

# Analyzing the Interaction Between Down-Sampling and Selection

Ryan Boldi

University of Massachusetts Amherst  
rbahlousbold@umass.edu

Thomas Helmuth

Hamilton College  
thelmuth@hamilton.edu

Ashley Bao

Amherst College  
abao26@amherst.edu

Dominik Sobania

Johannes Gutenberg University  
dsobania@uni-mainz.de

Martin Briesch

Johannes Gutenberg University  
briesch@uni-mainz.de

Lee Spector

Amherst College  
lspector@amherst.edu

Alexander Lalejini

Grand Valley State University  
lalejina@gvsu.edu

## ABSTRACT

Genetic programming systems often use large training sets to evaluate the quality of candidate solutions for selection. However, evaluating populations on large training sets can be computationally expensive. Down-sampling training sets has long been used to decrease the computational cost of evaluation in a wide range of application domains. Indeed, recent studies have shown that both random and informed down-sampling can substantially improve problem-solving success for GP systems that use the lexicase parent selection algorithm. We use the PushGP framework to experimentally test whether these down-sampling techniques can also improve problem-solving success in the context of two other commonly used selection methods, fitness-proportionate and tournament selection, across eight GP problems (four program synthesis and four symbolic regression). We verified that down-sampling can benefit the problem-solving success of both fitness-proportionate and tournament selection. However, the number of problems wherein down-sampling improved problem-solving success varied by selection scheme, suggesting that the impact of down-sampling depends both on the problem and choice of selection scheme. Surprisingly, we found that down-sampling was most consistently beneficial when combined with lexicase selection as compared to tournament and fitness-proportionate selection. Overall, our results suggest that down-sampling should be considered more often when solving test-based GP problems.

## KEYWORDS

down-sampling, program synthesis, regression, genetic programming, selection

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Genetic programming (GP) applies evolutionary search algorithms to automatically synthesize programs instead of writing them by hand. GP systems often use large training sets to evaluate the quality of candidate solutions (individuals). These training sets comprise examples of input and output pairs that describe the correct behavior of a program for a given problem. Each generation, individuals are evaluated on these pairs in order to determine whether or not they exhibit this desired behavior, such as returning the correct value for a program synthesis or regression problem. A

parent selection algorithm then chooses the “best” individuals to contribute genetic material to the next generation. To thoroughly assess the quality of individuals in a population, most GP systems evaluate all individuals on every input-output example in the training set. This process can be computationally expensive when using large population sizes on large training sets or when individual evaluations are slow to compute. Down-sampling has been shown to be effective for reducing the per-generation cost of evaluating programs when using lexicase selection [29]. Here, we show that these benefits apply to other selection methods, including tournament selection and fitness-proportionate selection.

Previous work demonstrated that using random down-sampling in the context of lexicase selection can substantially improve problem-solving success when the per-generation computational savings are reallocated to other aspects of evolutionary search, such as running for more generations [14, 26, 29, 45]. However, naively constructing random down-samples has the drawback of leaving out potentially important training cases or over-representing redundant training cases, which can slow or even impede problem-solving success [5, 26, 30]. To address this drawback, Boldi et al. [4] introduced informed down-sampling, which uses runtime population statistics to construct down-samples with distinct, more informative training cases. Informed down-sampling was found to significantly improve success rates over random down-sampling for program synthesis runs using the PushGP system. In each of these previous studies, down-sampling is applied in the context of standard lexicase selection. To our knowledge, these down-sampling techniques have yet to be evaluated in combination with other commonly used parent selection methods in GP, like tournament or fitness proportionate selection. Here, we ask whether random or informed down-sampling can benefit GP systems beyond the context of lexicase selection.

In this paper, we analyze the problem-solving success of the PushGP system on four program synthesis and four integer-based symbolic regression problems when using different combinations of selection scheme and down-sampling method. Specifically, for each of fitness-proportionate, tournament, and lexicase selection, we compare the impact of no down-sampling, random down-sampling, and informed down-sampling. We find that down-sampling either improved or did not significantly affect problem-solving success

in all instances. Surprisingly, we find that lexicase selection benefits most consistently from the addition of down-sampling, as lexicase’s problem-solving success was significantly better with down-sampling across all eight problems. Overall, our results highlight the potential problem-solving benefits of down-sampling in GP systems; though, some selection algorithms are likely to benefit more than others.

## 2 SELECTION

The process of selection is a fundamental feature of evolutionary search. Parent selection algorithms steer evolving populations through a search space by determining which individuals should contribute genetic material to the next generation. Many selection algorithms have been developed, each targeting different problem domains and search space topologies (e.g., [6, 27, 33, 44, 49]). In this subsection, we overview the three selection strategies studied in this paper: fitness-proportionate, tournament and lexicase selection. The implementation details and specific parameters of each of these strategies are then discussed in their respective subsection.

### 2.1 Fitness-Proportionate Selection

Fitness-proportionate selection is one of the earliest proposed selection strategies in evolutionary computation [33]. Fitness-proportionate selection assigns each parent a selection probability based on its aggregate fitness relative to that of the other population members. Although individuals with higher fitness have a higher chance of being selected, those with lower fitness can still be selected. The probability  $p_i$  that an individual  $i$  is selected is

$$p_i = \frac{f_i}{\sum_{j=1}^N f_j}$$

where  $f_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  individual’s fitness, and  $N$  is the population size. Since our genetic programming system evaluates individuals with *errors* instead of fitness values, we compute the fitness of the individual as  $\frac{1}{1+e_i}$  where  $e_i$  is the aggregate error the individual achieved on the training set.

