

Parameterized Analysis of Multi-objective Evolutionary Algorithms and the Weighted Vertex Cover Problem

Mojgan Pourhassan
mojgan.pourhassan@adelaide.edu.au
Optimisation and Logistics
School of Computer Science
The University of Adelaide
Adelaide, Australia

Feng Shi
fengshi@csu.edu.cn
School of Information Science and Engineering
Central South University
Changsha 410083, P.R. China

Frank Neumann
frank.neumann@adelaide.edu.au
Optimisation and Logistics
School of Computer Science
The University of Adelaide
Adelaide, Australia

January 31, 2022

Abstract

A rigorous runtime analysis of evolutionary multi-objective optimization for the classical vertex cover problem in the context of parameterized complexity analysis has been presented by Kratsch and Neumann [11]. In this paper, we extend the analysis to the weighted vertex cover problem and provide a fixed parameter evolutionary algorithm with respect to OPT , where OPT is the cost of the the optimal solution for the problem. Moreover, using a diversity mechanisms, we present a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm that finds a 2-approximation in expected polynomial time and introduce a population-based evolutionary algorithm which finds a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in expected time $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$.

1 Introduction

The area of runtime analysis has provided many rigorous new insights into the working behaviour of bio-inspired computing methods such as evolutionary algorithms and ant colony optimization [1, 8, 15]. In recent years, the parameterized analysis of bio-inspired computing has gained additional interest [10, 11, 18, 19]. Here the runtime of bio-inspired computing is studied in dependence of the input size and additional parameters such as the solution size and/or other structural parameters of the given input.

One of the classical problems that has been studied extensively in the area of runtime analysis is the classical NP-hard vertex cover problem. Here, an undirected graph is given and the goal is to find a minimum set of nodes V' such that each edge has at least one endpoint in V' . Friedrich et al. [5] have shown that the single-objective evolutionary algorithm (1+1) EA can not achieve a better than trivial approximation ratio in expected polynomial time. Furthermore, they have shown that a multi-objective approach using Global SEMO gives a factor $O(\log n)$ approximation for the wider classes of set cover problems in expected polynomial time. Further investigations regarding the approximation behaviour of evolutionary algorithms for the vertex cover problem have been carried out in [4, 16]. Edge-based representations in connection with different fitness functions have been investigated in [9, 17] according to their approximation behaviour in the static and dynamic setting. Kratsch and Neumann [11] have studied evolutionary algorithms and the vertex cover problem in the context of parameterized complexity. They have shown that Global SEMO, with a problem specific mutation operator is a fixed parameter evolutionary algorithm for this problem and finds 2-approximations in expected polynomial time. Kratsch and Neumann [11] have also introduced an alternative mutation operator and have proved that Global SEMO using this mutation operator finds a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in expected time $O(n^2 \log n + OPT \cdot n^2 + n \cdot 4^{(1-\varepsilon)OPT})$. Jansen et al. [9] have shown that a 2-approximation can also be obtained by using an edge-based representation in the (1+1) EA combined with a fitness function formulation based on matchings.

To our knowledge all investigations so far in the area of runtime analysis consider the (unweighted) vertex cover problem. In this paper, we consider the weighted vertex cover problem where in addition weights on the nodes are given and the goal is to find a vertex cover of minimum weight. We extend the investigations carried out in [11] to the weighted minimum vertex cover problem. In [11], multi-objective models in combination with a simple multi-objective evolutionary algorithm called Global SEMO are investigated. One key argument for the results presented for the (unweighted) vertex cover problem is that the population size is always upper bounded by $n + 1$. This argument does not hold in the weighted case. Therefore, we study how a variant of Global SEMO using appropriate diversity mechanisms is able to deal with the weighted vertex cover problem.

Our focus is on finding good approximations of an optimal solution. We analyse the time complexity with respect to n , W_{max} , and OPT , which denote the number of vertices, the maximum weight in the input graph, and the cost of the optimal solution respectively. We first study the expected time until Global SEMO has found a 2-approximation in dependence of n and OPT . Afterwards, we analyse the expected

time of finding a solution with expected approximation ratio $(1 + \varepsilon)$ for this problem when Global SEMO uses the alternative mutation operator. Furthermore, we consider DEMO, a variant of Global SEMO, which incorporates ε -dominance [12] as diversity mechanism. We show that DEMO finds a 2-approximation in expected polynomial time. Finally, we present a population-based approach that obtains a solution that has expected approximation ratio $(1 + \varepsilon)$ in expected time $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, the problem definition is presented as well as the classical Global SEMO algorithm and DEMO algorithm. Runtime analysis for finding a 2-approximation and a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation by Global SEMO is presented in Section 3. Section 4 includes the analysis that shows DEMO can find 2-approximations of the optimum in expected polynomial time. The population-based algorithm is defined and investigated for finding a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in Section 5. At the end, in Section 6 we summarize and conclude.

2 Preliminaries

We consider the weighted vertex cover problem defined as follows. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and edge set $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$, and a positive weight function $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ on the vertices, the goal is to find a subset of nodes, $V_C \subseteq V$, that covers all edges and has minimum weight, i.e. $\forall e \in E, e \cap V_C \neq \emptyset$ and $\sum_{v \in V_C} w(v)$ is minimized. We consider the standard node-based approach, i.e. the search space is $\{0, 1\}^n$ and for a solution $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ the node v_i is chosen iff $x_i = 1$.

The weighted vertex cover problem has the following Integer Linear Programming (ILP) formulation.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n w(v_i) \cdot x_i \\ \text{st.} \quad & x_i + x_j \geq 1 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E \\ & x_i \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

By relaxing the constraint $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ to $x_i \in [0, 1]$, the linear program formulation of Fractional Weighted Vertex Cover is obtained. Hochbaum [6] has shown that we can find a 2-approximation using the LP result of the relaxed weighted vertex cover. This can be done by including any vertex v_i for which $x_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

We consider primarily multi-objective approaches for the weighted vertex cover problem. Given a multi-objective fitness function $f = (f_1, \dots, f_d) : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where all d objectives should be minimized, we have $f(x) \leq f(y)$ iff $f_i(x) \leq f_i(y)$, $1 \leq i \leq d$. We say that x (weakly) dominates y iff $f(x) \leq f(y)$. Furthermore, we say that x (strongly) dominates y iff $f(x) \leq f(y)$ and $f(x) \neq f(y)$.

