

Solving Expensive Optimization Problems in Dynamic Environments with Meta-learning*

Huan Zhang¹, Jinliang Ding¹, Liang Feng², Kay Chen Tan³ and Ke Li⁴

¹State Key Laboratory of Synthetical Automation for Process Industries, Northeastern University, Shenyang, 110819, China

²College of Computer Science, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, China

³Department of Computing, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR

⁴Department of Computer Science, University of Exeter, EX4 4QF, Exeter, UK

*Email: huanzhang0320@163.com

Abstract: Dynamic environments pose great challenges for expensive optimization problems, as the objective functions of these problems change over time and thus require remarkable computational resources to track the optimal solutions. Although data-driven evolutionary optimization and Bayesian optimization (BO) approaches have shown promise in solving expensive optimization problems in static environments, the attempts to develop such approaches in dynamic environments remain rarely unexplored. In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective meta-learning-based optimization framework for solving expensive dynamic optimization problems. This framework is flexible, allowing any off-the-shelf continuously differentiable surrogate model to be used in a plug-in manner, either in data-driven evolutionary optimization or BO approaches. In particular, the framework consists of two unique components: 1) the meta-learning component, in which a gradient-based meta-learning approach is adopted to learn experience (effective model parameters) across different dynamics along the optimization process. 2) the adaptation component, where the learned experience (model parameters) is used as the initial parameters for fast adaptation in the dynamic environment based on few shot samples. By doing so, the optimization process is able to quickly initiate the search in a new environment within a strictly restricted computational budget. Experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm framework compared to several state-of-the-art algorithms on common benchmark test problems under different dynamic characteristics.

Keywords: Expensive dynamic optimization, Meta-learning, Few-shot learning, Data-driven evolutionary optimization, Bayesian optimization

1 Introduction

Real-world expensive optimization problems are challenging and complex. This is not only due to their non-convex and multi-objective nature but also being susceptible to a range of environmental uncertainties. Among the uncertainties, dynamic optimization problems (DOPs) emerge as prevalent scenarios where the objective function(s) or constraints change over time. Typical instances of DOPs include dynamic job shop scheduling [1, 2], path planning [3, 4], and dynamic economic dispatch problem [5].

Evolutionary algorithms (EAs) have gained widespread recognition as highly effective tools for tackling DOPs owing to their population-based nature and inherent self-adaptability [6, 7]. However, the computational cost of the objective function evaluations (FEs) is assumed to be cheap or trivial in most EAs. Consequently, it is common for an EA to spend tens of thousands or more FEs even in a single optimization procedure. Unfortunately, this assumption fails to hold in practical optimization scenarios where FEs are expensive to evaluate, either economically or computationally, which is recognized as expensive optimization. The challenge of solving such problems becomes even more

*This manuscript is submitted for potential publication. Reviewers can use this version in peer review.

pronounced when the optimization environment undergoes dynamic changes over time. This issue is pervasive across various real-world application domains, such as airfoil design [8], trauma systems design [9], and blast furnace optimization [10].

In the literature, data-driven evolutionary optimization¹ [12] and Bayesian optimization (BO) [13] are two widely adopted techniques for solving expensive optimization problems. Both approaches heavily rely on surrogate modeling, which is responsible for approximating the objective function and predicting the fitness of candidate solutions. By incorporating a surrogate model, the search process for subsequent optimization will be guided. In particular, EAs search the candidate solutions based on the predictions of the surrogate model in the data-driven evolutionary optimization approaches, while in BO, an acquisition function is considered to balance the exploitation and exploration over the surrogate landscape.

Despite extensive research studies have been conducted on data-driven evolutionary optimization and BO for solving static objective function(s) in continuous domains [14–16], it is worth noting that there is a lack of approaches specifically tailored for solving expensive DOPs. This gap could be due to two critical challenges. The first challenge arises from the dynamic nature of environments and the changing problem landscapes. When the environment changes, simply restarting the optimization from scratch poses significant difficulties in tracking the shifting optima over time. The second challenge stems from the limited data availability in the expensive optimization scenario. Due to computational constraints, only a limited number of training samples can be obtained at each time step, along with restricted historical data. Consequently, effectively utilizing the limited data to facilitate the search process in a new environment becomes a great challenge.

Meta-learning [17, 18], also known as ‘learning to learn’, has been extensively studied in many machine learning tasks, such as neural architecture search [19, 20] and hyperparameter optimization [21, 22]. By leveraging prior knowledge, meta-learning is able to enhance the adaptability of learning in new tasks. It offers a promising approach to mitigate the challenge of expensive optimization problems in dynamic environments. In particular, meta-learning equips models with the ability to learn domain-specific features from related tasks, thus facilitating the task-solving process of a new task. This concept holds promise for application in dynamic optimization, as there exist potential patterns in DOPs across different environments [6, 23]. Moreover, meta-learning can be executed as few-shot learning, extracting effective features from a limited sample size, which aligns with the expensive optimization scenarios well. To the best of our knowledge, there are no existing studies reported in the literature considering meta-learning to improve the optimization performance of expensive DOPs.

Bearing the above in mind, this paper proposes a novel meta-learning-based optimization framework called MLO, specifically designed to address the challenges posed by expensive dynamic optimization problems. The key contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- To overcome the challenge of changing problem landscapes caused by the dynamic environments, we employ a meta-learning mechanism to learn effective initial parameters for the surrogate model whenever an environmental change is detected, resulting in a strategic initiation at the outset of the new environment.
- To address the difficulty of working with limited data brought by a restricted computational budget, our framework is designed under the scenario of few-shot learning problems. Meta-learning empowers us to effectively extract domain-specific features from a limited quantity of samples.
- The proposed algorithm is high flexibility in incorporating existing optimization solvers. Firstly, it can be combined with both evolutionary optimization and BO approaches, resulting in meta-learning-based data-driven evolutionary optimization (referred to as MLDDBO) and meta-learning-based Bayesian optimization (referred to as MLBO), respectively. Secondly, the framework is compatible with any continuously differentiable surrogate model.
- In the empirical study, the proposed framework generates seven algorithm instances by combining two optimization mechanisms, two surrogate models, and three baseline EAs. Through rigorous

¹In the literature, this concept is interchangeably referred to as ‘surrogate-assisted EAs’ (SAEAs) [11].

empirical studies conducted on benchmark problems with diverse dynamic characteristics, we demonstrate the superiority of the proposed algorithms against state-of-the-art peer algorithms in terms of the effectiveness of the solution quality, the efficiency of the number of FEs, and flexibility.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the necessary background of this study and then presents an overview of the existing related work. Section 3 gives the technical details of the proposed algorithm. The experimental setup is given in Section 4 and the experimental results and analyses are provided in Section 5. Lastly, Section 6 draws the conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

This section begins with the problem definition of expensive DOP. Next, we present a literature review of expensive dynamic optimization and introduce the concept of meta-learning.

2.1 Problem Definition

According to [24], the mathematical form of expensive DOP considered in this paper is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && f(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T \in \Omega$ is a decision vector, $\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^n [l_i, u_i] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the decision space where l_i and u_i represent the lower and upper bounds of the i -th dimension, respectively. $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ is a discrete time step and $T > 1$ refers to the number of time steps. It is important to note that the fitness function f is computationally intensive and subject to changes over time t . As a result, the landscapes of the function, as well as the positions of the local and global optima, may fluctuate dynamically. In this dynamic context, the goal of computationally expensive optimization is to monitor the changing optimum at each time step with a strictly restricted computational budget.

2.2 Related Work

BO and data-driven evolutionary optimization are two extensively adopted techniques for tackling expensive optimization problems. While considerable progress has been made to solve static expensive problems, there have been relatively few studies exploring their applicability in dynamic environments. This subsection provides an overview of related work for solving expensive DOPs, including BO and data-driven evolutionary optimization approaches.