On its own, fitness-proportionate selection can impose low selection pressure on a population relative to other commonly used selection algorithms, such as tournament selection [3, 54]. Fitness-proportionate selection is also simple to implement and computationally efficient with a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ . As such, fitness-proportionate selection is still commonly used for evolutionary search [2, 9], often as one component of more sophisticated selection procedures [53].

### 2.2 Tournament Selection

Like fitness proportionate selection, tournament selection requires each individual in the population have a single “fitness score” that represents their quality. To select a single individual with tournament selection,  $t$  individuals are chosen from the population at random. Then, the individual with the best fitness (or lowest error) “wins” the tournament and is selected as a parent. Tournament size ( $t$ ) controls the strength of selection; larger tournament sizes

impose stronger selection, and smaller tournament sizes impose weaker selection. In this work, we use a tournament size of  $t = 10$ .

Tournament selection has been found to be more stable [7] than fitness proportionate selection, as it is not affected by fitness scaling [16]. Tournament selection also has a time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}(N)$ , which makes it attractive when using large population sizes [16]. Due to its simplicity and efficiency, tournament selection is widely used as the standard selection strategy for evolutionary computation [13].

### 2.3 Lexicase Selection

Unlike fitness-proportionate and tournament selection, lexicase selection does not aggregate error values across training cases to choose parents. Instead, lexicase considers each training case individually. To select a single parent, lexicase selection first shuffles the set of training cases into a random order, and all individuals in the population are included in a pool eligible for selection. Each training case is then applied in sequence (in shuffled order), filtering the pool of eligible individuals to include only individuals with elite performance on the current training case. This filtering continues until one individual remains in the eligible pool to be selected or until all training cases have been exhausted, where one of the remaining eligible individuals is then selected at random. Because each parent selection event uses a random permutation of training cases, lexicase selection prioritizes high performance on different sets of training cases across parent selection events, improving its capacity for diversity maintenance [12, 22].

Lexicase selection was initially designed for multi-modal test-based program synthesis problems [27, 49] and has frequently been found to outperform other selection methods in this domain [20, 47]. Lexicase selection has also been shown to be effective in domains beyond genetic programming, including evolutionary robotics [41, 52], deep learning [11], genetic algorithms [40], learning classifier systems [1] and even in the directed evolution of microbes [36]. Lexicase selection’s success is often attributed to its capacity to preserve diversity [12, 22] and maintain specialists [24]. However, the worst case time complexity for lexicase selection is  $\mathcal{O}(N * C)$  where  $N$  is the population size, and  $C$  is the number of training cases. In practice, this number is often closer to  $\mathcal{O}(N + C)$  when population diversity is high [21], and there are strategies that can be used to reduce this even further [10]. Despite this larger time complexity, in practice, the computational cost of genetic programming is more often dominated by program evaluation instead of selection. In this work, we focus on training set down-sampling, a strategy that can be used to reduce how expensive the evaluation step of evolutionary runs are by reducing the effective size of the training set.

## 3 DOWN-SAMPLING

In this work, we focus on down-sampling in the context of test-based program synthesis problems. In test-based program synthesis, candidate solutions are evaluated on a set of training cases in order to assess quality or correctness. Down-sampling techniques reduce the total number of training cases used for assessing candidate solution quality, which in turn, reduces the total number of program evaluations needed each generation. Down-sampling has

been studied in evolutionary computation as a means to reduce computational loads [37, 44] and reduce overfitting [17, 18, 39].

*Historical subset selection* is one simple down-sampling method that maintains a single static subset of the training cases for an entire evolutionary run [15]. In contrast, *random subset selection* [15] randomly chooses to include or not include each training case each generation, resulting in different down-sample sizes from generation to generation. *Stochastic subset sampling* [38, 42] chooses a new fixed-size down-sample each generation. More sophisticated methods of down-sampling have also been developed. Gathercole and Ross [15] introduce *dynamic subset selection*, which creates down-samples that are biased toward including harder cases and cases not seen for many generations. Lasarczyk et al. [38] introduce a topology-based selection that takes problem structure into account by selecting cases that individuals perform differently on in a problem domain. Topology-based selection is very similar to the later proposed informed down-sampling [4]; although the latter has only been tested on program synthesis problems, and the former only on symbolic regression and classification. In this work, we compare the performance of informed down-sampling to that of a method similar to the earlier proposed *stochastic subset sampling*, also known as random down-sampling [29], and the standard non-down-sampled selection strategy.

Given the demonstrated value of down-sampling for evolutionary search, it is important to understand how different down-sampling methods interact with different selection algorithms to benefit (or hinder) problem-solving success. Here, we focus on two down-sampling techniques that have been demonstrated to be effective in combination with lexicase selection for GP: random down-sampling and informed down-sampling, each described in detail below. We ask whether the benefits of these two down-sampling methods might extend to other commonly used selection procedures in GP.

### 3.1 Random Down-sampling

Random down-sampling (in this context) constructs a random subset of the training set each generation. This smaller subset of training cases is then used to evaluate the quality of the population for selection. By reducing the number of training cases used to evaluate programs each generation, random down-sampling reduces the per-generation computational costs of population evaluation and parent selection. Previous work demonstrated that reallocating these computational savings to other aspects of evolutionary search can lead to substantial improvements in problem-solving success in the context of lexicase selection [14, 26, 29, 45].