We now introduce the objectives used in our multi-objective evolutionary algorithm. Let $G(x)$ be the graph obtained from G by removing all nodes chosen by x and the corresponding covered edges. Formally, we have $G(x) = (V(x), E(x))$ where $V(x) = V \setminus \{v_i \mid x_i = 1\}$ and $E(x) = E \setminus \{e \mid e \cap (V \setminus V(x)) \neq \emptyset\}$. Kratsch and Neumann [11] investigated a multi-objective baseline algorithm called Global SEMO using

```

1 Choose  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random;
2 Determine  $f(x)$ ;
3  $P \leftarrow \{x\}$ ;
4 repeat
5   | Choose  $x \in P$  uniformly at random;
6   | Create  $x'$  by flipping each bit  $x_i$  of  $x$  with probability  $1/n$ ;
7   | Determine  $f(x')$ ;
8   | if  $\nexists y \in P \mid f(y) \leq f(x')$  then
9     |   |  $P \leftarrow \{x'\}$ ;
10    |   | delete all other solutions  $z \in P$  with  $f(x') \leq f(z)$  from  $P$ ;
11    | end
12 until termination condition satisfied;

```

Algorithm 1: Global SEMO

```

1 Choose  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  uniformly at random;
2 if  $(b = 1)$  then
3   | foreach  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  do
4     |   | if  $\exists j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid \{v_i, v_j\} \in E(x)$  then
5       |   |   | Flip  $x_i$  with probability  $1/2$ ;
6     |   | else
7       |   |   | Flip  $x_i$  with probability  $1/n$ ;
8     |   | end
9   | end
10 else
11   | foreach  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  do
12     |   | Flip  $x_i$  with probability  $1/n$ ;
13   | end
14 end

```

Algorithm 2: Alternative Mutation Operator

the LP-value for $G(x)$ as one of the fitness values for the (unweighted) minimum vertex cover problem.

Our goal is to expand the analysis on behaviour of multi-objective evolutionary algorithms to the Weighted Vertex Cover problem. In order to do this, we modify the fitness function that was used in Global SEMO in [11], to match the weighted version of the problem. We investigate the multi-objective fitness function $f(x) = (Cost(x), LP(x))$, where

- $Cost(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w(v_i)x_i$ is the sum of weights of selected vertices
- $LP(x)$ is the value of optimal solution of the LP for $G(x)$.

We analyse Global SEMO with this fitness function using the standard mutation operator flipping each bit with probability $1/n$. We also investigate Global SEMO

```

1 Choose  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random;
2 Determine  $b(x)$ ;
3  $P \leftarrow \{x\}$ ;
4 repeat
5   Choose  $x \in P$  uniformly at random;
6   Create  $x'$  by flipping each bit  $x_i$  of  $x$  with probability  $1/n$ ;
7   Determine  $f(x')$  and  $b(x')$ ;
8   if  $\exists y \in P \mid (f(y) \leq f(x') \wedge f(y) \neq f(x')) \vee (b(y) =$ 
    $b(x') \wedge Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq Cost(x') + 2 \cdot LP(x'))$  then
9     Go to 4;
10  else
11     $P \leftarrow \{x'\}$ ;
12    delete all other solutions  $z \in P$  where  $f(x') \leq f(z) \vee b(z) = b(x')$  from  $P$ ;
13  end
14 until termination condition satisfied;

```

Algorithm 3: DEMO

using the alternative mutation operator introduced in [11] (see Algorithm 2). By this mutation operator, the nodes that are adjacent to uncovered edges are included with probability $1/2$ in some steps.

In the fitness function used in Global SEMO, both $Cost(x)$ and $LP(x)$ can be exponential with respect to the input size; therefore, we need to deal with exponentially large number of solutions, even if we only keep the Pareto front. One approach for dealing with this problem is using the concept of ε -dominance [12]. The concept of ε -dominance has previously been proved to be useful for coping with exponentially large Pareto fronts in some problems [7, 14]. Having two objective vectors $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$, u ε -dominates v , denoted by $u \preceq_\varepsilon v$, if for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we have $(1 + \varepsilon)u_i \leq v_i$. In this approach, the objective space is partitioned into a polynomial number of boxes in which all solutions ε -dominate each other, and at most one solution from each box is kept in the population.

Motivated by this approach, DEMO (Diversity Evolutionary Multi-objective Optimizer) has been investigated in [13, 14]. In Section 4, we analyze DEMO (see Algorithm 3) in which only one non-dominated solution can be kept in the population for each box based on a predefined criteria. In our setting, among two solutions x and y from one box, y is kept in P and x is discarded if $Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x)$.

To implement the concept of ε -dominance in DEMO, we use the parameter $\delta = \frac{1}{2n}$ and define the boxing function $b : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^2$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1(x) &= \lceil \log_{1+\delta}(1 + Cost(x)) \rceil, \\
b_2(x) &= \lceil \log_{1+\delta}(1 + LP(x)) \rceil,
\end{aligned}$$

Analysing the runtime of our evolutionary algorithms, we are interested in the expected number of rounds of the repeat loop until a solution of desired quality has been

obtained. We call this the expected time until the considered algorithm has achieved its desired goal.

3 Analysis of Global SEMO

In this section we analyse the expected time of Global SEMO to find good approximations for the weighted vertex cover problem in dependence of the input size and OPT. Before we present our analysis for Global SEMO, we state some basic properties of the solutions in our multi-objective model. The following theorem shown by Balinski [2] states that all basic feasible solutions (or extremal points) of the fractional vertex cover LP are half-integral.

Theorem 1. *Each basic feasible solution x of the relaxed Vertex Cover ILP is half-integral, i.e., $x \in \{0, 1/2, 1\}^n$. [2]*

As a result, there always exists a half integral optimal LP solution for a vertex cover problem. In several parts of this paper, we make use of this result. We establish the following two lemmata which we will use later on in the analysis of our algorithms.