In the field of BO, Kushner [25] proposed the use of a stochastic process to model a dynamically changing function. However, only one-dimensional problem was considered, which greatly limits the application in practical scenarios. Morales-Enciso and Branke [26] applied the efficient global optimization [27] framework to propose eight strategies for handling expensive DOPs. The first four are straightforward and simple strategies while the last four are designed to transfer and reuse previous information within the underlying problem-solving process. Moreover, Richter *et al.* [28] developed two practical approaches using BO to optimize expensive DOPs. In particular, one is the window approach which selects the most recent samples to train the surrogate model, and the second is the time-as-covariate approach that incorporates the time into the covariance function to learn the influence of time. In [29], a transfer learning strategy was proposed to empower BO for solving expensive DOPs. It applies a multi-output Gaussian process (MOGP) model that measures the relationship between the historical and current samples. In addition, to alleviate the soaring computational cost, a decay mechanism is designed to discard less irrelevant samples. This relies on the assumption that the samples collected from earlier time steps can be less informative than recent ones. Subsequently, in [24], the authors proposed a hierarchical MOGP surrogate model for knowledge transfer and cost-efficiency optimization. Furthermore, this approach incorporates an adaptive source task selection mechanism and a customized warm-start initialization strategy to further enhance the effectiveness of knowledge transfer.

In the domain of data-driven evolutionary optimization, Luo *et al.* [30] investigated the performance of different SAEAs in solving data-driven dynamic optimization. This method starts with storing elite solutions obtained from previously optimized environments, which are subsequently clustered to construct surrogate models. Based on this, two variants of particle swarm optimization with memory are developed to address DOPs. In [31] and [32], the multipopulation technique was employed to solve expensive dynamic optimization. In particular, Liu *et al.* [31] designed a surrogate-assisted clustering particle swarm optimizer. The affinity propagation clustering method is first applied to create several clusters. Then, local radial basis function surrogates are built in each cluster to assist the particle swarm optimizer. In response to environmental changes, the best-fitness points in each cluster are incorporated into the new cradle swarm. Zhao *et al.* [32] proposed a SAEA based on multi-population clustering and prediction. Three strategies were employed: clustering and differential prediction for initial population selection, multi-population strategies for sample point generation in the surrogate model, and replacing high and low confidence samples in the Co-kriging model with samples from the previous strategy. Yang *et al.* [33] developed a data stream ensemble-assisted multifactorial EA for offline data-driven dynamic optimization. This approach employs ensemble learning to train surrogate models in each dynamic environment. Then, the ensemble surrogate model and the basic learners are simultaneously optimized via multifactorial EAs. Liu *et al.* [34] proposed a surrogate-assisted differential evolution with a knowledge transfer approach to address the expensive incremental optimization problem, a type of expensive dynamic optimization problem. In this study, a surrogate-based hybrid knowledge transfer strategy is designed to reuse the knowledge. Furthermore, a two-level surrogate-assisted evolutionary search is proposed to search for the optimum. In addition, some SAEAs have been developed for expensive dynamic multi-objective optimization problems [35–37].

In summary, the primary challenges in solving expensive DOPs could be summarized into two key aspects. One challenge stems from the dynamic changing environments. When the environment changes, simply restarting the optimization process from scratch presents considerable difficulties in tracking the time-varying optima. The other challenge arises from the scarcity of available data. Owing to computational constraints, effectively leveraging the limited data to promote the search process in the new environment becomes a main obstacle. Despite the success obtained by the approaches reviewed above, it is worth noting that most existing methods assume that data collected from earlier time steps is less informative than more recent data. This oversight may lead to the neglect of valuable information due to the presence of potential patterns in a DOP across different environments.

2.3 Meta-learning

Meta-learning, a rapidly growing research field in machine learning, focuses on developing algorithms that enable models to learn how to learn. Meta-learning has been successfully applied in many problems such as robotics [17, 38], learning optimizers [39, 40], the cold-start problem in collaborative filtering [41], and guiding policies by natural language [42]. Readers interested in meta-learning can refer to [18, 43] for a more comprehensive introduction.

Recently, some studies have attempted to adopt meta-learning methods to ‘warm starting’ the optimization process through acquisition function [22, 44], weighted surrogate models ensembles [21, 45], either implemented meta-features [46], or deep kernel [47]. From these, we can see that the meta-learning mechanism holds the potential to effectively mitigate the challenges posed by expensive DOPs. This can be attributed to the following reasons. In meta-learning approaches, a meta-learner is trained to extract domain-specific features across related tasks, even from a small number of samples. Subsequently, these domain-specific features are adopted to improve the performance in solving the new task. This will facilitate the extraction of features across different environments along the optimization process, thereby assisting in tracking time-varying optima within a limited computational budget. With the above in mind, in this paper, we thus propose to leverage the power of meta-learning to address expensive DOPs.




Figure 1: Flowchart of our proposed meta-learning-based optimization approach for expensive dynamic optimization.

3 Proposed Algorithm

In this section, the details of the proposed meta-learning-based approach for solving expensive DOPs are presented. In expensive DOPs, the problem changes over time, thus involving multiple time steps (or environments). The challenge of solving the expensive DOPs is to track the time-varying optimum under a limited computational budget at each time step. Here, we propose to address the expensive DOPs at the current time step by utilizing experience gained from previous time steps.

In particular, the problem-solving process of an expensive DOP in each new environment is considered a few-shot learning problem [48, 49]. The few-shot learning problem involves multiple related tasks, each with two subsets: a support set for training the model and a query set for evaluating the model’s performance. After learning from these related tasks, the goal is to estimate labels or values for a query set when given a support set from a new task. This problem is known as a ‘few-shot learning problem’ due to the limited number of samples used for both training and new tasks. Here, expensive DOPs in different time steps are treated as different tasks. Formally, given an expensive DOP, when the environment changes, previously optimized problems are denoted as related tasks $\{T_r\}_{r=0}^{t-1}$. The observations gathered from previous time steps are denoted as sets $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_r\}_{r=0}^{t-1}$. The expensive DOP to be solved in the new environment at time step t is considered the new task T_t . The observations obtained at the current time step constitute set \mathcal{D}_t . In what follows, we will present the details of the algorithm framework and the two main ingredients, which are the **meta-learning** component and the **adaptation** component.

3.1 Overall Algorithm Framework

In this paper, the proposed framework is highly flexible, enabling us to embed the meta-learning in both evolutionary optimization and BO, which are meta-learning-based data-driven evolutionary optimization (called MLDDEO) and meta-learning-based Bayesian optimization (called MLBO), respectively. In contrast to conventional data-driven evolutionary optimization and BO approaches, the proposed framework leverages meta-learning to efficiently initiate the optimization process when the environment changes. A diagram of the proposed meta-learning-based optimization approach is depicted in Fig. 1. The proposed framework comprises two primary components: 1) meta-learning component and 2) adaptation component. The meta-learning part extracts the domain-specific features from previously optimized tasks to generate initial model parameters θ^{ml} for the surrogate model in the new environment at time step t , in both data-driven evolutionary optimization and BO. In the adaptation part, the surrogate model is adapted to update task-specific parameters using both the learned initial model parameters θ^{ml} and the sampled initial dataset \mathcal{D}_t . Note that any continuously differentiable surrogate model can be integrated into the proposed framework, and any existing EA can serve as the optimizer in MLDDEO. In this paper, we apply well-known Gaussian process regression (GPR) [50] and neural network (NN) [51] as surrogate models, along with common EAs such as covariance matrix adaptation evolution strategy (CMA-ES) [52], particle swarm optimization (PSO) [53], and differential evolution (DE) [54]. The pseudo codes of MLDDEO and MLBO are given in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively. More details of the important steps are summarized below:

Algorithm 1: MLDDEO

Input: DOP, $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$; initial population size, N ; initial training dataset size, N_I ; promising solution(s) size, ξ ; learning rate, α , β

