is between random search and CFG-GP, as

confirmed by the results on the *Keijzer-6*, *Vladislavleva-4*, *Boston Housing*, *Dow Chemical* and *Forest Fire* problems; and (2) in general, CFG-GP seems reasonably robust to the choice of initialisation method, and is able to perform a good search following varying degrees of initial search quality.

While CFG-GP appears to offer the overall most stable and effective search performance, its behaviour on the *Shape* problem (using grammars g5 and g6) and the *Santa Fe Trail* (using grammar g0) is poor. However, an analysis of the grammars, and the requirements of these grammars in terms of the derivation trees required to produce good solutions yields useful information that can help the performance of CFG-GP on these problems. In the case of the *Shape* problem, examples of optimal solutions are provided in previous work [17]. The derivation trees for these optimal solutions have a depth of around 20, which is outside the depth limits imposed on CFG-GP in this work. Similarly, for the *Santa Fe Trail*, the production that ultimately produces `if (food_ahead())...` expressions requires a minimum derivation tree depth of 5 to be fully terminated. Given that CFG-GP operated with a maximum mutation depth of 4, this meant that no such expressions could appear in




Figure 3: Fitness evolution over generations for the *Keijzer-6* problem.




Figure 5: Fitness evolution over generations for the *Vladislavleva-4* problem.




Figure 4: Test performance of best solution in final generation for the *Keijzer-6* problem.

solutions through mutation, which greatly inhibited search quality on this problem using this grammar.

Given the insights developed from examining the grammars for the *Shape* and *Santa Fe Trail* problems, a simple modification to




Figure 6: Test performance of best solution in final generation for the *Vladislavleva-4* problem.

CFG-GP was proposed. First, depth limiting was removed, and then a small modification was made to subtree mutation: rather than setting a hard limit, maximum mutation depth was computed as the




Figure 7: Fitness evolution over generations for the four additional symbolic regression problems.

larger of either the depth of the largest production for the non-terminal being mutated, or the depth of the subtree that mutation is replacing. The results of this modified configuration of CFG-GP are shown in Figures 11 and 12. All results are presented using the *g6* grammar for *Shape* and the *g0* grammar for *Santa Fe Trail*. As can be seen, the simple modifications to CFG-GP have markedly improved performance.

The solution proposed here for CFG-GP is simple, but appears to be effective. It must be acknowledged that the insight that led to removing or increasing depth limits on the *Shape* problem required knowledge of the optimal solutions for this problem. However, the proposed solution shed light new light on the understanding of the tuning parameters of CFG-GP. Traditionally, CFG-GP has been configured using similar parameter settings to that of standard genetic programming; it is likely that, due to the shift from parse trees to derivation trees, the parameter values typically used for standard genetic programming are not suitable for CFG-GP. Future work should be dedicated to developing a more thorough understanding of the tuning parameters of CFG-GP independent from any understanding of standard genetic programming.

6 CONCLUSION

Grammars provide a simple and powerful method of incorporating structure and domain knowledge into evolutionary search. Recent work suggests that grammatical evolution, currently the most popular form of grammar-guided evolutionary computation, requires extensive tuning to problems through careful grammar design and




Figure 8: Out of sample test errors for the four additional symbolic regression problems.




Figure 9: Fitness evolution over generations for the *Shape* problem.

is heavily reliant upon accurate initialisation of the population for




Figure 10: Fitness evolution over generations for the *Santa Fe Trail* problem.




Figure 11: Effect of depth limiting and mutation depth on the *Shape* problem.

good performance. However, the behaviour of these modifications to GE has not been developed in reference to other methods of grammar-guided search, such as context-free grammar genetic programming. Hence the relative merits of these modifications has been an unknown quantity. This paper attempts to shed light on the relative merit of these modifications to GE by repeating similar experiments using random search and CFG-GP as a reference point. When tested on several benchmark problems, it is shown that the modified variants of GE do demonstrate improved performance, but this performance is still often inferior to that of CFG-GP. Additionally, the results presented here suggest that CFG-GP is less sensitive to the effects of initialisation and the design of the grammar. Finally, the results presented here also suggest that CFG-GP




Figure 12: Effect of depth limiting and mutation depth on the *Santa Fe Trail* problem.

may be able to adapt to more problems through simple tuning of its parameters, rather than resorting to more elaborate modifications to the grammar.