Lemma 2. *For any $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $LP(x) \leq LP(0^n) \leq OPT$.*

Proof. Let y be the LP solution of $LP(0^n)$. Also, for any solution x , let $G(x)$ be the graph obtained from G by removing all vertices chosen by x and their edges. The solution 0^n contains no vertices; therefore, y is the optimal fractional vertex cover for all edges of the input graph. Thus, for any solution x , y is a (possibly non-optimal) fractional cover for $G(x)$; therefore, $LP(x) \leq LP(0^n)$. Moreover, we have $LP(0^n) \leq OPT$ as $LP(0^n)$ is the optimal value of the LP relaxation. ■

Lemma 3. *Let $x = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ be a solution and $y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}, y_i \in [0, 1]$ be a fractional solution for $G(x)$. If there is a vertex v_i where $y_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$, mutating x_i from 0 to 1 results in a solution x' for which $LP(x') \leq LP(x) - y_i \cdot w(v_i) \leq LP(x) - \frac{1}{2}w(v_i)$.*

Proof. The graph $G(x')$ is the same as $G(x)$ excluding the edges connected to v_i . Therefore, the solution $y' = \{y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, 0, y_{i+1}, y_n\}$ is a fractional vertex cover for $G(x')$ and has a cost of $LP(x) - y_i w(v_i)$. The cost of the optimal fractional vertex cover of $G(x')$ is at most as great as the cost of y' ; thus $LP(x') \leq LP(x) - y_i w(v_i) \leq LP(x) - \frac{1}{2}w(v_i)$. ■

3.1 2-Approximation

We now analyse the runtime behaviour of Global SEMO (Algorithm 1) with the standard mutation operator, in dependence of OPT. We start by giving an upper bound on the population size of Global SEMO.

Lemma 4. *The population size of Algorithm 1 is upper bounded by $2 \cdot OPT + 1$.*

Proof. For any solution x there exists an optimal fractional vertex cover which is half-integral (Theorem 1). Moreover, we are assuming that all the weights are integer values. Therefore, $LP(x)$ can only take $2LP(0^n) + 1$ different values, because $LP(0^n)$ is

an upper bound on $LP(x)$ (Lemma 2). For each value of LP , only one solution is in P , because Algorithm 1 keeps non-dominated solutions only. Therefore, the population size of this algorithm is upper bounded by $2 \cdot LP(0^n) + 1$ which is at most $2 \cdot OPT + 1$ due to Lemma 2. ■

For our analysis, we first consider the expected time of Global SEMO to reach a population which contains the empty set of nodes. Once included, such a solution will never be removed from the population as it is minimal with respect to the cost function.

Lemma 5. *The search point 0^n is included in the population in expected time of $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4 we know that the population contains at most $2 \cdot OPT + 1$ solutions. Therefore, at each step, there is a probability of $\frac{1}{2 \cdot OPT + 1}$ that the solution x_{min} is selected where $Cost(x_{min}) = \min_{x \in P} Cost(x)$.

If $Cost(x_{min}) > 0$, there must be $k \geq 1$ vertex such as v_i in x_{min} where $x_i = 1$. Let Δ^t be the improvement that happens on the minimum cost in P at step t . If all the 1-bits in solution x_{min} flip to zero, at the same step or different steps, a solution 0^n will be obtained with $Cost(0^n) = 0$, which implies that the expected improvement that flipping each 1-bit makes is $\Delta^t = \frac{Cost(x_{min})}{k}$ at each step t . Note that flipping 1-bits always improves the minimum cost and the new solution is added to the population. Moreover, flipping the 0-bits does not improve the minimum cost in the population and x_{min} is not replaced with the new solution in that case.

At each step, with probability $\frac{1}{e}$ only one bit flips. With probability $\frac{k}{n}$, the flipping bit is a 1-bit, and makes an expected improvement of $\Delta^t = \frac{Cost(x_{min})}{k}$, and with probability $1 - \frac{k}{n}$, a 0-bit is flipped with $\Delta^t = 0$. We can conclude that the expected improvement of minimum cost, when only one bit of x_{min} flips, is

$$\frac{k}{n} \cdot \frac{Cost(x_{min})}{k} = \frac{Cost(x_{min})}{n}$$

Moreover, the algorithm selects x_{min} and flips only one bit with probability $\frac{1}{(2 \cdot OPT + 1) \cdot e}$; therefore, the expected improvement of minimum cost is

$$E[\Delta^t | x_{min}] \geq \frac{Cost(x_{min})}{(2 \cdot OPT + 1) \cdot e \cdot n}$$

The maximum value that $Cost(x_{min})$ can take is bounded by $W_{max} \cdot n$, and for any solution $x \neq 0^n$, the minimum value of $Cost(x)$ is at least 1. Using Multiplicative Drift Analysis [3] with $s_0 \leq W_{max} \cdot n$ and $s_{min} \geq 1$, we can conclude that in expected time $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$ solution 0^n is included in the population. ■

We now show that Global SEMO is able to achieve a 2-approximation efficiently as long as OPT is small.

Theorem 6. *The expected number of iterations of Global SEMO until the population P contains a two approximation is $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$.*

Proof. Let x be a solution that minimizes $LP(x)$ under the constraint that $Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq 2 \cdot OPT$. Note that this constraint holds for solution 0^n since $LP(0^n) \leq OPT$, and according to Lemma 5, solution 0^n exists in the population in expected time of $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$.

If $LP(x) = 0$, then all edges are covered and x is a 2-approximate vertex cover, because we have $Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq 2 \cdot OPT$ as the constraint. Otherwise, some edges are uncovered and any LP solution of $G(x)$ assigns at least $\frac{1}{2}$ to at least one vertex of any uncovered edge. Let $y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ be a basic LP solution for $G(x)$. According to Theorem 1, y is a half-integral solution.