Output: Optima found at all time steps, \mathcal{X}^*

- 1 Initialize $t = 0$, $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{X}^* = \emptyset$;
- 2 Initialize surrogate model parameters θ^0 , θ^{ml} ;
- 3 Initialize an evolutionary parent population $\mathcal{P} = \{(\mathbf{x}^i, t)\}_{i=1}^N$;
- 4 Initialize training dataset for the surrogate model $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{((\mathbf{x}^i, t), f((\mathbf{x}^i, t), t))\}_{i=1}^{N_I}$;
- 5 Set the number of function evaluations $N_t \leftarrow N_I$;
- 6 **while** *termination criteria is not met* **do**
- 7 **if** *Change detected* **then**
- 8 $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_t$;
- 9 $\mathcal{X}^* = \mathcal{X}^* \cup \{\arg \min_{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{D}_t} f((\mathbf{x}, t), t)\}$;
- 10 $t = t + 1$;
- 11 $\theta^{ml} = \text{Meta-learning}(\mathcal{D}, \alpha, \beta)$;
- 12 Sample N_I initial training dataset for the new environment $\mathcal{D}_t = \{((\mathbf{x}^i, t), f((\mathbf{x}^i, t), t))\}_{i=1}^{N_I}$;
- 13 Initialize an evolutionary parent population $\mathcal{P} = \{(\mathbf{x}^i, t)\}_{i=1}^N$ for the new environment;
- 14 $\theta^t = \text{Adaptation}(\mathcal{D}_t, \theta^{ml}, \theta^t)$;
- 15 Reproduce an offspring population $\mathcal{Q} = \{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^i, t)\}_{i=1}^N$;
- 16 Identify ξ solution(s) $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$ and evaluate the fitness value(s) of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, $f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t)$;
- 17 $\mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{D}_t \cup \{((\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t), f((\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t), t))\}$;
- 18 $N_t = N_t + \xi$;
- 19 Conduct an environmental selection upon $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$ to select the next parent population \mathcal{P} ;
- 20 **return** \mathcal{X}^* ;

Algorithm 2: MLBO

Input: DOP, $f(\mathbf{x}, t)$; initial training dataset size, N_I ; promising solution(s) size, ξ ; learning rate, α , β

Output: Optima found at all time steps, \mathcal{X}^*

- 1 Initialize $t = 0$, $\mathcal{D} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{X}^* = \emptyset$;
- 2 Initialize surrogate model parameters θ^0 , θ^{ml} ;
- 3 Initialize training dataset for the surrogate model $\mathcal{D}_0 = \{((\mathbf{x}^i, t), f((\mathbf{x}^i, t), t))\}_{i=1}^{N_I}$;
- 4 Set the number of function evaluations $N_t \leftarrow N_I$;
- 5 **while** *termination criteria is not met* **do**
- 6 **if** *Change detected* **then**
- 7 $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}_t$;
- 8 $\mathcal{X}^* = \mathcal{X}^* \cup \{\arg \min_{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathcal{D}_t} f((\mathbf{x}, t), t)\}$;
- 9 $t = t + 1$;
- 10 $\theta^{ml} = \text{Meta-learning}(\mathcal{D}, \alpha, \beta)$;
- 11 Sample N_I initial training dataset for the new environment $\mathcal{D}_t = \{((\mathbf{x}^i, t), f((\mathbf{x}^i, t), t))\}_{i=1}^{N_I}$;
- 12 $\theta^t = \text{Adaptation}(\mathcal{D}_t, \theta^{ml}, \theta^t)$;
- 13 Identify ξ solution(s) $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ in the search space and evaluate the fitness value(s) of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, $f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t)$;
- 14 $\mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{D}_t \cup \{((\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t), f((\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, t), t))\}$;
- 15 $N_t = N_t + \xi$;
- 16 **return** \mathcal{X}^* ;

- Initialization (line 1-4 in MLDDEO and line 1-3 in MLBO): This step involves the surrogate model parameters initialization, the training dataset initialization, and the population initialization².
- Meta-learning (line 11 in MLDDEO and line 10 in MLBO) and adaptation (line 15 in MLDDEO and line 13 in MLBO): The **meta-learning** component is the process of learning experience θ^{ml} and the **adaptation** component is responsible for the use of the learned experience θ^{ml} .

²The population initialization is present in MLDDEO but absent in MLBO.

- Identify solution(s) (line 17 in MLDDEO and line 14 in MLBO): This step aims to pick up $\xi \geq 1$ promising solutions and evaluate them by using the fitness function. These newly evaluated solutions are then used to update the training dataset \mathcal{D}_t for the next iteration (line 18 in MLDDEO and line 15 in MLBO). In the proposed framework, the methods of selecting solutions in MLDDEO and MLBO are different. In MLBO, the optimization of an acquisition function across the entire search space is performed to identify the optimal solution. In MLDDEO, one or more solutions are selected from both the parent and offspring populations of the current generation, depending on the surrogate model employed. Specifically, when using a GPR as the surrogate model, the solution with the optimal acquisition function value is selected. In the case of utilizing an NN as the surrogate model, a batch of top ξ solutions predicted using NN is selected.

Remark 1. *Our proposed framework offers a high degree of flexibility. Firstly, it can be combined with both evolutionary optimization and BO approaches. Secondly, it can be seamlessly integrated with any continuously differentiable surrogate model, allowing for compatibility with a wide range of models. Moreover, any existing EA can be employed as the optimizer within the framework of MLDDEO.*

3.2 Gradient-based Meta-learning for Surrogate Modeling

Parameter optimization is vital in the surrogate modeling [16, 55]. It is widely recognized that the configuration of initial parameters significantly influences the outcome of parameter optimization. In the conventional data-driven evolutionary optimization and BO approaches, the initial parameters are typically determined using rules of thumb or randomly generated by an experimental design method. However, considering the potential relevant patterns of a DOP across different environments, valuable information can be collected from previously optimized problems [6, 23]. The effective utilization of this knowledge can facilitate the process of surrogate modeling for a new environment. In addition, this becomes crucial when considering an expensive optimization scenario, where the computational budget is severely restricted at each time step. To address the above issue, this section elaborates on a gradient-based meta-learning approach [17] for surrogate modeling to learn experience from previously optimized time steps of an expensive DOP.

Whenever an environment changes, we employ the **meta-learning** component to leverage historical data to learn good initial model parameters for the new environment. This component encompasses both inner optimization and outer optimization. In a nutshell, the inner optimization aims to quickly adjust the model parameters to fit the requirements of the problem at each time step, while the outer optimization focuses on learning shared patterns among the problems at different time steps to obtain domain-specific parameters. The working strategy of the **meta-learning** component is given in Algorithm 3. First, m time steps are randomly sampled from all previously optimized time steps $\{T_r\}_{r=0}^{t-1}$ (line 3), each of which contains K observations randomly drawn from the corresponding dataset to constitute the support set $\mathcal{D}_i^s = \{x_i^k, f_i(x_i^k)\}_{k=1}^K$ (line 5) and query set $\mathcal{D}_i^q = \{x_i^k, f_i(x_i^k)\}_{k=1}^K$ (line 8), $i \in 1, \dots, m$, $k \in 1, \dots, K$, respectively. In the inner optimization, the parameters θ of the surrogate model are computed using one gradient update (line 7):

$$\theta'_i = \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^s), \quad (2)$$

where α is the inner-loop learning rate and $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^s)$ is the gradient of the loss function in regard to the support set \mathcal{D}_i^s .

In the outer optimization, the model parameters can be updated by optimizing the meta-loss function of θ'_i with respect to θ across the query sets \mathcal{D}_i^q defined as (line 11):

$$\mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, \mathcal{D}_b^q) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{L}(\theta'_i, \mathcal{D}_i^q), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, \mathcal{D}_b^q)$ is the loss of the b -th batch.