However, random down-sampling results in less thorough program evaluations, which can lead to misleading assessments of program quality. For example, a random down-sample might omit important training cases (e.g., cases that test input edge cases), as the down-sample is created randomly with no consideration for the program behavior that each training case might be assessing. Boldi et al. [5] explored the extent to which random down-sampling resulted in discontinuities between training sets used to select successive generations. However, Boldi et al. [5] found that the commonality of synonymous training cases usually prevented discontinuities; that is, most training sets contain many training cases that measure the same behavior and are thus passed by the same

groups of individuals. In these circumstances, down-samples are less likely to entirely omit an entire class of training cases.

### 3.2 Informed Down-sampling

Informed down-sampling addresses random down-sampling’s drawback of potentially omitting informative training cases by minimizing the number of synonymous training cases included in the down-sample [4]. To estimate differences among training cases, informed down-sampling fully evaluates a random subset of the population on the complete set of training cases. Two training cases solved by different subsets of the population sample are not synonymous and should be more likely to be included in the down-sample. Conversely, two training cases solved by the same subset of the population sample are more likely to be synonymous and should not both be included in the down-sample.

Algorithm 1 specifies the full informed down-sampling procedure. We modified the algorithm from [4] to allow for an arbitrary selection scheme,  $\mathcal{S}$ . To construct a down-sample, we use a random subset of the population to estimate the “distance” between all pairs of training cases. The distance between two training cases is the Hamming distance between their “solve vectors”, which are vectors of binary value that specify which individuals in the population subset (or “parent sample”) solved the training case. We specify the size of the population subset using the  $\rho$  parameter. With  $\rho = 0.01$ , we include 1% of the population in the population subset used for calculating each training case’s solve vector. We used  $\rho = 0.01$  for all experiments in this work. Next, a single training case is added to the down-sample at random, and training cases are added in sequence such that each additional training case is maximally far away from the current down-sample through a process known as farthest first traversal [32].

Like other down-sampling methods, informed down-sampling reduces the per-generation computational cost of evaluating programs. Likewise, a previous study demonstrated that re-allocating these computational savings to increasing the number of generations of evolutionary search resulted in improved success rates on a number of program synthesis problems with PushGP [4]. However, Boldi et al. [4]’s study was limited to applying informed down-sampling in the context of lexicase selection. We extend this work by testing the efficacy of informed down-sampling in the context of other commonly used selection strategies, tournament and fitness proportionate selection.

## 4 METHODS

In this work, we study random and informed down-sampling in the context of three selection schemes commonly used in GP: tournament selection, fitness-proportionate selection, and lexicase selection. Specifically, we compare problem-solving success using PushGP on four program synthesis problems and four symbolic regression problems.

### 4.1 Program Synthesis Problems

The goal of program synthesis problems is to achieve zero error on each of a set of training cases, where each training case encodes what the program should output given a certain input. For this work, we choose four program synthesis problems from the first

---

**Algorithm 1** Informed Down-Sampling. Adapted from [4].

---

**Data:**

$\mathcal{P}$  : population, **cases**: set of all training cases,  
 $\mathcal{S}$  : selection scheme,  
 $k$  : scheduled case distance computation parameter,  
 $\rho$  : parent sampling rate,  
 $\mathcal{G}$  : current generation counter,  
 $\mathcal{D}$  : case distance matrix.

▷  $\mathcal{S}$  picks a new pop. given an old pop. and a set of cases  
 ▷  $\rho, k$  are parameters to reduce the distance computation cost  
 ▷ all distances are initialized to be maximally far

**Result:** A list of selected parents

```

1: if  $\mathcal{G} \% k == 0$  then
2:    $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \leftarrow$  sample  $\rho \times |\mathcal{P}|$  parents from  $\mathcal{P}$ 
3:   evaluate  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  on cases
4:   calculate  $\mathcal{D}$  from solve vectors from solutions in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  on cases
5: end if
6:  $D(\cdot, \cdot) \leftarrow$  distance function derived from indexing into  $\mathcal{D}$ 
7: ds  $\leftarrow$  create down-sample using farthest first traversal
8:  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow$  select  $|\mathcal{P}|$  new parents using  $\mathcal{S}$  from  $\mathcal{P}$  using ds as cases
9: return  $\mathcal{P}$ 
  
```

and second program synthesis benchmark suites [19, 20, 25]. These problems have been explored in previous work on informed down-sampling [4] and are therefore a good basis for this investigation. We included problems where informed down-sampling has been shown to improve problem-solving success (Count Odds and Fizz Buzz), reduce problem-solving success (Small or Large), and have no significant effect on problem-solving success (Fuel Cost):

- Count Odds - Given a vector of integers, return the number of integers that are odd, without use of a specific even or odd instruction (but allowing instructions such as mod and quotient).
- Fizz Buzz - Given an integer  $x$ , return "Fizz" if  $x$  is divisible by 3, "Buzz" if  $x$  is divisible by 5, "FizzBuzz" if  $x$  is divisible by 3 and 5, and a string version of  $x$  if none of the above hold.
- Fuel Cost - Given a vector of positive integers, divide each by 3, round the result down to the nearest integer, and subtract 2. Return the sum of all of the new integers in the vector.
- Small or Large - Given an integer  $n$ , print "small" if  $n < 1000$  and "large" if  $n \geq 2000$  (and nothing if  $1000 \leq n < 2000$ ).