Let Δ^t be the improvement that happens on the minimum LP value among solutions that fulfil the constraint at time step t . Also, let k be the number of nodes that are assigned at least $\frac{1}{2}$ by y . Flipping only one of these nodes by the algorithm happens with probability at least $\frac{k}{e \cdot n}$. According to Lemma 3, flipping one of these nodes, v_i , results in a solution x' with $LP(x') \leq LP(x) - \frac{1}{2}w(v_i)$. Observe that the constraint of $Cost(x') + 2 \cdot LP(x') \leq 2 \cdot OPT$ holds for solution x' . Therefore, $\Delta^t \geq y_i \cdot w(v_i)$, which is in expectation at least $\frac{LP(x)}{k}$ due to definition of $LP(x)$. Moreover, at each step, the probability that x is selected and only one of the k bits defined above flips is $\frac{k}{(2 \cdot OPT + 1) \cdot e \cdot n}$. As a result we have:

$$E[\Delta^t | x] \geq \frac{k}{(2 \cdot OPT + 1) \cdot e \cdot n} \cdot \frac{LP(x)}{k} = \frac{LP(x)}{en(2 \cdot OPT + 1)}$$

According to Lemma 2 for any solution x , we have $LP(x) \leq OPT$. We also know that for any solution x which is not a complete cover, $LP(x) \geq 1$, because the weights are positive integers. Using the method of Multiplicative Drift Analysis [3] with $s_0 \leq OPT$ and $s_{min} \geq 1$, in expected time of $O(OPT \cdot n \log OPT)$ a solution y with $LP(y) = 0$ and $Cost(y) + 2LP(y) \leq 2OPT$ is obtained which is a 2-approximate vertex cover. Overall, since we have $OPT \leq W_{max} \cdot n$, the expected time of finding this solution is $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$. ■

3.2 Improved Approximations by Alternative Mutation

In this section, we analyse the expected time of Global SEMO with alternative mutation operator to find a $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximation.

Lemma 7. *A solution x fulfilling the two properties*

1. $LP(x) = LP(0^n) - Cost(x)$ and
2. *there is an optimal solution of the LP for $G(x)$ which assigns 1/2 to each non-isolated vertex of $G(x)$*

is included in the population of Global SEMO in expected time $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n + OPT))$.

Proof. As the standard mutation occurs with probability 1/2 in the alternative mutation operator, the search point 0^n which satisfies property 1 is included in the population in expected time of $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$ using the argument presented

in the proof of Lemma 5. Let $P' \subseteq P$ be a set of solutions such that for each solution $x \in P'$, $LP(x) + Cost(x) = LP(0^n)$. Let $x_{min} \in P'$ be a solution such that $LP(x_{min}) = \min_{x \in P'} LP(x)$.

If the optimal fractional vertex cover for $G(x_{min})$ assigns $1/2$ to each non-isolated vertex of $G(x_{min})$, then the conditions of the lemma hold. Otherwise, it assigns 1 to some non-isolated vertex, say v . The probability that the algorithm selects x_{min} and flips the bit corresponding to v , is $\Omega(\frac{1}{OPT \cdot n})$, because the population size is $O(OPT)$ (Lemma 4). Let x_{new} be the new solution. We have $Cost(x_{new}) = Cost(x_{min}) + w(v)$, and by Lemma 3, $LP_w(x_{new}) \leq LP_w(x_{min}) - w(v)$. This implies that $LP(x_{new}) + Cost(x_{new}) = LP(0^n)$; hence, x_{new} is a Pareto Optimal solution and is added to the population P .

Since $LP_w(x_{min}) \leq OPT$ (Lemma 2) and the weights are at least 1 , assuming that we already have the solution 0^n in the population, by means of the method of fitness based partitions, we find the expected time of finding a solution that fulfils the properties given above as $O(OPT^2 \cdot n)$. Since the search point 0^n is included in expected time $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n))$, the expected time that a solution fulfilling the properties given above is included in P is $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n + OPT))$. \blacksquare

We now present the main approximation result for Global SEMO using the alternative mutation operator.

Theorem 8. *The expected time until Global SEMO has obtained a solution that has expected approximation ratio $(1 + \varepsilon)$ is $O(OPT \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n + OPT))$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7, a solution x that satisfies the two properties given in Lemma 7 is included in the population in expected time of $O(OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n + OPT))$. For a set of nodes, X' , we define $Cost(X') = \sum_{v \in X'} w(v)$. Let X be the vertex set of graph $G(x)$. Also, let $S \subseteq X$ be a vertex cover of $G(x)$ with the minimum weight over all vertex covers of $G(x)$, and T be the set containing all non-isolated vertices in $X \setminus S$. Note that all vertices in $X \setminus (S \cup T)$ are isolated vertices in $G(x)$. Due to property 2 of Lemma 7, $\frac{1}{2}Cost(S) + \frac{1}{2}Cost(T) = LP(x) \leq Cost(S)$; therefore, $Cost(T) \leq Cost(S)$. Let $OPT' = OPT - Cost(x)$. Observe that $OPT' = Cost(S)$.

Let $s_1, \dots, s_{|S|}$ be a numbering of the vertices in S such that $w(s_i) \leq w(s_{i+1})$, for all $1 \leq i \leq |S| - 1$. And let $t_1, \dots, t_{|T|}$ be a numbering of the vertices in T such that $w(t_i) \geq w(t_{i+1})$, for all $1 \leq i \leq |T| - 1$. Let $S_1 = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_\rho\}$, where $\rho = \min\{|S|, (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT'\}$, and $T_1 = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_\eta\}$, where $\eta = \min\{|T|, (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT'\}$.

With probability $\Omega(\frac{1}{OPT})$, the algorithm Global SEMO selects the solution x , and sets $b = 1$ in the Alternative Mutation Operator. With $b = 1$, the probability that the bits corresponding to all vertices of S_1 are flipped, is $\Omega((\frac{1}{2})^\rho)$, and the probability that none of the bits corresponding to the vertices of T_1 are flipped is $\Omega((\frac{1}{2})^\eta)$. Also, the bits corresponding to the isolated vertices of $G(x)$ are flipped with probability $\frac{1}{n}$ by the Alternative Mutation Operator; hence, the probability that none of them flips is $\Omega(1)$. As a result, with probability $\Omega(\frac{1}{OPT} \cdot (\frac{1}{2})^{\rho+\eta})$, solution x is selected, the vertices of S_1 are included, and the vertices of T_1 and isolated vertices are not included in the new solution x' . Since $\rho + \eta \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$, and also $\rho + \eta \leq n$; the expected time until solution x' is found after reaching solution x , is $O(OPT \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}})$.