Accordingly, the parameters θ are updated in the outer optimization using the meta-optimizer (line 12). For example, if the gradient descent is used as the meta-optimizer, the model parameters θ are updated, which is given by:

$$\theta = \theta - \beta \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, \mathcal{D}_b^q), \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 3: Gradient-based Meta-learning for Surrogate Modeling

Input: Meta training dataset, \mathcal{D} , learning rate, α , β **Output:** Model parameters θ^{ml}

```

1 Initialize model parameters  $\theta$ ;
2 while termination criteria is not met do
3   Sample batch of time steps  $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^m$  from all previously optimized time steps  $\{T_r\}_{r=0}^{t-1}$ ;
4   for all  $T_i$  do
5     Sample support set  $\mathcal{D}_i^s$  from the dataset of  $T_i$ ;
6     Compute loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^s)$  according to the surrogate model used;
7     Compute the  $\theta'_i$  with gradient descent in equation (2);
8     Sample query set  $\mathcal{D}_i^q$  from the dataset of  $T_i$ ;
9     Compute loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta'_i, \mathcal{D}_i^q)$  according to the surrogate model used;
10    Compute meta-loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, \mathcal{D}_b^q)$  in equation (3);
11    Update  $\theta$  using meta-optimizer with respect to  $\theta$  in equation (4);
12   $\theta^{ml} = \theta$ ;
13 return  $\theta^{ml}$ ;
```

where β is the outer-loop learning rate. The termination criteria in the **meta-learning** component can be either reaching a fixed number of epochs or achieving convergence of model parameters and loss function (line 2). Finally, θ is assigned to θ^{ml} as the output (line 14), which serves as the initial model parameters of the surrogate model for the new environment. Note that when different surrogate models are applied in the **meta-learning** component, we directly employ the corresponding loss function to replace the loss function in line 6 and line 9 of Algorithm 3. For example, the loss function of GPR is considered as maximizing the log marginal likelihood [50]. For NN, the minimum mean-squared error [56] is used as the loss function.

Remark 2. *The meta-learning component is capable of learning the experience from the previously optimized time steps of an expensive DOP when a change occurs. This enables the optimization process to be efficiently initiated in the new environment, facilitating adaptation to the dynamic changing environment.*

3.3 Adaptation for new environment

In general, the experience learned by the **meta-learning** component, denoted as θ^{ml} , represents the domain-specific features of the related tasks. To optimize a new task, the surrogate model needs to update the task-specific parameters with the guidance of θ^{ml} . Bearing this consideration in mind, we develop a **adaptation** component to carry out this process.

The algorithmic implementation of the **adaptation** component is shown in Algorithm 4. It contains the following steps. Firstly, the inputs of the **adaptation** component include the dataset \mathcal{D}_t sampled from the new task T_t , the experience θ^{ml} obtained from the **meta-learning** component, and the current surrogate model parameters θ^t . If a change is detected, the surrogate model parameters θ^t of the new task T_t are initialized with experience θ^{ml} (line 1-3); otherwise, the current model parameters will be retained. Last but not least, the surrogate model is updated using the parameters θ^t and the dataset \mathcal{D}_t (lines 5-6). For the sake of algorithmic rationality, the optimizer employed for updating the surrogate model in the **adaptation** component is consistent with the meta-optimizer utilized in the **meta-learning** component. The termination criteria is to reach the convergence condition of the adopted optimizer, such as reaching the maximum number of iterations or achieving the predetermined error requirement (line 4).

3.4 Analysis of Computational Complexity

The computational complexity of the **meta-learning** component is determined by the number of tasks, epochs, and the complexity of the surrogate model. For GPR, the computational complexity of the **meta-learning** component can be expressed as $\mathcal{O}(I_{ml}mK^3)$. Here, I_{ml} is the number of epochs of

Algorithm 4: Adaptation

Input: A dataset sampled from new task T_t, \mathcal{D}_t ; surrogate model parameters obtained from meta-learning, θ^{ml} ; current surrogate model parameters, θ^t

Output: Updated surrogate model parameters, θ^t

- 1 **if** *Change detected* **then**
- 2 $\theta^t = \theta^{ml}$;
- 3 **while** *termination criteria is not met* **do**
- 4 Compute the loss function according to the surrogate model used based on θ^t and \mathcal{D}_t ;
- 5 Update θ^t using the optimizer;
- 6 **return** θ^t ;

meta-learning component, m is the number of tasks per epoch, and K is the size of the support set and the query set. For NN, the computational complexity of the meta-learning component can be expressed as $\mathcal{O}(I_{ml}LN_e^2mK)$. Here, L represents the number of layers, and N_e represents the number of neurons per layer.

The computational complexity of data-driven evolutionary optimization depends on the surrogate model and the corresponding baseline EA. The training complexities of the GPR and NN models are $\mathcal{O}(N_t^3)$ and $\mathcal{O}(LN_e^2N_t)$, respectively. Here, N_t represents the number of training points in the surrogate model. The evaluation complexity of SACMA-ES with UCB is $\mathcal{O}(N_t n)$, where n is the number of dimensions in the search space. The evaluation complexity of SAPSO and SADE with UCB is $\mathcal{O}(NN_t)$, where N is the population size. Therefore, the overall computational complexity of SACMA-ES, SAPSO, and SADE is primarily determined by the model training process. Using GPR, the computational complexity is $\mathcal{O}(I_{eo}N_t^3)$, while using NN, it is $\mathcal{O}(I_{eo}LN_e^2N_t)$, where I_{eo} represents the number of iterations of the data-driven evolutionary optimization approach.

The computational complexity of BO is determined by both GPR training and the acquisition function optimization. Typically, the computational complexity of training of the GPR model is still $\mathcal{O}(N_t^3)$. For the UCB used in this study, the computational complexity of optimizing the acquisition function is $\mathcal{O}(nN_t^2)$ with N_t data points and n dimensions. The computational complexity of BO is typically $\mathcal{O}(I_{BO}N_t^3)$, where I_{BO} is the number of iterations of BO.

In summary, the overall computational complexity of the proposed algorithm framework can be categorized into the following three cases: 1) The complexity of MLBO is $\mathcal{O}(I_{ml}mK^3) + \mathcal{O}(I_{BO}N_t^3)$. 2) The complexity of MLDDEO with GPR as the surrogate model is $\mathcal{O}(I_{ml}mK^3) + \mathcal{O}(I_{eo}N_t^3)$. 3) The complexity of MLDDEO with NN as the surrogate model is $\mathcal{O}(I_{ml}LN_e^2mK) + \mathcal{O}(I_{eo}LN_e^2N_t)$. In terms of complexity, the computational complexity of the proposed framework is significantly influenced by the surrogate model, and the GPR model entails a higher complexity compared to the NN considered in this paper.

4 Experimental Setup

The experimental setup is presented in this section, including benchmark test problems, peer algorithms, performance metrics, statistical test methods, and parameter settings.

4.1 Benchmark Problems and Peer Algorithms

According to [57,58], we consider the moving peaks benchmark (MPB) [59] in this empirical study, the most widely used synthetic problem in the DOP field. The problem in this benchmark consists of a landscape with a definable quantity of peaks. When the environment changes, the height, width, and location of each peak are varied. MPB can generate scalable objective functions with a configurable number of peaks. Each peak is capable of being the global optimum at the current environment. The mathematical definition of MPB is described in Appendix A of the supplemental material due to the page limitation.

To validate the performance of the proposed algorithms, five data-driven optimization algorithms and three evolutionary optimization algorithms are considered for comparison, including DIN [26],

MBO [28], TBO [29], restart BO (RBO), vanilla BO (CBO), and restart data-driven evolutionary optimization (RDDEO). Among them, RBO, CBO, and RDDEO are variants of the proposed algorithm in this paper. In particular, RBO and RDDEO are dynamic versions of BO and DDEO with a random reinitialization strategy, that is, restart the optimization process from scratch if the change occurs. This paper applies three iconic EAs, i.e., CMA-ES [52], PSO [53], and DE [54]. Accordingly, there are three SAEAs, i.e., SACMA-ES, SAPSO, and SADE. In CBO, it neglects the dynamic characteristics of DOP and instead employs all data collected so far to train the surrogate model. The working mechanisms of other peer algorithms can be found in Appendix A of the supplemental material.