The specific parameters used for the program synthesis part of this investigation can be found in Table 1. We performed 50 evolutionary runs for each program synthesis problem configuration, each with a population size of 1000. Each of these runs were performed at 5% down-sampling, meaning  $r = 0.05$ . Since we have 200 training cases in the entire training set, each individual is evaluated on 10 of the cases every generation. We chose  $r = 0.05$  based on previous work [4]. The down-sampling strategy being used determines which cases are selected out of the 200 to make up the down-sample.

**Table 1: System parameters used for program synthesis runs. As the methods with down-sampling usually reduce the number of per-generation program executions, we limit all runs to performing only 60,000,000 program executions total (equivalent to 300 generations with standard (no down-sampling) GP).**

Parameter	Value
GP system parameters	
runs per problem	50
population size	1000
initial training set size	200
testing set size	1000
maximum program executions	60,000,000
variation operator	UMAD
Down-sampling parameters (when used)	
down-sample rate $r$	0.05
parent sample rate $\rho$	0.01
generational interval $k$	100

## 4.2 Symbolic Regression Problems

In addition to program synthesis problems, we included four simple, integer-based symbolic regression problems to test whether the benefits of down-sampling extend beyond program synthesis. These symbolic regression problems included 3rd, 4th, and 5th-degree polynomials with randomly chosen coefficients, and inputs and outputs were restricted to integers. Since these problems are integer based, the fitness of an individual on a particular training case is simply the absolute difference between the program's output and the true label of the training case. For each problem, the inputs of the training and testing sets were  $[-5, 5]$  and  $[-10, -5] \cup (5, 10]$  respectively. Thus, we had 11 elements in the training set

**Table 2: System parameters used for symbolic regression runs. We limit all runs to performing only 3,300,000 program executions total (equivalent to 300 generations with standard (no down-sampling) GP on this training set).**

Parameter	Value
GP System Parameters	
runs per problem	200
population size	1000
initial training set size	11
testing set size	10
maximum program executions	3,300,000
variation operator	UMAD
Down-sampling parameters (when used)	
down-sample rate $r$	0.30
parent sample rate $\rho$	0.01
generational interval $k$	100

and 10 elements in the testing set with our testing set purely consisting of elements outside the bounds of the training set. This is close to the same number of training cases as those used by Koza [35] for similar symbolic regression problems. In exploratory experiments, we found that larger ranges led to integer outputs becoming too large to find solutions within our computational limits, further motivating us to use a limited input range. Since we only had 11 elements in the training set, we set the down-sample size to 30% to avoid having only 1 or 2 cases in the down-sample. Below are the regression problems used.

- $f(x) = 2x^5 - x^4 + 2x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 6$
- $f(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 3$
- $f(x) = x^4 - 2x^2 + 4x + 3$
- $f(x) = 3x^3 - 4x^2 + 8x + 3$

Our symbolic regression problems were computationally cheaper than our program synthesis runs, allowing us to perform 200 replicate runs for each of our symbolic regression experiments. To make the comparisons fair, we ensure that all methods (regardless of down-sampling) use the same number of program executions. In this work, we limited all symbolic regression runs to 3.3 million program evaluations.

### 4.3 Experimental Design

We used the PushGP framework to conduct our experiments. PushGP is a genetic programming framework for evolving Push programs. The Push programming language uses a set of typed memory stacks to allow programs to handle different data types (e.g., strings, numbers, etc.) and includes a Turing complete instruction set that supports basic computations as well as complex control flow, such as looping and conditional execution [48, 50, 51]. For these experiments, we use the same instruction sets as those used by Boldi et al. [4]. We used the propeller implementation of PushGP for this work<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/lspector/propeller>

For each configuration, we report the number of generalizing runs. This is the number of runs that produce a program that successfully passes all of the cases in the held out testing set. Since we are not evaluating the individuals on the entire training set when we down-sample, checking if an individual passes the *entire* training set happens when an individual passes all the cases in the down-sample. If an individual passes the entire training set, the evolutionary run ends. This individual is then evaluated on the held out testing set. If this individual passes the testing set, the run is marked as a generalizing run. If the individual passes the down-sample, but not the entire *training* set, the evolutionary run continues. Contrary to previous work on down-sampling with lexicase selection [4, 26, 29], the extra program executions required to verify if an individual passes the entire training set are added to our program execution tally used to limit our runs.

## 5 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 shows problem-solving successes for the Count Odds, Small or Large, Fuel Cost, and Fizz Buzz program synthesis problems. A run is considered to be successful if a perfect solution evolves (i.e., a program that solves all training and unseen testing cases). Consistent with previous work with lexicase selection [4, 20, 26, 30], not all program synthesis problems benefited from down-sampling. However, we found no instances where selection configurations without down-sampling significantly outperformed configurations with down-sampling enabled. In fact, when using lexicase selection, problem-solving success was significantly improved for all problems by at least one of the down-sampling methods, and when using tournament selection, down-sampling significantly improved problem-solving success for all but one problem (Fizz Buzz). Overall, fitness-proportionate selection benefited the least from the addition of down-sampling, as problem-solving success was significantly better for only one out of four problems. We also found examples where fitness proportionate and tournament selection failed to find *any* solutions unless we used down-sampling.

Across all configurations of program synthesis problems, we detected a significant difference in problem-solving success between informed and random down-sampling in three instances: the small or large problem with tournament selection and the count odds and fizz buzz problems with lexicase selection. In each of these instances, informed down-sampling outperformed random down-sampling.