Note that the bits corresponding to vertices of $S_2 = S \setminus S_1$ and $T_2 = T \setminus T_1$, are arbitrarily flipped in solution x' with probability $1/2$ by the Alternative Mutation Operator. Here we show that for the expected cost and the LP value of x' , the following constraint holds: $E[\text{Cost}(x')] + 2 \cdot LP(x') \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$.

Let $S' \subseteq S$ and $T' \subseteq T$ denote the subset of vertices of S and T that are actually included in the new solution x' respectively. In the following, we show that for the expected values of $\text{Cost}(S')$ and $\text{Cost}(T')$, we have:

$$E[\text{Cost}(S')] \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' + E[\text{Cost}(T')] \quad (1)$$

Since the bits corresponding to the vertices of S_2 and T_2 are flipped with probability $1/2$, for the expected values of $\text{Cost}(S')$ and $\text{Cost}(T')$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\text{Cost}(S')] &= \text{Cost}(S_1) + \frac{\text{Cost}(S_2)}{2} \\ &= \text{Cost}(S_1) + \frac{\text{Cost}(S) - \text{Cost}(S_1)}{2} \\ &= 1/2\text{Cost}(S) + 1/2\text{Cost}(S_1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E[\text{Cost}(T')] = 1/2\text{Cost}(T_2)$$

If $\rho = |S|$, then $S_1 = S$ and $\text{Cost}(S_1) = \text{Cost}(S) = OPT'$. If $\rho = (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT'$, we have $\text{Cost}(S_1) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT'$, since each vertex has a weight of at least 1. Using $\text{Cost}(S) = OPT'$ and the inequality above, we have

$$E[\text{Cost}(S')] \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' + \frac{\varepsilon \cdot OPT'}{2}$$

We divide the analysis into two cases based on the relation between η and $|T|$.

Case (I). $\eta = |T|$. Then $T_2 = T' = \emptyset$. Thus, $E[\text{Cost}(T')] = 0$ and Inequality (1) holds true.

Case (II). $\eta = (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' < |T|$. Since $w(t_i) \geq w(t_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq |T| - 1$ and $\text{Cost}(T) \leq \text{Cost}(S) = OPT'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost}(T_2) &\leq \frac{|T| - \eta}{|T|} \text{Cost}(T) \\ &\leq \frac{OPT' - (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT'}{OPT'} \text{Cost}(T) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \text{Cost}(S) = \varepsilon \cdot OPT' \end{aligned}$$

Thus for the expected value of $\text{Cost}(T')$, we have

$$E[\text{Cost}(T')] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Cost}(T_2) \leq \frac{\varepsilon \cdot OPT'}{2}$$

Summarizing above analysis, we can get that the Inequality 1 holds. In the following, using Inequality (1), we prove that, on expectation, the new solution x' satisfies the inequality $\text{Cost}(x') + 2 \cdot LP(x') \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$.

$$E[\text{Cost}(x')] + 2 \cdot LP(x')$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{Cost}(x) + E[\text{Cost}(S')] + E[\text{Cost}(T')] + 2 \cdot LP(x') \\
&\leq \text{Cost}(x) + E[\text{Cost}(S')] + E[\text{Cost}(S')] - (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' + 2 \cdot LP(x') \\
&\leq \text{Cost}(x) + 2E[\text{Cost}(S')] - (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' + 2 \cdot (OPT' - E[\text{Cost}(S')]) \\
&= \text{Cost}(x) + (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT' = \text{Cost}(x) + (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot (OPT - \text{Cost}(x)) \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we analyze whether the new solution x' could be included in the population P . If x' could not be included in P , then there is a solution x'' dominating x , i.e., $LP(x'') \leq LP(x')$ and $\text{Cost}(x'') \leq \text{Cost}(x')$. This implies $\text{Cost}(x'') + 2 \cdot LP(x'') < \text{Cost}(x') + 2 \cdot LP(x') \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$. Therefore, after having a solution that fulfils the properties of Lemma 7 in P , in expected time $O(OPT \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}})$, the population would contain a solution y such that $\text{Cost}(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$.

Let P' contain all solutions $x \in P$ such that $\text{Cost}(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$, and let x_{min} be the one that minimizes LP . With similar proof as we saw in Theorem 6 it is possible to show that at each step, $LP(x_{min})$ improves by $\frac{LP(x)}{en(2 \cdot OPT + 1)}$ in expectation. Using Multiplicative Drift Analysis, we get the expected time $O(OPT \cdot n \log OPT)$ to find a solution y for which $LP(y) = 0$ and $\text{Cost}(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$.

Overall, the expected number of iterations of Global SEMO with alternative mutation operator, for getting a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate weighted vertex cover, is bounded by $O(OPT \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + OPT \cdot n(\log W_{max} + \log n + OPT))$. ■

4 Analysis of DEMO

Due to Lemma 4, with Global SEMO, the population size is upper bounded by $O(OPT)$, which can be exponential in terms of the input size. In this section, we analyse the other evolutionary algorithm, DEMO (Algorithm 3), that uses some diversity handling mechanisms for dealing with exponentially large population sizes. The following lemmata are used in the proof of Theorem 12.

Lemma 9. *Let W_{max} be the maximum weight assigned to a vertex. The population size of DEMO is upper bounded by $O(n \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max}))$.*

Proof. The values that can be taken by b_1 are integer values between 0 and $\lceil \log_{1+\delta}(1 + \text{Cost}(1^n)) \rceil$ and the values that can be taken by b_2 are integer values between 0 and $\lceil \log_{1+\delta}(1 + LP(0^n)) \rceil$ (Lemma 2). Since $n \cdot W_{max}$ is an upper bound for both $\text{Cost}(1^n)$ and $LP(0^n)$, the number of rows and also the number of columns are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
k &= (1 + \lceil \log_{1+\delta}(1 + n \cdot W_{max}) \rceil) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \left\lceil \frac{\log(1 + n \cdot W_{max})}{\log(1 + \delta)} \right\rceil \right) \\
&= O(n \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max}))
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because $\delta = \frac{1}{2n}$.