The results presented here suggest several areas of future work. Clearly, the parameter space of CFG-GP is not as fully-understood as it could be, so future work should develop a better understanding of how the parameters of CFG-GP impact its behaviour. Likewise, there would be significant benefit from future work developing new methods for grammar design that emphasise *more effective expression of the problem being searched* rather than focusing on *distorting the grammar to fit the chosen representation*.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alberto Bartoli, Mauro Castelli, and Eric Medvet. 2020. Weighted Hierarchical Grammatical Evolution. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 50, 2 (2020), 476–488.
- [2] Edmund K. Burke, Matthew R. Hyde, and Graham Kendall. 2012. Grammatical Evolution of Local Search Heuristics. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 16, 3 (2012), 406–417.
- [3] Michael Lynn Cramer. 1985. A representation for the adaptive generation of simple sequential programs. In *Proceedings of the first international conference on genetic algorithms*. Psychology Press, Pittsburgh, PA, 183–187.
- [4] Grant Dick and Peter A. Whigham. 2022. Initialisation and Grammar Design in Grammar-Guided Evolutionary Computation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. ACM, Boston, USA, 4 pages. To appear.
- [5] Robin Harper. 2010. GE, explosive grammars and the lasting legacy of bad initialisation. In *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*. IEEE, Barcelona, Spain, 1–8.
- [6] Robin Harper and Alan Blair. 2005. A structure preserving crossover in grammatical evolution. In *Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, Vol. 3. IEEE, Edinburgh, Scotland, 2537–2544.
- [7] Nuno Lourenço, Francisco B Pereira, and Ernesto Costa. 2016. Unveiling the properties of structured grammatical evolution. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 17, 3 (2016), 251–289.
- [8] Sean Luke. 2000. Two fast tree-creation algorithms for genetic programming. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 4, 3 (2000), 274–283.
- [9] Sean Luke and Liviu Panait. 2001. A survey and comparison of tree generation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2001 Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, 81–88.
- [10] Robert I McKay, Nguyen Xuan Hoai, Peter Alexander Whigham, Yin Shan, and Michael O’Neill. 2010. Grammar-based genetic programming: a survey. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 11, 3–4 (2010), 365–396.
- [11] Miguel Nicolau. 2004. Automatic grammar complexity reduction in grammatical evolution. In *The 3rd Grammatical Evolution Workshop: A workshop of the 2004 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO-2004)*. ACM, Seattle, Washington, 12 pages.
- [12] Miguel Nicolau. 2017. Understanding grammatical evolution: initialisation. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 18, 4 (2017), 467–507.

- [13] Miguel Nicolau and Alexandros Agapitos. 2018. Understanding Grammatical Evolution: Grammar Design. In *Handbook of Grammatical Evolution*, Conor Ryan, Michael O'Neill, and JJ Collins (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 23–53.
- [14] Miguel Nicolau and Ian Dempsey. 2006. Introducing grammar based extensions for grammatical evolution. In *Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*. IEEE, Vancouver, Canada.
- [15] Miguel Nicolau, Michael O'Neill, and Anthony Brabazon. 2012. Termination in grammatical evolution: Grammar design, wrapping, and tails. In *Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*. IEEE, Brisbane, Australia, 8 pages.
- [16] Michael O'Neill and Conor Ryan. 2001. Grammatical Evolution. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 5, 4 (2001), 349–358.
- [17] Michael O'Neill, John Mark Swafford, James McDermott, Jonathan Byrne, Anthony Brabazon, Elizabeth Shotton, Ciaran McNally, and Martin Hemberg. 2009. Shape grammars and grammatical evolution for evolutionary design. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. ACM, Montréal, Canada, 1035–1042.
- [18] Michael O'Neill and Conor Ryan. 1999. Evolving multi-line compilable C programs. In *Proceedings of the 2nd European Workshop on Genetic Programming*. Springer, Göteborg, Sweden, 83–92.
- [19] Denis Robilliard, Sébastien Mahler, Dominique Verhaghe, and Cyril Fonlupt. 2005. Santa Fe Trail Hazards. In *Artificial Evolution, 7th International Conference, Evolution Artificielle, EA 2005*, El-Ghazali Talbi, Pierre Liardet, Pierre Collet, Evelyne Lutton, and Marc Schoenauer (Eds.). Springer, Lille, France, 1–12.
- [20] Franz Rothlauf and Marie Oetzel. 2006. On the Locality of Grammatical Evolution. In *Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Genetic Programming (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 3905)*, Pierre Collet, Marco Tomassini, Marc Ebner, Steven Gustafson, and Anikó Ekárt (Eds.). Springer, Budapest, Hungary, 320–330.
- [21] Conor Ryan and R. Muhammad Atif Azad. 2003. Sensible Initialisation in Grammatical Evolution. In *GECCO 2003: Proceedings of the Bird of a Feather Workshops, Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, Alwyn M. Barry (Ed.). AAAI, Chicago, IL, 142–145.
- [22] Conor Ryan, Michael O'Neill, and JJ Collins. 2018. Introduction to 20 Years of Grammatical Evolution. In *Handbook of Grammatical Evolution*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 1–21.
- [23] Peter A Whigham. 1995. Grammatically-based Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Genetic Programming: From Theory to Real-World Applications*. University of Rochester, USA, 33–41.
- [24] Peter A Whigham, Grant Dick, and James Maclaurin. 2017. On the mapping of genotype to phenotype in evolutionary algorithms. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 18, 3 (2017), 353–361.
- [25] Peter A Whigham, Grant Dick, James Maclaurin, and Caitlin A Owen. 2015. Examining the best of both worlds of grammatical evolution. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. ACM, Madrid, Spain, 1111–1118.