COMPARATIVE STUDY ON DIFFEREN TECHNIQUES FOR SOLVING MULTIOBJECTIVE PROBLEMS OF OPTIMIZATION

HARIPRIYA SARGOCH

haripriyasargoch@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHANDIGARH UNIVERSITY, GHARUAN, MOHALI, PUNJAB

ABSTRACT:

During the last 15 years, multi objective mathematical programming has been one of the fastest developing fields of person view. Following the use of evolutionary methods over single-objective optimization for a longer period of time, more than two decades, the wellness industry has incorporated several goals. Function has finally gained attention as a field of science. As a result, many people variations of current strategies and new evolutionary- based methods have been developed. In the scientific articles, it was recently written. In this paper, we suggest a multi objective optimization algorithm which is based on antibody production theorem (either constrained or unconstrained). The aim of this paper is to summarise and compile details on these existing methods, stressing the relevance of analysing operations analysis strategies, which are used by the majority of them. In an effort to entice scholars to explore these problems, they are focused. Approaches to mathematical analysis for new ways to utilize the scope evolved algorithms' features. An overview of the key algorithms behind

these methods is also given, as well as short critique that includes their benefits and drawbacks, applicability, and some recommendations applications that are well-known. Finally, future developments in this field are discussed, as well as any potential future directions, additional analysis is also being considered. According to the findings, the suggested strategy seems to be a feasible solution for solving multi objective optimization problems.

INTRODUCTION:

Without a question, multi objective optimization is a significant research subject not only for scientists but also for engineers, not only because most major problems are multi objective, but also because due to the fact that there are already a lot of unfilled positions concerns in this field. Over the years, more than 20 methods in operations analysis have been developed and try to solve problems act with functions that have multiple inputs and outputs. Many methods have been used to accomplish these aims. The ambiguity in this field stems from the fact that there is no universally agreed - upon description of “Optimal” in the context of single-objective optimization. As a consequence, comparing the effects of one system to those of another is challenging. Since in most situations, the option of the “best” solution usually refers to the ostensibly team leader.

Natural processes have also grown to a high degree of mission suitability over time. A similar aim is pursued in the construction of man- made structures. That is, under the constraints of practically, to arrive at the best possible solution to a moral choice or design challenge. Single objective (SO) optimization problems with a real number metric of fairness and set of parameters are commonly used to model such design problems. Since most significant difficulties involve several competing goals, this paradigm is often a simplification. For eg, when it comes to reinforced concrete members, their aim is to produce the lightest and most expense build possible.Because of the differing pricing ratios of the materials used, the weight limit design does not necessarily result in the lowest cost project. **Multi- objective (MO) optimization** is a strategy for resolving addressing problems challenges with different goals. In general, there are two types of multiple objective decision (MCDM) challenges. One of those is multi – attribute decision theory, which looks at how competing priorities are resolved when dealing with ambiguity. Besides that, the results are normally infrequent and predictable. These types of analysis are often used in field such as economics, communications, government policies, and financial decision. The relativistic subset of MCDM in which the results are not determined in advance is multi- objective optimization. Such method of study is frequently done in project management.

The multi- objective optimization problem is described as follows:

$$\text{Min } f(x) = \{f_1(x), f_2(x), \ldots\ldots\ldots, f_?(x)\}$$

According, g_j (x) ≤ 0 where, j= 1, 2, 3,….,J

So, h_k(x) = 0 where, k = 1, 2, 3, ……,K

; gj is the jthlimit in inequality,$h_k$is the kth constraint of equality, and n, j, and k are the aggregate amount of optimization methods unequal treatment and relative deprivation, respectively. Only one variation between this and a single optimization dilemma is that this one uses a collection of optimization methods rather than just one. As a result, Multi objective optimization is also known as vector optimization.