We here show that the size of the population is $P_{size} \leq 2k - 1$. Since the dominated solutions according to f are discarded by the algorithm, none of the solutions in P can be located in a box that is dominated by another box that contains a solution in P . Moreover, at most one solution from each box is kept in the population; therefore, P_{size} is at most the maximum number of boxes where none of them dominates another.

Let k_1 be the number of boxes that contain a solution of P in the first column. Let r_1 be the smallest row number among these boxes. Observe that $r_1 \leq k - k_1 + 1$ and the equality holds when the boxes are from rows k down to $k - k_1 + 1$. Any box in the second column with a row number of $r_1 + 1$ or above is dominated by the box of the previous column and row r_1 . Therefore, the maximum row number for a box in the second column, that is not dominated, is $r_1 \leq k - k_1 + 1$. With generalizing the idea, the maximum row number for a box in the column i , that is not dominated, is $r_{i-1} \leq k - k_1 - \dots - k_{i-1} + i - 1$, where for $1 \leq j \leq k$, k_j is the number of boxes that contain a solution of P in column j .

The last column has $k_k \leq r_{k-1}$ boxes which gives us:

$$k_k \leq r_{k-1} \leq k - k_1 - \dots - k_{k-1} + k - 1$$

This implies that

$$k_1 + \dots + k_k \leq r_{k-1} \leq 2k - 1$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 10. *The search point $x_z = 0^n$ is included in the population in expected time of $O(n^3(\log n + \log W_{max})^2)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 9 we know that the population contains $P_{size} = O(n \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max}))$ solutions. Therefore, at each step, there is a probability of at least $\frac{1}{P_{size}}$ that the solution x_{min} is selected where $b_1(x_{min}) = \min_{x \in P} b_1(x)$.

If $b_1(x_{min}) = 0$, we have $Cost(x_{min}) = 0$, which means $x_{min} = 0^n$ since the weights are greater than 0.

If $b_1(x_{min}) \neq 0$, there must be at least one vertex v_i in x_{min} where $x_i = 1$. Consider v_j the vertex that maximizes $w(v_i)$ among vertices v_i where $x_i = 1$. If $Cost(x) = C$, then $w(v_j) \geq \frac{C}{n}$, because n is an upper bound on the number of vertices selected by x_{min} . As a result, removing vertex x_j from solution x_{min} results in a solution x' for which $Cost(x') \leq C \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{n})$. Using this value of $Cost(x')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \delta)(1 + Cost(x')) &\leq 1 + \delta + C(1 - \frac{1}{n})(1 + \delta) \\ &\leq 1 + \delta + C + C(\delta - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\delta}{n}) \\ &\leq 1 + C\delta + C + C(\delta - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\delta}{n}) \\ &\leq 1 + C + C(2\delta - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\delta}{n}) \\ &\leq 1 + C \end{aligned}$$

The third inequality above holds because $C \geq 1$ and the last one holds because $\delta = \frac{1}{2n}$. From $(1 + \delta)(1 + \text{Cost}(x')) \leq 1 + C$ we can observe that

$$1 + \log_{1+\delta}(1 + \text{Cost}(x')) \leq \log_{1+\delta}(1 + C)$$

which implies $b_1(x') \leq b_1(x) - 1$. Note that x' is obtained by performing a 1-bit flip on x and is done at each step with a probability of at least

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{P_{\text{size}}} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1} \\ &= \Omega\left(\frac{1}{n(\log n + \log W_{\max})} \cdot \frac{1}{n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in expected time of at most $O(n^2(\log n + \log W_{\max}))$ the new solution, x' is obtained which is accepted by the algorithm because it is placed in a box with a smaller value of b_1 than all solutions in P and hence not dominated. There are $O(n(\log n + \log W_{\max}))$ different values for b_1 ; therefore, the solution $x_z = 0^n$ with $b_1(x_z) = 0$ is found in expected time of at most $O(n^3(\log n + \log W_{\max})^2)$. ■

Lemma 11. *Let $x \in P$ be a search point such that $\text{Cost}(x) + 2 \cdot \text{LP}(x) \leq 2 \cdot \text{OPT}$ and $b_2(x) > 0$. There exists a 1-bit flip leading to a search point x' with $\text{Cost}(x') + 2 \cdot \text{LP}(x') \leq 2 \cdot \text{OPT}$ and $b_2(x') < b_2(x)$.*

Proof. Let $y = \{y_1 \cdots y_n\}$ be a basic half integral LP solution for $G(x)$. Since $b_2(x) = \text{LP}(x) \neq 0$, there must be at least one uncovered edge; hence, at least one vertex v_i has a $y_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$ in LP solution y . Consider v_j the vertex that maximizes $y_i w(v_i)$ among vertices v_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. Also, let x' be a solution obtained by adding v_j to x . Since solutions x and x' are only different in one vertex, v_j , we have $\text{Cost}(x') = \text{Cost}(x) + w(v_j)$. Moreover, according to Lemma 3, $\text{LP}(x') \leq \text{LP}(x) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot w(v_j)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost}(x') + 2 \cdot \text{LP}(x') &\leq \text{Cost}(x) + w(v_j) + 2 \left(\text{LP}(x) - \frac{w(v_j)}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \text{Cost}(x) + 2 \cdot \text{LP}(x) \leq 2 \cdot \text{OPT} \end{aligned}$$

which means solution x' fulfils the mentioned constraint. If $\text{LP}(x) = W$, then $y_j w(v_j) \geq \frac{W}{n}$, because n is an upper bound on the number of vertices selected by the LP solution. As a result, using Lemma 3, we get $\text{LP}(x') \leq W \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)$. Therefore, with similar analysis as Lemma 10 we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \delta)(1 + \text{LP}(x')) &\leq 1 + \delta + W \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) (1 + \delta) \\ &\leq 1 + W \end{aligned}$$

This inequality implies

$$1 + \log_{1+\delta}(1 + \text{LP}(x')) \leq \log_{1+\delta}(1 + W)$$

As a result, $b_2(x') < b_2(x)$ holds for x' , which is obtained by performing a 1-bit flip on x , and the lemma is proved. ■

Theorem 12. *The expected time until DEMO constructs a 2-approximate vertex cover is $O(n^3 \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max})^2)$.*

Proof. Consider solution $x \in P$ that minimizes $b_2(x)$ under the constraint that $Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq 2 \cdot OPT$. Note that 0^n fulfils this constraint and according to Lemma 10, the solution 0^n will be included in P in time $O(n^3(\log n + \log W_{max})^2)$.