Table 4 shows problem-solving success for four symbolic regression problems. Like our program synthesis results, not all symbolic regression problems benefited from down-sampling. In fact, we did not detect any significant problem-solving benefits from applying down-sampling to fitness-proportionate selection on any of the four symbolic regression problems. Though not statistically significant, we observed one problem where fitness proportionate found two solutions (out of 200 runs) without down-sampling and failed to find any solutions with either form of down-sampling enabled. As before, however, we detected no instances where selection configurations without down-sampling *significantly* outperformed configurations with down-sampling. When using tournament selection, one out of four problems significantly benefited

**Table 3: Number of generalizing solutions (successes) out of 50 program synthesis runs achieved by PushGP on the test set. All down-sampling is performed at a rate of  $r = 0.05$ . All informed down-sampling is performed with  $\rho = 0.01$  and  $k = 100$ . The numbers reported are number of generalizing solutions out of 50 evolutionary runs using each selection scheme and down-sample strategy combination. In bold font are the results where performing down-sampling offers significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) benefits over the standard (no down-sampling) version of the *same selection scheme*. We signify with an asterisk the configurations in which informed down-sampling significantly outperforms random down-sampling on the same problem with the same selection scheme. All significance analysis was conducted with a two proportion z-test with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.**

	Selection Scheme	FPS			Tournament			Lexicase		
	Down-sample Type	No	Rnd	IDS	No	Rnd	IDS	No	Rnd	IDS
Problem	Count Odds	0	1	0	0	<b>26</b>	<b>33</b>	10	10	<b>49*</b>
	Fizz Buzz	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	<b>32</b>	<b>45*</b>
	Fuel Cost	0	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	1	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>	20	<b>40</b>	<b>41</b>
	Small or Large	0	5	5	13	18	<b>47*</b>	16	<b>42</b>	<b>38</b>

from down-sampling, and when using lexicase selection, all four problems benefited from at least one type of down-sampling.

Across all configurations of symbolic regression problems, we detected a significant difference in problem-solving success between informed and random down-sampling for only one problem in the context of lexicase selection. Unlike our program synthesis results, random down-sampling outperformed informed down-sampling on this problem.

Across both problem domains (program synthesis and symbolic regression) and all three selection methods, our results indicate that down-sampling is often beneficial or neutral for problem-solving success. We did not find compelling evidence that down-sampling *impeded* problem-solving success in any of our experiments. Though, we do note that others have found down-sampling to impede problem-solving success when there are strong trade-offs between training cases (e.g., low error on one excludes low error on another) or when a training set lacks some redundancy [30].

Indeed, our findings are consistent with many previous studies that report substantial problem-solving gains in GP when applying down-sampling in order to reallocate computational resources to running deeper evolutionary searches [4, 26, 29]. These previous studies, however, focused on using down-sampling in the context of lexicase selection. Our results indicate that random and informed down-sampling are also potentially valuable additions to GP systems using other selection methods, such as fitness-proportionate selection or tournament selection. Further study is needed to verify that the value of using down-sampling with fitness-proportionate selection or tournament selection stems from the increase in generations that we can run evolution with fixed computational resources.

Surprisingly, we found that down-sampling was most consistently beneficial in the context of lexicase selection, as problem-solving success was improved by at least one down-sampling method across all problems. Further investigation is necessary to tease this apart. Fitness-proportionate and tournament selection are known

to be susceptible to premature convergence [31, 34], while lexicase selection is more capable of maintaining both phenotypic and phylogenetic diversity [12, 23, 28, 46]. Given this, we hypothesize that lexicase selection benefits more from the increased number of generations afforded by down-sampling than tournament or fitness-proportionate selection. That is, if a population evolving under fitness-proportionate and tournament selection has converged to a local fitness optimum, that population may not benefit from extra generations of evolution. In contrast, a more diverse population evolving under lexicase selection may benefit substantially from running for an increased number of generations.

Overall, our results suggest that down-sampling, selection scheme, and search space topology interact to influence the likelihood of problem-solving success. Even with our limited set of problems, neither down-sampling method completely dominated the other, and the benefits of down-sampling dramatically varied by problem and selection scheme. Future investigations should explore dynamic down-sampling; that is, can we use population statistics to automatically choose and parameterize down-sampling during an evolutionary search?

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we extended previous studies that evaluated the efficacy of random and informed down-sampling in the context of lexicase selection. Here, we show that both random and informed down-sampling may also benefit GP systems that use fitness-proportionate or tournament selection. For fitness-proportionate, tournament, and lexicase selection, applying some form of down-sampling either helped or had no significant effect on problem-solving success (across four program synthesis and four symbolic regression problems). This result suggests that evolutionary computing practitioners should experiment with different forms of down-sampling in combination with their preferred selection methods, as it can be used to improve problem-solving success by reallocating per-generation computational savings to running a deeper evolutionary search.