INTERPRETATION OF OPTIMALITY:

The Richardson constraints will provide the requisite conditions for optimization problem in a single objective optimization problem. After that, the requirementswill then be applied to describe every possible single objective solution.The challenge of multi objective optimization is rather difficult. In particular, in a Multi objective problem, a solution achieved by maximising one goal at a time would result in an unacceptable solution. Instead of a single-valued integer, the resolution to a multi objective optimization problem would be a vector in RN. As a consequence, the multi objective problem can be written as a constrained optimization problem:

min $\{z_1(x)$, z_2(x),……, z_n(x)} (4)

Subjected to $f_1(x)$ = $z_1(x)$, for all i = 1, 2, 3, ……, N (5)

g_1(x) $\leq$ 0 , for all j = 1, 2, 3, …….., J (6)

h_k (x) = 0 , for all k = 1, 2, 3,……., K (7)

Choosing the best result vector is consist of problem that involves taking into account the arranging and selection with one variable (set) above others. The process called as the Pareto optimality conditions determines optimal multi objective solutions in form of thesecollections. Whether any change in thing of the optimization methods from its current value leads at least one of the other objective functions to deteriorate of its present price, the feasible strategies are said to be Pareto optimal. Typically, the Pareto ideal set is infinite. As a result, the team leader has to select the desired solution from the available solutions.

TECHNIQUES OF SOLUTION:

Throughout this part, we will go through a few of the strategies which can be applied to resolve multi objective optimization problems. All of these approaches necessitate additional feedback from the decision-maker beyond that necessary to formulate the multi objective optimization problem *(from equations 1 to 3)*. This feedback usually consists of details about the objectives' rating, weighting, or approachability in order to transform the multi objective optimization to a single objective optimization problem. V: $R^n \rightarrow$ R that converts the N- dimensional result function to a single-valued number is implicitly assumed by the judgement.

1) **WEIGHING OBJECTIVE METHOD**: This technique combining all of the objective functions and assigning different weighting coefficients to each of them. This converts our multi-objective optimization problem into a vector optimization problem of the type,

   Min $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i f_i\ (x)$ (8)

   Where, $w_i \geq 0$ represents computing parameters that reflect the comparative significance of the goals. It's commonly presumed that;

   $\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i$ = 1 (9)

   Because the outcome of resolving an optimization method with (8) will differ considerably as the weighting coefficients differ, and because there is generally little knowledge as how to determine such parameters, this is essential for fix the identical model again, for very different needs of w_i.

   It's worth noting that the weighting coefficients don't represent the significance of the aims in any way; they're just variables that, when modified, find lines in the Pareto-optimal solutions. This location is dependent not just from the w_i values, but also from the components to which all of the procedures are written, for the numerical techniques which can be used to obtain the minimal.

2) **METHOD OF HIERARCHIAL OPTIMIZATION:** This process necessitates that the goals be prioritised in order of significance. Let $f_1$is perhaps the most appropriate goal, and f_n be the lowest rating. The following is the process for this method:

- Take the first step. Optimize the single objective problem, which includes the main goal function $f_1(x)$ and the existing restrictions. All other goals are disregarded. Let x_1 be the best solution found, with the sequence indicating the number of steps. Step second should be repeated for i = 2, N.
- Step 2: Determine the best solution x^ith for the ith objective function f_i(x) given the following extra constraint:

$$f_{i-1}(x) \leq | 1 \pm \frac{\in_{i-1}}{100} | f_{i-1}(x^{i-1}) \qquad (10)$$

Where $\in_i$ is the percentile variance in the optimization problem that is $f_i(x^i)$. The significance of the last computed goal is ranked using this constraint. The process is also known as lexicographic approach of this proportion is close to unity. A Pareto optimal solution will be generated by the algorithm. A set of Pareto optimal solutions can be changed by determining the values of $\in_i$.

3) **TRADE OFF METHOD:** The team leader specifies a trade-off among the several goals of the trade-off process. Because this method involving searching in a gradually relatively small rubric space, this

method is called as the constraint or reduced viable spatial technique. The problem description is transformed into a new problem in which one goal is reduced while other criteria and constraints are limited by N – 1. In terms of mathematics, we have the following problems:

Min f_r(x) (11)

Subjected tof_r(x) ≤$\in_i$, for all i = 1, N ;i≠r (12)

from plus equation 2 and 3

Where $\in_i$ denotes the decision-preferred maker'sf_i limiting value. A complete set of Pareto optimization problems can be obtained by varying the values of $\in_i$.