If $b_2(x) = 0$ then x covers all edges and by selection of x we have $Cost(x) \leq 2 \cdot OPT$, which means that x is a 2-approximation.

In case $b_2(x) \neq 0$, according to Lemma 11 there is a one-bit flip on x that results in a new solution x' for which $b_2(x') < b_2(x)$, while the mentioned constraint also holds for it. Since the population size is $O(n \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max}))$ (Lemma 9), this 1-bit flip happens with a probability of $\Omega(n^{-2} \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max})^{-1})$ and x' is obtained in expected time of $O(n^3 \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max})^2)$. This new solution will be added to P because a solution y with $Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) > 2 \cdot OPT$ can not dominate x' with $Cost(x') + 2 \cdot LP(x') \leq 2 \cdot OPT$, and x' has the minimum value of b_2 among solution that fulfil the constraint. Moreover, if there already is a solution, x_{prev} , in the same box as x' , it will be replaced by x' because $Cost(x_{prev}) + 2 \cdot LP(x_{prev}) > 2 \cdot OPT$; otherwise, it would have been selected as x .

There are at most $1 + \lceil \frac{\log n + \log W_{max}}{\log(1+\delta)} \rceil$ different values for b_2 in the objective space, therefore, the expected time until a solution x'' is found so that $b_2(x'') = 0$ and $Cost(x'') + 2 \cdot LP(x'') \leq 2 \cdot OPT$, is at most $O(n^3 \cdot (\log n + \log W_{max})^2)$. ■

5 Diverse Population-based EA

In this section, we introduced a population-based algorithm (see Algorithm 4) that keeps for each k , $0 \leq k \leq n$, at most two solutions. This implies that the population size is upper bounded by $2n$. The two solutions kept in the population are chosen according to different weighing of the cost and the LP-value. For each solution x , let $|x|_1$ be the number of selected nodes in x . Algorithm 4 keeps a new solution x' in the population, if it minimizes $Cost(z) + LP(z)$ or $Cost(z) + 2 \cdot LP(z)$ among other solutions $x \in P$ where $|x|_1 = |x'|_1$. Algorithm 4 gives a detailed description.

Taking into account that the population size is upper bounded by $2n$ and considering in each step an individual with the smallest number of ones in the population for mutation, one can obtain the following lemma by standard fitness level arguments.

Lemma 13. *The search point 0^n is included in the population in expected time of $O(n^2 \log n)$.*

To show the main result for Diverse Population-Based EA, we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 14. *A solution x fulling the two properties*

1. $LP(x) = LP(0^n) - Cost(x)$ and
2. *there is an optimal solution of the LP for $G(x)$ which assigns 1/2 to each non-isolated vertex of $G(x)$*

```

1 Choose  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  uniformly at random;
2  $P \leftarrow \{x\}$ ;
3 repeat
4   Choose  $x \in P$  uniformly at random;
5   Create  $x'$  by using Alternative Mutation Operator;
6    $P \leftarrow \{x'\}$ ;
7   Let  $P'$  be a set containing all solutions  $y \in P$  where  $|y|_1 = |x'|_1$ ;
8   Find solutions  $y_{min_1}$  and  $y_{min_2}$  from  $P'$  such that  $y_{min_1}$  minimizes
    $Cost(z) + LP(z)$ , and  $y_{min_2}$  minimizes  $Cost(z) + 2 \cdot LP(z)$  among solutions
    $z \in P'$ ;
9    $P = P \setminus P'$ ;
10   $P \leftarrow \{y_{min_1}, y_{min_2}\}$ ;
11 until termination condition satisfied;

```

Algorithm 4: Diverse Population-Based EA

is included in the population of the Diverse Population-Based EA in expected time $O(n^3)$.

Proof. By Lemma 13, solution 0^n is contained in the population in expected time $O(n^2 \log n)$, which satisfies the property 1 given above. Let $P' \subseteq P$ be a set containing all solutions in P that satisfy the property 1 given above.

Let x_{max} be the solution of P' with the maximal number of 1-bits. If the optimal fractional vertex cover for $G(x_{max})$ assigns $1/2$ to each non-isolated vertex of $G(x_{max})$, then the second property also holds. If the optimal fractional vertex cover for $G(x_{max})$ assigns 1 to some non-isolated vertex, say v , then the algorithm selects x_{max} and flips exactly the bit corresponding to v with probability $\Omega(\frac{1}{n^2})$. Let x' be the new solution. By selection of x_{max} we know that x' is the only solution with $|x_{max}|_1 + 1$ one-bits; hence, added to P .

Since the maximum value of $|x|_1$ is n , after expected time of $O(n^3)$, there is a solution in the population that fulfils the properties given in the lemma. ■

We now show the main result for the Diverse Population-Based EA.

Theorem 15. *The expected time until Diverse Population-Based EA has obtained a solution that has expected approximation ratio $(1 + \varepsilon)$ is $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 14 we know that after expected time of $O(n^3)$, there is a solution, x , in the population that fulfils the properties given in that lemma. With analysis similar to what we had in Theorem 8, we can show that a solution x with $Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$ is produced in expected time $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$.

Now we see whether solution x is added to population P . If x could not be added to P , then there exists a solution $y \in P$ such that $|y|_1 = |x|_1$ and $Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x)$. Thus, the population already includes a solution y such that $Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$.

Let P' be a set containing all solutions $x \in P$ such that $Cost(x) + 2 \cdot LP(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$. Let $x_{max} \in P'$ such that $|x_{max}|_1 = \max_{x \in P'} |x|_1$.