**Table 4: Number of generalizing solutions (successes) out of 200 symbolic regression runs achieved by PushGP on the test set. All down-sampling is performed at a rate of  $r = 0.30$ . All informed down-sampling is performed with  $\rho = 0.01$  and  $k = 100$ . The numbers reported are number of generalizing solutions out of 50 evolutionary runs using each selection scheme and down-sample strategy combination. In bold font are the results where performing down-sampling offers significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) benefits over the standard (no down-sampling) version of the *same selection scheme*. We signify with a dagger the configurations in which random down-sampling significantly outperforms informed down-sampling on the same problem with the same selection scheme. All significance analysis was conducted with a two proportion z-test with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.**

	Selection Scheme	FPS			Tournament			Lexicase		
	Down-sample Type	No	Rnd	IDS	No	Rnd	IDS	No	Rnd	IDS
Problem	$2x^5 - x^4 + 2x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 6$	1	2	2	0	0	0	21	36	<b>43</b>
	$x^4 - 2x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 3$	7	8	11	19	16	11	120	<b>180</b>	<b>179</b>
	$x^4 - 2x^2 + 4x + 3$	2	0	0	131	<b>156</b>	<b>172</b>	187	<b>198<sup>†</sup></b>	189
	$3x^3 - 4x^2 + 8x + 3$	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	<b>71</b>	<b>83</b>

Previous studies have shown that the benefits of down-sampling stem from reallocating the computational savings to running an evolutionary search for more generations or evaluating more individuals [14, 26, 29]. We hypothesize that this explanation holds across each of the selection schemes that we tested in this work. We did, however, find that different selection schemes benefited more or less from the addition of down-sampling: fitness-proportionate selection seemed to benefit the least, while lexicase selection benefited from down-sampling on all eight problems. We hypothesize that populations evolving under lexicase selection are more diverse and therefore benefit the most from the extra generations afforded by down-sampling. In contrast, fitness-proportionate and tournament selection are known to be susceptible to premature convergence to local optima and might not always benefit from more generations of evolution; that is, if an entire population is stuck on a local optimum, tournament and fitness-proportionate selection have no built-in mechanisms to escape in subsequent generations.

We did not observe consistent differences between random and informed down-sampling. The best choice of down-sampling method depended on the selection strategy and the problem. Future work should investigate the interaction between down-sampling and selection methodology further to determine when informed down-sampling should be used over different down-sampling strategies.

Our study was limited to a relatively small set of problems, a single genetic programming system (PushGP), and just two down-sampling techniques. Future work is needed to verify our findings beyond this context. Indeed, many down-sampling techniques have been developed for use in evolutionary computing and machine learning. Just as there has been recent progress in large-scale benchmarking for selection algorithms [8, 43], we argue that large-scale benchmarking efforts should be implemented for different down-sampling methods. Such efforts would help us to disentangle the circumstances where particular down-sampling methods are most appropriate. Additionally, more unified theory on the effects of down-sampling on test-based problems could help to tie

together disparate results from different application domains in evolutionary computing.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sneha Aenugu and Lee Spector. 2019. Lexicase Selection in Learning Classifier Systems. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference* (Prague, Czech Republic) (GECCO '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 356–364. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3321707.3321828>
- [2] Jaroslaw Arabas and Karol R. Opara. 2020. Population Diversity of Nonelitist Evolutionary Algorithms in the Exploration Phase. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 24 (2020), 1050–1062.
- [3] Tobias Blicke and Lothar Thiele. 1996. A comparison of selection schemes used in evolutionary algorithms. *Evolutionary Computation* 4, 4 (1996), 361–394.
- [4] Ryan Boldi, Martin Briesch, Dominik Sobania, Alexander Lalejini, Thomas Helmuth, Franz Rothlauf, Charles Ofria, and Lee Spector. 2023. Informed Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection: Identifying productive training cases for efficient problem solving. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.01488> arXiv:2301.01488.
- [5] Ryan Boldi, Thomas Helmuth, and Lee Spector. 2022. The Environmental Discontinuity Hypothesis for Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.15931>
- [6] Anne Brindle. 1980. Genetic algorithms for function optimization. (1980). <https://doi.org/10.7939/R3FB4WS2W>
- [7] Martin Volker Butz, Kumara Sastry, and David E. Goldberg. 2003. Tournament Selection: Stable Fitness Pressure in XCS. In *Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*.
- [8] William La Cava, Patryk Orzechowski, Bogdan Burlacu, Fabricio Olivetti de Franca, Marco Virgolin, Ying Jin, Michael Kommeda, and Jason H. Moore. 2021. Contemporary Symbolic Regression Methods and their Relative Performance. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 1)*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=xVQMrDLyGst>
- [9] Duc-Cuong Dang, Anton V. Ereemeev, and P. Lehre. 2019. Runtime Analysis of Fitness-Proportionate Selection on Linear Functions. *ArXiv abs/1908.08686* (2019).
- [10] Li Ding, Ryan Boldi, Thomas Helmuth, and Lee Spector. 2022. Lexicase Selection at Scale. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '22 Companion)*, July 9–13, 2022, Boston, MA, USA.
- [11] Li Ding and Lee Spector. 2021. Optimizing neural networks with gradient lexicase selection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [12] Emily L. Dolson, Wolfgang Banzhaf, and Charles Ofria. 2018. *Ecological theory provides insights about evolutionary computation*. preprint. PeerJ Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27315v1>
- [13] Yongsheng Fang and Jun Li. 2010. A Review of Tournament Selection in Genetic Programming. In *Advances in Computation and Intelligence (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Zhihua Cai, Chengyu Hu, Zhuo Kang, and Yong Liu (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 181–192. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16493-4\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16493-4_19)
- [14] Austin J. Ferguson, Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Daniel Junghans, Alexander Lalejini, Emily Dolson, and Charles Ofria. 2019. Characterizing the effects of