4.2 Performance Metrics and Statistical Tests

In the experimental studies, we adopt two performance metrics to evaluate the performance of different algorithms.

1) *Best error before change* (E_{BBC}) [60]: it is commonly used performance metric in the field [61]. E_{BBC} calculates the last error at the end of each environment.

$$E_{BBC} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T [f(\mathbf{x}^*, t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*, t)], \quad (5)$$

where T is the number of environments, (\mathbf{x}^*, t) is the global optimum at the t -th environment, (\mathbf{x}^*, t) is the best found solution at the end of the t -th environment.

2) *Budget ratio* (ρ_c) [24]: it assesses the ratio of the computational budget required between the best algorithm and a peer algorithm at each time step.

$$\rho_c = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{N_{FE}^t}{\tilde{N}_{FE}^{t*}}, \quad (6)$$

where \tilde{N}_{FE}^{t*} represents the number of FEs required by the best algorithm at the t -th time step to achieve its best solution found $f(\tilde{x}^*, t)$. N_{FE}^t is the number of FEs consumed by one of the other comparative algorithms to obtain the same solution. In practice, $\rho_c \geq 1$ and the larger ρ_c becomes, the poorer the performance of the corresponding peer algorithm.

To obtain a statistical interpretation of the significance between comparison results, three statistical measures are applied in our empirical study, including Wilcoxon signed-rank test [62], Scott-Knott test [63], and A_{12} effect size [64]. The basic idea of three statistical measures is provided in Appendix A of the supplemental material due to space limitations.

4.3 Parameter Settings

In our empirical study, the parameters for the compared algorithms are kept the same as in the published papers. Some key parameters are listed below.

1) *Settings of computational budget*: In our experiment, the total number of FEs is fixed, and the number of FEs per environment (N_{FE}^t) is also limited. For fairness, the initial sampling size is set to $4 \times n$ and the maximum number of FEs is set to $5 \times n$ for all algorithms. When calculating ρ_c , the number of FEs per environment can reach up to $7 \times N_{FE}^t$, regardless of whether the corresponding comparative algorithm acquires $f(\tilde{x}^*, t)$. Once the maximum number of FEs per environment is reached, the environment changes. The experiment terminates when the total computational cost is exhausted.

2) *Settings of test problems*: The parameters for the MPB problem are given in Table I of the supplementary material.

3) *Settings of meta-learning*: The number of few-shot samples is set as $K = 5$. The inner-loop learning rate is set as $\alpha = 0.01$ by referring to [17]. The learning rate in the meta-optimizer (outer-loop learning rate) is also set as $\beta = 0.01$.

4) *Settings of surrogate models*: We use the Python packages GPy [65] and scikit-learn [66] to implement GPR and NN, respectively. For GPR, the initial model parameters are set to their default

values in GPy: $l = 1$, $\sigma_f^2 = 1$, and $\sigma_n^2 = 0.01$. For NN, we implement a model with three hidden layers of size 40 and ReLU nonlinearities using the suggested hyperparameters in scikit-learn. Additionally, a batch size of $\xi = 5$ is used when selecting promising solutions for NN.

5) *Settings of acquisition function*: The upper confidence bound (UCB) [67] is employed as the acquisition function in this paper. It is implemented by the Python packages GPyOpt [68]. The parameter w for UCB is set to 2, consistent with the default setting in GPyOpt.

6) *Number of decision variables*: The number of decision variables is set as $n \in \{4, 6, 8, 10\}$.

7) *Number of environments*: There are 10 changes (environments) for each run in our experiment.

8) *Number of repeated runs*: Each algorithm performs 20 times independently with different random seeds.

5 Empirical Results

In this section, we provide a comprehensive study of the proposed framework by investigating the following concerns ³: 1) the effectiveness of the solution quality and the efficiency of the number of FEs of the proposed algorithm, 2) how does the proposed algorithm work? 3) sensitivity study of the algorithm parameters.

5.1 Effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed algorithm

In this subsection, we investigate the performance of the proposed framework MLO against the state-of-the-art algorithms. To answer concern 1, the experimental results are analyzed in four parts, i.e., Wilcoxon signed-rank test, loss function curves, Scott-Knott test, and A_{12} effect size.

Based on the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, the statistical comparison results of E_{BBC} values are shown in Table II and III in Appendix B of the supplementary material. From these results, it is evident that the proposed algorithm instances perform significantly better in E_{BBC} metric than the other peer algorithms in all comparisons.

To intuitively assess the solutions obtained by each algorithm during the evolutionary process, we record the loss function defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, t) = f(\mathbf{x}^*, t) - f(\mathbf{x}^*, t), \quad (7)$$

where (\mathbf{x}^*, t) represents the best solution discovered at the corresponding FE of the t -th environment, (\mathbf{x}^*, t) is the global optimum at the t -th environment. The loss function curves obtained by different algorithms over time are shown in Fig. 2. The complete results are available in Figs. 9 in Appendix B of the supplemental material. From these plots, it evidently shows that MLO obtains solutions with smaller errors from the global optimum than peer algorithms in most time steps at different dimensions. In addition, we can find that the superiority of MLO becomes more pronounced compared to peer algorithms with the increase of dimensionality. In particular, SACMA-ES, SAPSO, SADE, and RBO all restart from scratch, while CBO simply ignores the environmental changes. This makes it difficult for them to adapt to the dynamic environment with a strictly restricted computational budget. MBO claimed to include the time as a covariate and learn the influence of the time. Nevertheless, its performance crashes to almost the same level as RBO when $n = 10$. Both DIN and TBO introduce an improved covariance function to leverage the previous information. However, they assume earlier collected information is less informative for the current environment, resulting in the possibility of overlooking useful information. In contrast, the proposed framework can leverage meta-learning to learn a priori, whether for BO or evolutionary optimization. This enables a rapid initiation of the optimization process in the new environment.

To facilitate a clear analysis of ranking among different algorithms, the Scott-Knott test is employed to partition their metric values into different groups. It will be chaotic to list all ranking results on

³Due to the page limitation, the study in the manuscript is focused on three concerns, while the remaining investigations are provided in Appendix B of the supplementary material. The additional investigations encompass assessing the robustness of the proposed algorithm under varying degrees of environmental changes and exploring the performance of the proposed framework when employing different optimization solvers and surrogate models.




Figure 2: Loss function of the mean errors between the true objective functions and the best objective values along with a confidence level over time at different dimensions with $h_{sev} = 7.0$ and $x_{sev} = 5.0$ when comparing MLDDDEO by using GPR and MLBO with other peer algorithms, respectively.




Figure 3: Box plots of Scott-Knott test ranks of E_{BBC} obtained by the proposed algorithm instances and the corresponding peer algorithms with $h_{sev} = 7.0$ and $x_{sev} = 5.0$ (the smaller rank is, the better performance achieved).

different dimensions among these algorithms. Therefore, all the Scott-Knott test results are pulled together and the distribution and median are presented as box plots in Fig. 3. As shown in Fig. 3, the proposed framework achieves the smallest summation rank across all comparisons both for MLDDDEO and MLBO. It is further confirmed that the proposed algorithm is the best algorithm in the corresponding comparisons.

In addition, we evaluate the A_{12} effect size to compare the proposed algorithm instances with the corresponding peer algorithms under two optimization mechanisms separately. A_{12} is a pairwise performance comparison, all the results are pulled together again and the percentage of the large, medium, small, and equivalent effects size is calculated. The statistical results given in Fig. 4 further validate the remarkable advantage of the proposed framework. Specifically, the percentage of the large effect sizes is all 100% except for the comparison with TBO. Nevertheless, MLBO outperforms TBO by 50% in both large effect size and medium effect size.