If $LP(x_{max}) = 0$, then solution x_{max} leads to a vertex cover for graph G . If $LP(x_{max}) > 0$, we present a way to construct a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate vertex cover as follows, using x_{max} . If $LP(x_{max}) > 0$, then there exists at least one vertex v to which the optimal fractional vertex cover $LP(x_{max})$ assigns value at least $1/2$. Then the algorithm selects the solution x_{max} and flips exactly the bit corresponding to the vertex v with probability $\Omega(\frac{1}{n^2})$. Let y be the new solution. We have

$$Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq Cost(x_{max}) + 2 \cdot LP(x_{max}) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT.$$

Suppose that y could not be included in P , then there exists a solution y' in P such that $|y'|_1 = |y|_1$ and $2 \cdot LP(y') + Cost(y') \leq 2 \cdot LP(y) + Cost(y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$, which contradicts the assumption that $|x_{max}|_1 = \max_{x \in P'} |x|_1$. Therefore, solution y could be included in P .

Observe that for any solution x , if $|x|_1 = n$, then $LP(x) = 0$. Thus, after expected time of at most $O(n^3)$, the population P could include a solution y such that $Cost(y) + 2 \cdot LP(y) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot OPT$ and $LP(y) = 0$, which is a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate weighted vertex cover.

Overall, the expected time in which Diverse Population-Based EA finds a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate weighted vertex cover, is bounded by $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$. ■

6 Conclusion

The minimum vertex cover problem is one of the classical NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems. In this paper, we have generalized previous results of Kratsch and Neumann [11] for the unweighted minimum vertex cover problem to the weighted case where in addition weights on the nodes are given. Our investigations show that Global SEMO efficiently computes a 2-approximation as long as the value of an optimal solution is small. Furthermore, we have studied the algorithm DEMO using the ε -dominance approach and shown that it reaches a 2-approximation in expected polynomial time. Furthermore, we have generalized the results for Global SEMO to $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximations and presented a population-based approach with a specific diversity mechanism that reaches an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in expected time $O(n \cdot 2^{\min\{n, 2(1-\varepsilon)OPT\}} + n^3)$.

Acknowledgements

This research has been supported by Australian Research Council grants DP140103400 and DP160102401.

Bibliography

- [1] A. Auger and B. Doerr. *Theory of Randomized Search Heuristics: Foundations and Recent Developments*. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., 2011.

- [2] M. Balinski. On the maximum matching, minimum covering. In *Proc. Symp. Math. Programming*, pages 434–445. Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [3] B. Doerr, D. Johannsen, and C. Winzen. Multiplicative drift analysis. *Algorithmica*, 64(4):673–697, 2012.
- [4] T. Friedrich, J. He, N. Hebbinghaus, F. Neumann, and C. Witt. Analyses of simple hybrid algorithms for the vertex cover problem. *Evolutionary Computation*, 17(1):3–19, 2009.
- [5] T. Friedrich, N. Hebbinghaus, F. Neumann, J. He, and C. Witt. Approximating covering problems by randomized search heuristics using multi-objective models. In *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation, GECCO '07*, pages 797–804, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [6] D. S. Hochbaum. Efficient bounds for the stable set, vertex cover and set packing problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 6(3):243 – 254, 1983.
- [7] C. Horoba and F. Neumann. Benefits and drawbacks for the use of ϵ -dominance in evolutionary multi-objective optimization. In *In Proc. of GECCO 2008*, 2008.
- [8] T. Jansen. *Analyzing Evolutionary Algorithms - The Computer Science Perspective*. Natural Computing Series. Springer, 2013.
- [9] T. Jansen, P. S. Oliveto, and C. Zarges. Approximating vertex cover using edge-based representations. In F. Neumann and K. A. D. Jong, editors, *Foundations of Genetic Algorithms XII, FOGA '13, Adelaide, SA, Australia, January 16-20, 2013*, pages 87–96. ACM, 2013.
- [10] S. Kratsch, P. K. Lehre, F. Neumann, and P. S. Oliveto. Fixed parameter evolutionary algorithms and maximum leaf spanning trees: A matter of mutation. In R. Schaefer, C. Cotta, J. Kolodziej, and G. Rudolph, editors, *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN XI, 11th International Conference, Kraków, Poland, September 11-15, 2010, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 6238 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 204–213. Springer, 2010.
- [11] S. Kratsch and F. Neumann. Fixed-parameter evolutionary algorithms and the vertex cover problem. *Algorithmica*, 65(4):754–771, 2013.
- [12] M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, K. Deb, and E. Zitzler. Combining convergence and diversity in evolutionary multiobjective optimization. *Evol. Comput.*, 10(3):263–282, Sept. 2002.
- [13] F. Neumann and J. Reichel. Approximating minimum multicuts by evolutionary multi-objective algorithms. In G. Rudolph, T. Jansen, S. M. Lucas, C. Poloni, and N. Beume, editors, *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN X, 10th International Conference Dortmund, Germany, September 13-17, 2008, Proceedings*, volume 5199 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 72–81. Springer, 2008.

- [14] F. Neumann, J. Reichel, and M. Skutella. Computing minimum cuts by randomized search heuristics. *Algorithmica*, 59(3):323–342, 2011.
- [15] F. Neumann and C. Witt. *Bioinspired Computation in Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Their Computational Complexity*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1st edition, 2010.
- [16] P. S. Oliveto, J. He, and X. Yao. Analysis of the (1+1)-ea for finding approximate solutions to vertex cover problems. *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, 13(5):1006–1029, 2009.
- [17] M. Pourhassan, W. Gao, and F. Neumann. Maintaining 2-approximations for the dynamic vertex cover problem using evolutionary algorithms. In S. Silva and A. I. Esparcia-Alcázar, editors, *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2015, Madrid, Spain, July 11-15, 2015*, pages 903–910. ACM, 2015.
- [18] A. M. Sutton and F. Neumann. A parameterized runtime analysis of simple evolutionary algorithms for makespan scheduling. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature (PPSN 2012)*, pages 52–61. Springer, 2012.
- [19] A. M. Sutton, F. Neumann, and S. Nallaperuma. Parameterized runtime analyses of evolutionary algorithms for the planar euclidean traveling salesperson problem. *Evolutionary Computation*, 22(4):595–628, 2014.