- random subsampling and dilution on Lexicase selection. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVII*, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Erik Goodman, Leigh Sheneman, Leonardo Trujillo, and Bill Worzel (Eds.). Springer, East Lansing, MI, USA, 1–23. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-030-39958-0\\_1](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-030-39958-0_1)
- [15] Chris Gathercole and Peter Ross. 1994. Dynamic Training Subset Selection for Supervised Learning in Genetic Programming. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature III (LNCS, Vol. 866)*, Yuval Davidor, Hans-Paul Schwefel, and Reinhard Männer (Eds.). Springer-Verlag, Jerusalem, 312–321. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/3-540-58484-6\\_275](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/3-540-58484-6_275)
- [16] David E. Goldberg and Kalyanmoy Deb. 1991. A Comparative Analysis of Selection Schemes Used in Genetic Algorithms. In *Foundations of Genetic Algorithms*. Vol. 1. Elsevier, 69–93. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-050684-5.50008-2>
- [17] Ivo Gonçalves and Sara Silva. 2013. Balancing Learning and Overfitting in Genetic Programming with Interleaved Sampling of Training data. In *Proceedings of the 16th European Conference on Genetic Programming, EuroGP 2013 (LNCS, Vol. 7831)*, Krzysztof Krawiec, Alberto Moraglio, Ting Hu, A. Sima Uyar, and Bin Hu (Eds.). Springer Verlag, Vienna, Austria, 73–84. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-642-37207-0\\_7](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-642-37207-0_7)
- [18] Ivo Gonçalves, Sara Silva, Joana B. Melo, and Joao Carreiras. 2012. *Random Sampling Technique for Overfitting Control in Genetic Programming*. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-642-29139-5\\_19](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-642-29139-5_19) Pages: 229.
- [19] Thomas Helmuth and Peter Kelly. 2021. PSB2: the second program synthesis benchmark suite. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, Lille France, 785–794. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/3449639.3459285>
- [20] Thomas Helmuth and Peter Kelly. 2022. Applying genetic programming to PSB2: the next generation program synthesis benchmark suite. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* (June 2022). <https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/s10710-022-09434-y>
- [21] Thomas Helmuth, Johannes Lengler, and William La Cava. 2022. Population Diversity Leads to Short Running Times of Lexicase Selection. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature – PPSN XVII*, Günter Rudolph, Anna V. Kononova, Hernán Aguirre, Pascal Kerschke, Gabriela Ochoa, and Tea Tušar (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 485–498.
- [22] Thomas Helmuth, Nicholas Freitag McPhee, and Lee Spector. 2016. Effects of Lexicase and Tournament Selection on Diversity Recovery and Maintenance. In *Proceedings of the 2016 on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '16 Companion)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 983–990. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/2908961.2931657>
- [23] Thomas Helmuth, Nicholas Freitag McPhee, and Lee Spector. 2016. Lexicase Selection for Program Synthesis: A Diversity Analysis. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIII*, Rick Riolo, W.P. Worzel, Mark Kotanchek, and Arthur Kordon (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 151–167. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-319-34223-8\\_9](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-319-34223-8_9) Series Title: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation.
- [24] Thomas Helmuth, Edward Pantridge, and Lee Spector. 2020. On the importance of specialists for lexicase selection. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 21, 3 (Sept. 2020), 349–373. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/s10710-020-09377-2>
- [25] Thomas Helmuth and Lee Spector. 2015. General Program Synthesis Benchmark Suite. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. ACM, Madrid Spain, 1039–1046. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/2739480.2754769>
- [26] Thomas Helmuth and Lee Spector. 2021. Problem-solving benefits of down-sampled lexicase selection. *Artificial Life* (jun 2021), 1–21. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1162/artl\\_a\\_00341](https://doi.org/doi:10.1162/artl_a_00341) arXiv:2106.06085
- [27] Thomas Helmuth, Lee Spector, and James Matheson. 2015. Solving Uncompromising Problems With Lexicase Selection. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 19, 5 (2015), 630–643. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1109/TEVC.2014.2362729>
- [28] Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, and Emily Dolson. 2022. What Can Phylogenetic Metrics Tell us About Useful Diversity in Evolutionary Algorithms? In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVIII*, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Leonardo Trujillo, Stephan Winkler, and Bill Worzel (Eds.). Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 63–82. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-981-16-8113-4\\_4](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-981-16-8113-4_4) Series Title: Genetic and Evolutionary Computation.
- [29] Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, Emily Dolson, and Charles Ofria. 2019. Random subsampling improves performance in lexicase selection. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. ACM, Prague Czech Republic, 2028–2031. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/3319619.3326900>
- [30] Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, and Charles Ofria. 2022. *An Exploration of Exploration: Measuring the Ability of Lexicase Selection to Find Obscure Pathways to Optimality*. Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 83–107. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-981-16-8113-4\\_5](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-981-16-8113-4_5)
- [31] Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, and Charles Ofria. 2022. A suite of diagnostic metrics for characterizing selection schemes. <https://doi.org/doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2204.13839>
- [32] Dorit S. Hochbaum and David B. Shmoys. 1985. A Best Possible Heuristic for the k-Center Problem. *Math. Oper. Res.* 10 (1985), 180–184.