To assess the efficiency among different algorithms, we compare the computational budget consumed when each algorithm achieves the same solution. We choose MLBO, MLSADE (GP), and MLSADE (NN) as representative algorithms from each optimization mechanism and surrogate model. The bar chart of ρ_c is shown in Fig. 5. From these plots, we can see that the proposed algorithms obtain smaller values of ρ_c under both optimization mechanisms. This indicates that the proposed algorithms require fewer evaluations compared to the peer algorithms to achieve the same solution. In expensive optimization




Figure 4: Percentage of A_{12} effect size of E_{BBC} with $h_{sev} = 7.0$ and $x_{sev} = 5.0$ when comparing MLDDDEO or MLBO with corresponding state-of-the-art peer algorithms.




Figure 5: Bar chart of ρ_c achieved by MLO and the other comparative algorithms.

scenarios, this significantly conserves computational resources and enhances computational efficiency.


Due to the page limitation, the remaining experimental results of using NN as the surrogate model in response to concern 1 can be found in Appendix B of the supplementary material, further supporting the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm instances.

Response to concern 1: We have the following takeaways from the experiments: 1) In terms of effectiveness, all algorithm instances within the proposed framework have consistently exhibit significantly superior performance against the peer algorithms when given a limited number of evaluations. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the solution quality achieved by the proposed algorithm. 2) Regarding efficiency, all algorithm instances within the framework consume fewer evaluations to obtain the same solution compared to the peer algorithms. In expensive optimization scenarios, this results in substantial conservation of computational resources, thereby enhancing computational efficiency.


5.2 How does the proposed algorithm work?

The empirical study conducted in Section 5.1 has indicated the proposed framework outperforms the state-of-the-art peer algorithms. In this subsection, we aim to discover the driving force that renders the proposed algorithm instances effective. We choose MLBO as the baseline and analyze quantitatively some experimental examples.

We apply MPB with $n = 1$ for better visual interpretation. Based on the characteristics of the MPB problem, we consider the following two scenarios: the global optimum of the true objective functions at adjacent environment 1) locates at the same peak. As shown in Fig. 6 (a), the three peaks at $(t - 1)$ -th time step are at points A , B , and C , corresponding to peaks A' , B' , and C' at t -th time step, respectively. When the environment changes, the global optimum moves from the peak C to the peak C' . 2) jumps from one peak to another. As depicted in Fig. 6 (b), the peaks D , E , and F at $(t - 1)$ -th time step correspond to the peaks D' , E' , and F' at t -th time step, respectively. The global optimum jumps from the peak D to the peak F' after the change occurs. Obviously, the second scenario is more challenging. To address concern 2, we plan to investigate the superiority of MLBO from two aspects, i.e., the effectiveness of the meta-learning component and adaptation component.



(a) Locate at the same peak



(b) Jump from one peak to another

Figure 6: Illustrative example of the global optimum of the true objective functions at adjacent environment under two scenarios.

1) *Effectiveness of the meta-learning component:* We track two measures, average loss over sampled batches (AL_B) and model parameters values for each batch (MP_B), to study the usefulness of the **meta-learning** component. In the GPR model, AL_B that measures the average negative log marginal likelihood over sampled batches in regard to the query set is formulated as

$$AL_B = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, D_b^q) = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{i=1}^m \log p(\mathbf{f}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \theta'_i), \quad (8)$$

where B denotes the number of sampled batches, $\mathcal{L}_{meta}(\theta'_b, D_b^q)$ is the loss of the b -th batch in equation (3) as introduced in Section 3.2, $\log p(\mathbf{f}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \theta'_i)$ is the log marginal likelihood, $\mathbf{f}_i = \{f_i^k\}_{k=1}^K$, $\mathbf{X}_i = \{x_i^k\}_{k=1}^K$. MP_B contains three parameters in the GPR model, i.e., the length-scale l , scale σ_f^2 , and Gaussian noise σ_n^2 .

Let us consider an illustrative example, Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 show the AL_B and MP_B during the **meta-learning** component obtained by MLBO in the two scenarios as shown in Fig. 6, respectively. It is evident that the AL_B gradually decreases until convergence is achieved at the end of the **meta-learning** component in both scenarios. We also find that AL_B in the second scenario requires more sampled batches to reach convergence than in the first scenario. Meanwhile, MP_B is changing in a good direction for the new environment. Specifically, the length-scale increases gradually, the Gaussian noise decreases gradually, the scale does not change much, and they all level off at the end of the meta-learning. By using meta-learning, MLBO is able to learn initial model parameters for the new environment. This is accomplished concretely by optimizing the sum of loss across the query sets over related tasks, as described in equation (3) of Section 3.2. In contrast, the initial model parameters of the other peer algorithms are set as introduced in Section 4.3. Note that for fairness the initial parameters of the meta-learning are also consistent with the other algorithms.

2) *Effectiveness of the adaptation component:* The above study has shown that the meta-learning helps the model learn initial parameters for the new environment. To verify the effectiveness of the learned initial parameters for subsequent **adaptation** component under the two scenarios shown in Fig. 6, we look into the search dynamics of the MLBO and RBO over three new samples through iteratively optimizing the UCB, respectively. As an example shown in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, MLBO can locate the new global optimum more quickly with the same number of sampling. Specifically, regardless of which scenario depicted in Fig. 6, MLBO can locate near the global optimum at the first sampling. Then, MLBO




Figure 7: Illustrative example of the AL_B and MP_B values during the meta-learning component in the first scenario.




Figure 8: Illustrative example of the AL_B and MP_B values during the meta-learning component in the second scenario.




Figure 9: Illustrative example of the search dynamics of MLBO and RBO across three new samples after environmental changes in the first scenario.

probes quickly to the global optimum just at the third sample. This can be explained that utilizing meta-learning to learn effective model parameters enables MLBO to achieve a jump start in the new environment for BO. In contrast, due to the manually given initial parameters, the model in RBO does not fit well in the initial stage, resulting in the first sampling being far from the global optimum. In




Figure 10: Illustrative example of the search dynamics of MLBO and RBO across three new samples after environmental changes in the second scenario.

addition, it is observed that the second scenario makes RBO more struggling during the search stage.

Response to concern 2: We derived the following two insights from the empirical study: 1) Hyperparameter optimization of the surrogate model is a central pillar in the optimization procedure. A larger length-scale value and a smaller Gaussian noise value in a GPR model are helpful for fitting the GPR model. 2) The remarkable superior performance attained by the proposed framework can be attributed to the loss function in equation (3) as introduced in Section 3.2. It helps to learn effective initial model parameters for the new environment. Therefore, each of the proposed algorithm instances can achieve a jump start of optimization.

5.3 Parameter sensitivity study

In the proposed framework, the user needs to specify the few-shot sample size K for the meta-learning component and the batch size ξ for MLDDEO when using NN. To address concern 3, we choose MLBO and MLSACMA-ES using NN as the baseline, respectively. Their performance is empirically investigated under different settings of $K = \{1, 5, 15, 30, 50\}$ and $\xi = \{1, 5, 10\}$.

The statistical results of E_{BBC} values, based on the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, are shown in Table IV in Appendix B of the supplementary material. Additionally, the A_{12} effect size is shown in Fig. 11. These results indicate that in cases where the variable dimension is low, specifically when $n \in 4$, the performance of MLBO with different K is classified as statistically equivalent. In other words, the proposed algorithm instance is not very sensitive to K in the lower dimensionality. In contrast, with the increase of dimensionality, especially when $n \in \{8, 10\}$, reducing K to 1 leads to a significant degradation in the E_{BBC} values and a large classification in effect sizes. Utilizing a small value for K may hinder the opportunity of exploiting previous information, thereby hindering the effectiveness of the meta-learning strategy. As an example depicted in Fig. 12, with $K = 1$, the model parameters in the GPR model (i.e., length-scale l and Gaussian noise σ_n^2) hardly change during the




Figure 11: Percentage of A_{12} effect size of E_{BBC} , when comparing MLBO with the recommended settings (i.e., $K = 5$) against others (i.e., $K = 1, 15, 30, 50$).