4) **GOAL PROGRAMMING:** For solving Multi objective optimization problems, goal programming (GP) is a common approach. The aims are viewed as goals with the desired target or threshold values in this method. These restrictions, on the other hand, are often not rigid, and are generally permitted to differ within a narrow range of the desired values. Deviational factors are used to achieve this. To indicate their relative importance, the objectives are given a priority or a weighing. One of the following aim criteria can be usedgreater than, less than, equal to, or beyond a certain spectrum.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN ACTUAL LIFE:

The techniques provided in the preceding segment demonstrate that the methods necessitate additional, often subjective, feedback from the team leader.As a result, Multi objective optimization is both an art and a science. In Multi objective(MO) problems, the principle of optimal solutions is derived from consumer economics, in which each customers receive the "better prices" viable; that much variability from that could arise sometimes in digital consumer a fair package than many others.As a result, the Pareto ideal is a nondominated result variable. The accessibility of a cost function which can describe one result in relation to other underpins this optimality argument. The cost function is seldom used in practise, so the methods mentioned in the subsequent portion have been applied. The method of trade-off is completely arbitrary. However, because of its simplicity, it is often used as an interactive decision-making tool. In each iteration, the decision-maker would change the constraints to try to get better results.

The worldwide requirement, transport protocol, and min-max methods all rely on knowing a relatively close decision variable. When the problem is massive and complex, this is always impossible. Furthermore, using an invalid decision vector would make the problem impossible to solve.

Goal programming is the most realistic approach. This method has a strong critical framework, allowing the decision-maker to precisely set up the problem. Deviational factors are an efficient way to deal with flexible constraints. They are, nonetheless, not very effective. Each objective is associated with at least one deviational variable. As a consequence, the number of variables in the dilemma increases in tandem with the number of targets.

REMARKS AT THE END:

Multi-objective optimization is an organised and ordered method for resolving real complicated team leader problems, including that discovered in structural technology. All multi-objective optimization methods use extra data to estimate the final result. As a result, they aren't pre-programmed.

When applied quickly and accurately to somehow get appropriate results from an accessible viable answer, multi-objective optimization is most successful.

This paper aims to include a systematic review with the most famous augmented reality techniques to multi-objective optimization, including some observations regarding about their information systems origins, a short explanation of their major procedures, their benefits and also drawbacks, and their focus on diversity of suitability. A very extensive bibliography is also included, as well as a few constituent practical applications of each methodology (when discovered) (that may be enough to lead a new arrival in this important and dynamic field of research).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

I and our concerned professors who help me in this research paper DR. ASHOK PAUL And DR.JATINDER KAUR (CHANDIGARH UNIVERSITY)wishes to express our gratitude to the following individuals for their commentsthat added in the improvement of this piece of paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1) **S. Azarm, "Multi objective Optimum Design," http://www.glue.umd.edu/azarm/, Fuzzy Multiple Objective Decision Making—Methods and Applications, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. Lai, Y. –J. and Hwang, C. –L.**

2) **W. Stadler (Ed.), Plenum Press, New York, NY, 1988, Multicriteria Optimization in Engineering and the Sciences.**
3) **Steuer, R. E. (1986), Multiple Criteria Optimization: Theory, Computation, andApplication, John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.**
4) **A survey of multi-attribute/multi-criterion assessment hypotheses, P. C. FISHBURN, P. C. FISHBURN, P. C. FISHBURN, P. C. FISHBURN, P. C S. Zionts, Ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 181–224.**
5) **COELLO, C. A. C., CHRISTIANSEN, A. D., AND AGUIRRE, A. H. For the design of robot arms, a new GA-based multi objective optimization approach was used. 401–414 in Robotica 16.**
6) **D. CVETKOVIC, I. PARME, and E. WEBB. 1998.Preliminary airframe design and multi-objective optimization. The Use of Evolutionary and Adaptive Computing Technologies in the Integration of Evolutionary and Adaptive Computing Technologies Design and Realization of Products/ Systems Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, I. Parme, Ed.267–255.**
7) **C. A. C. COELLO and A. D. CHRISTIANSEN, 1998.Two new multi objective optimization techniques based on GA. 207–15, Civil Eng. Syst. 15, 3244**