- [33] John H. Holland. 1992. *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems: an introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence* (1st mit press ed ed.). MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [34] Gregory S. Hornby. 2006. ALPS: the age-layered population structure for reducing the problem of premature convergence. In *Proceedings of the 8th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation – GECCO '06*. ACM Press, Seattle, Washington, USA, 815. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/1143997.1144142>
- [35] John R. Koza. 1992. *Genetic programming: On the programming of computers by means of natural selection*. MIT Press, 138–139.
- [36] Alexander Lalejini, Emily Dolson, Anya E Vostinar, and Luis Zaman. 2022. Artificial selection methods from evolutionary computing show promise for directed evolution of microbes. *eLife* 11 (Aug. 2022), e79665. <https://doi.org/doi:10.7554/eLife.79665>
- [37] W. Langdon. 2011. Minimising testing in genetic programming. *RN* 11, 10 (2011), 1.
- [38] Christian W.G. Lasarczyk, Peter Dittrich, and Wolfgang Banzhaf. 2004. Dynamic Subset Selection Based on a Fitness Case Topology. *Evolutionary Computation* 12, 2 (June 2004), 223–242. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1162/106365604773955157>
- [39] Yi Liu and Taghi Khoshgoftaar. 2004. Reducing overfitting in genetic programming models for software quality classification. In *Proceedings of the Eighth IEEE international conference on High assurance systems engineering (HASE'04)*. IEEE Computer Society, USA, 56–65.
- [40] Blossom Metevier, Anil Kumar Saini, and Lee Spector. 2019. Lexicase Selection Beyond Genetic Programming. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVI*, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Lee Spector, and Leigh Sheneman (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 123–136. [https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-030-04735-1\\_7](https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-030-04735-1_7)
- [41] Jared M. Moore and Adam Stanton. 2017. Lexicase selection outperforms previous strategies for incremental evolution of virtual creature controllers. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth European Conference Artificial Life, ECAL 2017, Lyon, France, September 4-8, 2017*, Carole Knibbe, Guillaume Beslon, David P. Parsons, Dusan Misevic, Jonathan Rouzaud-Cornabas, Nicolas Bredèche, Salima Hassas, Olivier Simonin 0001, and Hédi Soula (Eds.). MIT Press, 290–297. <http://cognet.mit.edu/journal/ecal2017>
- [42] Peter Nordin and Wolfgang Banzhaf. 1997. An On-Line Method to Evolve Behavior and to Control a Miniature Robot in Real Time with Genetic Programming. *Adaptive Behavior* 5, 2 (Jan. 1997), 107–140. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1177/105971239700500201>
- [43] Patryk Orzechowski, William La Cava, and Jason H. Moore. 2018. Where are we now? a large benchmark study of recent symbolic regression methods. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, Kyoto Japan, 1183–1190. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/3205455.3205539>
- [44] Brian J Ross. 1999. *The Effects of Randomly Sampled Training Data on Program Evolution*. Technical Report CS-99-03. Dept. of Computer Science, Brock University, Canada.
- [45] Dirk Schweim, Dominik Sobania, and Franz Rothlauf. 2022. Effects of the Training Set Size: A Comparison of Standard and Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection in Program Synthesis. In *2022 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1109/CEC55065.2022.9870337>
- [46] Shakiba Shahbandegan, Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, and Emily Dolson. 2022. Untangling phylogenetic diversity’s role in evolutionary computation using a suite of diagnostic fitness landscapes. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. ACM, Boston Massachusetts, 2322–2325. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/3520304.3534028>
- [47] Dominik Sobania, Dirk Schweim, and Franz Rothlauf. 2022. A comprehensive survey on program synthesis with evolutionary algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* (2022).
- [48] Lee Spector. 2001. Autoconstructive Evolution: Push, PushGP, and Pushpop. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO-2001)*, Lee Spector, Erik D. Goodman, Annie Wu, W. B. Langdon, Hans-Michael Voigt, Mitsuo Gen, Sandip Sen, Marco Dorigo, Shahram Pezeshk, Max H. Garzon, and Edmund Burke (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, California, USA, 137–146. <http://hampshire.edu/lspector/pubs/ace.pdf>
- [49] Lee Spector. 2012. Assessment of Problem Modality by Differential Performance of Lexicase Selection in Genetic Programming: A Preliminary Report. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference Companion on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA) (GECCO '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 401–408. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/2330784.2330846>
- [50] Lee Spector, Jon Klein, and Maarten Keijzer. 2005. The Push3 Execution Stack and the Evolution of Control. In *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Washington DC, USA) (GECCO '05)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1689–1696. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1145/1068009.1068292>
- [51] Lee Spector and Alan Robinson. 2002. Genetic Programming and Autoconstructive Evolution with the Push Programming Language. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 3, 1 (March 2002), 7–40. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1023/A:1014538503543>



- [52] Adam Stanton and Jared M. Moore. 2022. Lexicase Selection for Multi-Task Evolutionary Robotics. *Artificial Life* 28, 4 (Nov. 2022), 479–498. [https://doi.org/10.1162/artl\\_a\\_00374](https://doi.org/10.1162/artl_a_00374) \_eprint: [https://direct.mit.edu/artl/article-pdf/28/4/479/2043352/artl\\_a\\_00374.pdf](https://direct.mit.edu/artl/article-pdf/28/4/479/2043352/artl_a_00374.pdf).
- [53] Xuyang Yan, Mohammad Razeghi-Jahromi, Abdollah Homaifar, Berat A. Erol, Abenezzer Girma, and Edward Tunstel. 2019. A Novel Streaming Data Clustering Algorithm Based on Fitness Proportionate Sharing. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 184985–185000. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2922162>
- [54] Jinghui Zhong, Xiaomin Hu, Jun Zhang, and Min Gu. 2005. Comparison of Performance between Different Selection Strategies on Simple Genetic Algorithms., Vol. 2. 1115–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CIMCA.2005.1631619>