Figure 12: Illustrative example of the AL_B and MP_B values during the meta-learning component when $K = 1$.




Figure 13: Percentage of A_{12} effect size of E_{BBC} , when comparing MLSACMA-ES (NN) with the recommended settings (i.e., $\xi = 5$) against others (i.e., $\xi = 1, 10$).




Figure 14: Collected comparisons of CPU wall clock time when using different ξ settings.

meta-learning component. Meanwhile, the AL_B values increase beyond their initial value. In this case, meta-learning does not help the model learn good parameters for the new environment. On the other hand, it will obtain more information when selecting more samples in the meta-learning component by increasing the value of K . Nevertheless, a too large K will increase the risk of overfitting and lead to a degradation of the model’s performance on new task. As the results shown in Table IV in the supplementary material and the A_{12} effect size given in Fig. 11, it is obvious that there is a performance degradation on the 10-th dimension when increasing K to 30 and 50. Based on the above findings, it is advisable to set K as 5.

Table V in Appendix B in the supplementary material and the A_{12} effect size shown in Fig. 13 demonstrate that MLSACMA-ES (NN) with $\xi = 5$ exhibits superior performance compared to $\xi = 1$. Specifically, 25% of the comparisons showed a large effect size, while 75% exhibited a medium effect size. With a restricted number of FEs, a smaller ξ results in more iterations in the proposed framework, making the process more time-consuming. Fig. 14 presents a comparison of CPU time using different ξ values. From this figure, it is evident that MLSACMA-ES (NN) with $\xi = 1$ is slower than that of $\xi = 5$ and $\xi = 10$. However, although increasing ξ speeds up the algorithm by selecting more solutions, it also reduces the resilience of the surrogate model against local optima. This is because the number of iterations available to update the model is decreased. Therefore, a larger ξ does not necessarily improve algorithm performance. As shown in Fig. 13, the comparison results of A_{12} effect size demonstrate that MLSACMA-ES (NN) with $\xi = 5$ is comparable to that of $\xi = 10$, with all differences classified as statistically equivalent. Based on these findings, we recommend setting ξ as 5.

Response to concern 3: We have the following takeaways from the experiments. 1) The proposed algorithm instances are not very sensitive to the number of few-shot samples size K in the lower dimensionality. 2) Using a too small K may compromise the opportunity to exploit previous information. 3) However, an excessively large K introduces a higher risk of overfitting and can result in a performance degradation on new tasks. 4) Using a small ξ increases time consumption significantly, whereas a too large ξ diminishes the resilience of the surrogate model against local optima.

6 Conclusion

This paper has proposed a simple yet effective meta-learning-based optimization framework, called MLO, to solve expensive dynamic optimization problems. MLO encompasses three distinctive characteristics that set it apart from existing approaches. Firstly, it introduces a novel direction to address the challenges posed by solving expensive DOPs. Secondly, the proposed framework is flexible and allows any existing continuously differentiable surrogate model to be applied in a plug-and-play manner and further extended to data-driven evolutionary optimization or BO approaches. Lastly, by providing effective initial model parameters, MLO enables a jump-start of the optimization process in a new environment within limited computational resources. The experimental studies provide comprehensive evidences of the significant superiority of the proposed MLO against state-of-the-art peer algorithms.

References

- [1] S. Nguyen, M. Zhang, M. Johnston, and K. C. Tan, “Automatic programming via iterated local search for dynamic job shop scheduling,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2015.
- [2] F. Zhang, Y. Mei, S. Nguyen, and M. Zhang, “Correlation coefficient-based recombinative guidance for genetic programming hyperheuristics in dynamic flexible job shop scheduling,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 552–566, 2021.
- [3] M. Mavrovouniotis, F. M. Müller, and S. Yang, “Ant colony optimization with local search for dynamic traveling salesman problems,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 1743–1756, 2017.

- [4] X. Lu, K. Tang, S. Menzel, and X. Yao, “Dynamic optimization in fast-changing environments via offline evolutionary search,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 431–445, 2022.
- [5] Y. Wang, J. Zhou, Y. Lu, H. Qin, and Y. Wang, “Chaotic self-adaptive particle swarm optimization algorithm for dynamic economic dispatch problem with valve-point effects,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 14 231–14 237, 2011.
- [6] D. Yazdani, R. Cheng, D. Yazdani, J. Branke, Y. Jin, and X. Yao, “A survey of evolutionary continuous dynamic optimization over two decades - part A,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 609–629, 2021.
- [7] —, “A survey of evolutionary continuous dynamic optimization over two decades - part B,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 630–650, 2021.
- [8] H. Wang, Y. Jin, and J. Doherty, “Committee-based active learning for surrogate-assisted particle swarm optimization of expensive problems,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 2664–2677, 2017.
- [9] H. Wang, Y. Jin, and J. O. Jansen, “Data-driven surrogate-assisted multiobjective evolutionary optimization of a trauma system,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 939–952, 2016.
- [10] T. Chugh, N. Chakraborti, K. Sindhya, and Y. Jin, “A data-driven surrogate-assisted evolutionary algorithm applied to a many-objective blast furnace optimization problem,” *Mater. Manuf. Process.*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 1172–1178, 2017.
- [11] Y. Jin, “A comprehensive survey of fitness approximation in evolutionary computation,” *Soft Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 3–12, 2005.
- [12] Y. Jin, H. Wang, T. Chugh, D. Guo, and K. Miettinen, “Data-driven evolutionary optimization: An overview and case studies,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 442–458, 2019.
- [13] B. Shahriari, K. Swersky, Z. Wang, R. P. Adams, and N. de Freitas, “Taking the human out of the loop: A review of bayesian optimization,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 148–175, 2016.
- [14] J. Li, Z. Zhan, C. Wang, H. Jin, and J. Zhang, “Boosting data-driven evolutionary algorithm with localized data generation,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 923–937, 2020.
- [15] H. Huang and Y. Gong, “Contrastive learning: An alternative surrogate for offline data-driven evolutionary computation,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 370–384, 2023.
- [16] J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, and R. P. Adams, “Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms,” in *NIPS’12: Proc. of the 26th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2012, pp. 2960–2968.
- [17] C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, “Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks,” in *ICML’17: Proc. of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 70. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1126–1135.
- [18] J. Vanschoren, “Meta-learning: A survey,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1810.03548, 2018.
- [19] T. Elsken, B. Staffler, J. H. Metzen, and F. Hutter, “Meta-learning of neural architectures for few-shot learning,” in *CVPR’20: Proc. of the 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020, pp. 12 362–12 372.
- [20] D. Lian, Y. Zheng, Y. Xu, Y. Lu, L. Lin, P. Zhao, J. Huang, and S. Gao, “Towards fast adaptation of neural architectures with meta learning,” in *ICLR’20, Proc. of the 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2020.

- [21] M. Wistuba, N. Schilling, and L. Schmidt-Thieme, “Two-stage transfer surrogate model for automatic hyperparameter optimization,” in *ECML/PKDD’16: Proc. of the 2016 European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9851. Springer, 2016, pp. 199–214.
- [22] —, “Scalable gaussian process-based transfer surrogates for hyperparameter optimization,” *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 107, no. 1, pp. 43–78, 2018.
- [23] T. T. Nguyen, S. Yang, and J. Branke, “Evolutionary dynamic optimization: A survey of the state of the art,” *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 6, pp. 1–24, 2012.
- [24] K. Li, R. Chen, and X. Yao, “A data-driven evolutionary transfer optimization for expensive problems in dynamic environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 2023, accepted for publication.
- [25] H. J. Kushner, “A versatile stochastic model of a function of unknown and time varying form,” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 150–167, 1962.
- [26] S. Morales-Enciso and J. Branke, “Tracking global optima in dynamic environments with efficient global optimization,” *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 242, no. 3, pp. 744–755, 2015.
- [27] D. R. Jones, “A taxonomy of global optimization methods based on response surfaces,” *J. Glob. Optim.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 345–383, 2001.
- [28] J. Richter, J. Shi, J. Chen, J. Rahnenführer, and M. Lang, “Model-based optimization with concept drifts,” in *GECCO’20: Proc. of the 2020 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 2020, pp. 877–885.
- [29] R. Chen and K. Li, “Transfer bayesian optimization for expensive black-box optimization in dynamic environment,” in *SMC’21: Proc. of the 2021 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1374–1379.
- [30] W. Luo, R. Yi, B. Yang, and P. Xu, “Surrogate-assisted evolutionary framework for data-driven dynamic optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 137–150, 2019.
- [31] Y. Liu, J. Liu, T. Zheng, and Y. Yang, “A surrogate-assisted clustering particle swarm optimizer for expensive optimization under dynamic environment,” in *CEC’20: Proc. of the 2020 IEEE congress on evolutionary computation*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [32] L. Zhao, Y. Hu, B. Wang, X. Jiang, C. Liu, and C. Zheng, “A surrogate-assisted evolutionary algorithm based on multi-population clustering and prediction for solving computationally expensive dynamic optimization problems,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 223, p. 119815, 2023.
- [33] C. Yang, J. Ding, Y. Jin, and T. Chai, “A data stream ensemble assisted multifactorial evolutionary algorithm for offline data-driven dynamic optimization,” *Evolutionary Computation*, pp. 1–25, 2023.
- [34] Y. Liu, J. Liu, J. Ding, S. Yang, and Y. Jin, “A surrogate-assisted differential evolution with knowledge transfer for expensive incremental optimization problems,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 2023, accepted for publication.
- [35] X. Fan, K. Li, and K. C. Tan, “Surrogate assisted evolutionary algorithm based on transfer learning for dynamic expensive multi-objective optimisation problems,” in *CEC’20: Proc. of the 2020 IEEE congress on evolutionary computation*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [36] Z. Liu and H. Wang, “A data augmentation based kriging-assisted reference vector guided evolutionary algorithm for expensive dynamic multi-objective optimization,” *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 75, p. 101173, 2022.

- [37] X. Zhang, G. Yu, Y. Jin, and F. Qian, “An adaptive gaussian process based manifold transfer learning to expensive dynamic multi-objective optimization,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 538, p. 126212, 2023.
- [38] J. X. Wang, Z. Kurth-Nelson, D. Tirumala, H. Soyer, J. Z. Leibo, R. Munos, C. Blundell, D. Kumaran, and M. Botvinick, “Learning to reinforcement learn,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1611.05763, 2016.
- [39] M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. G. Colmenarejo, M. W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, and N. de Freitas, “Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent,” in *NeurIPS16’: Proc. of the 29th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 3981–3989.
- [40] K. Li and J. Malik, “Learning to optimize,” in *ICLR17’: Proc. of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [41] M. Vartak, A. Thiagarajan, C. Miranda, J. Bratman, and H. Larochelle, “A meta-learning perspective on cold-start recommendations for items,” in *NeurIPS’17: Proc. of the 2017 Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. ACM, 2017, pp. 6904–6914.
- [42] J. D. Co-Reyes, A. Gupta, S. Sanjeev, N. Altieri, J. Andreas, J. DeNero, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, “Guiding policies with language via meta-learning,” in *ICLR’19: Proc. of the 7th International Conference on Learning Representations*. ACM, 2019.
- [43] T. M. Hospedales, A. Antoniou, P. Micaelli, and A. J. Storkey, “Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey,” *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 5149–5169, 2022.
- [44] M. Volpp, L. P. Fröhlich, K. Fischer, A. Doerr, S. Falkner, F. Hutter, and C. Daniel, “Meta-learning acquisition functions for transfer learning in bayesian optimization,” in *ICLR’20: Proc. of the 8th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [45] M. Feurer, B. Letham, and E. Bakshy, “Scalable meta-learning for bayesian optimization using ranking-weighted gaussian process ensembles,” in *AutoML Workshop at ICML*, vol. 7, 2018.
- [46] M. Feurer, J. T. Springenberg, and F. Hutter, “Initializing bayesian hyperparameter optimization via meta-learning,” in *AAAI’15: Proc. of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, January 25-30, 2015, Austin, Texas, USA*. AAAI Press, 2015, pp. 1128–1135.
- [47] M. Wistuba and J. Grabocka, “Few-shot bayesian optimization with deep kernel surrogates,” in *ICLR’21: Proc. of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [48] W. Chen, Y. Liu, Z. Kira, Y. F. Wang, and J. Huang, “A closer look at few-shot classification,” in *ICLR’19: 7th International Conference on Learning Representations*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [49] Y. Wang, Q. Yao, J. T. Kwok, and L. M. Ni, “Generalizing from a few examples: A survey on few-shot learning,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 63:1–63:34, 2021.
- [50] C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, ser. Adaptive computation and machine learning. MIT Press, 2006.
- [51] D. E. Rumelhart, G. E. Hinton, and R. J. Williams, “Learning representations by back-propagating errors,” *nature*, vol. 323, no. 6088, pp. 533–536, 1986.
- [52] N. Hansen and A. Ostermeier, “Completely derandomized self-adaptation in evolution strategies,” *Evol. Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 159–195, 2001.
- [53] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart, “Particle swarm optimization,” in *Proceedings of International Conference on Neural Networks (ICNN’95), Perth, WA, Australia, November 27 - December 1, 1995*. IEEE, 1995, pp. 1942–1948.

- [54] R. Storn and K. V. Price, “Differential evolution - A simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces,” *J. Glob. Optim.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 341–359, 1997.
- [55] L. Yang and A. Shami, “On hyperparameter optimization of machine learning algorithms: Theory and practice,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 415, pp. 295–316, 2020.
- [56] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. H. Friedman, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction, 2nd Edition*, ser. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, 2009.
- [57] T. T. Nguyen, “Continuous dynamic optimisation using evolutionary algorithms,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, UK, 2011.
- [58] D. Yazdani, M. N. Omidvar, R. Cheng, J. Branke, T. T. Nguyen, and X. Yao, “Benchmarking continuous dynamic optimization: Survey and generalized test suite,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 3380–3393, 2022.
- [59] J. Branke, “Memory enhanced evolutionary algorithms for changing optimization problems,” in *CEC’99: Proc. of the 1999 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 3, 1999, pp. 1875–1882.
- [60] K. Trojanowski and Z. Michalewicz, “Searching for optima in non-stationary environments,” in *CEC’99: Proc. of the 1999 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 3, 1999, pp. 1843–1850.
- [61] D. Yazdani, R. Cheng, D. Yazdani, J. Branke, Y. Jin, and X. Yao, “A survey of evolutionary continuous dynamic optimization over two decades - part B,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 630–650, 2021.
- [62] F. Wilcoxon, “Individual comparisons by ranking methods,” *Biometrics Bull*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 80–83, 1945.
- [63] N. Mittas and L. Angelis, “Ranking and clustering software cost estimation models through a multiple comparisons algorithm,” *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 537–551, 2013.
- [64] A. Vargha and H. D. Delaney, “A critique and improvement of the cl common language effect size statistics of mcgraw and wong,” *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, vol. 25, pp. 101–132, 2000.
- [65] GPy, “GPy: A gaussian process framework in python,” <http://github.com/SheffieldML/GPy>, since 2012.
- [66] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay, “Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, pp. 2825–2830, 2011.
- [67] N. Srinivas, A. Krause, S. M. Kakade, and M. W. Seeger, “Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design,” in *ICML’10: Proc. of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Omnipress, 2010, pp. 1015–1022.
- [68] T. G. authors, “GPyOpt: A bayesian optimization framework in python,” <http://github.com/SheffieldML/GPyOpt>, 2016.