

## Quasi-genetic algorithms and continuation Newton methods with deflation techniques for global optimization problems

Xin-long Luo\* · Hang Xiao

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** The global minimum point of an optimization problem is of interest in engineering fields and it is difficult to be found, especially for a nonconvex optimization problem. In this article, we consider a quasi-genetic algorithm and the continuation Newton method for this problem. Firstly, we use the continuation Newton method with the deflation technique to find critical points of the objective function as many as possible. Then, we use those critical points as the initial evolutionary seeds of the quasi-genetic algorithm. After evolving into several generations such as twenty generations, we obtain a suboptimal point of the optimization problem. Finally, we use this suboptimal point as the initial point of the continuation Newton method to obtain the critical point of the original objective function, and output the minimizer between this final critical point and the suboptimal point of the quasi-genetic algorithm as the global minimum point of the original optimization problem. Numerical results show that the proposed method is quite reliable to find the global optimal point of the unconstrained optimization problem, compared to the multi-start method (the built-in subroutine GlobalSearch.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment).

**Keywords** Genetic algorithm · continuation Newton method · deflation technique · nonconvex optimization · global optimization

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010)** 65K05 · 65L05 · 65L20

---

Xin-long Luo, Corresponding author  
School of Artificial Intelligence, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, P. O. Box 101,  
Xitucheng Road No. 10, Haidian District, 100876, Beijing China, E-mail: luoxinlong@bupt.edu.cn

Hang Xiao  
School of Artificial Intelligence, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, P. O. Box 101,  
Xitucheng Road No. 10, Haidian District, 100876, Beijing China, E-mail: xiaohang0210@bupt.edu.cn

## 1 Introduction

In this article, we are mainly concerned with the global minimum of the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{x \in \mathcal{R}^n} f(x), \quad (1)$$

where  $f : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  is a differentiable function. When problem (1) is nonconvex, it may have many local minimizers and it is challenge to find its global minimizer. For problem (1), there are some popular global optimization methods, such as the multi-start methods [5, 13, 41, 46] based on the local minimum methods [8, 12, 39, 43], the genetic algorithms [23, 35, 37] and their hybrid algorithms [16, 45].

For multi-start methods, they use the local minimum method such as the trust-region method [8, 49] or the line search method [39, 43] to solve problem (1) and find its local minimum point  $x^*$ , which satisfies the following first-order condition

$$F(x^*) = \nabla f(x^*) = 0. \quad (2)$$

Since the implementations of multi-start methods are simple and successful for many real-world problems, many commercial global solvers are based on these methods such as GlobalSearch.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment [36, 46].

However, for the multi-start method, a starting point could easily lie in the basin of attraction of a previously found local minimum point [41]. Hence, the algorithm might find the same local minima even if the searches are initiated from points that are far apart. In order to make up this disadvantage, we consider the deflation technique [7] and the continuation Newton method [30] to find the critical points of  $f(x)$  as many as possible via solving the nonlinear system (2). Then, we select the first  $L$  smallest critical points of  $f(x)$  as the initial evolutionary seeds of the quasi-genetic algorithm [35, 37]. After the Quasi-genetic algorithm evolves into several generations such as twenty generations, we obtain a suboptimal point  $x_{ag}^*$ . Finally, we use this suboptimal point  $x_{ag}^*$  as the initial point of the continuation Newton method [30] to solve the nonlinear equation (2) and obtain one critical point  $x_{cn}^*$  of  $f(x)$ . Finally, we output  $x_{min}^* = \arg \min \{f(x_{ag}^*), f(x_{cn}^*)\}$  as the global minimum point of the algorithm.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In the next section, we convert the nonlinear system (2) into the continuation Newton flow. Then, we give the continuation Newton method with the trust-region updating strategy to follow the continuation Newton flow and obtain its steady-state solution, i.e. a critical point of  $f(x)$ . In section 3, we consider the deflation technique to construct a new nonlinear function  $G_k(\cdot)$  such that the zero points of  $G_k(x)$  are the critical points of  $f(x)$  and exclude the previously obtained critical points  $x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*$  of  $f(x)$ . In section 4, by using these critical points  $x_1^*, \dots, x_K^*$ , we give a quasi-genetic algorithm to obtain a good initial point for the continuation Newton method finding the global optimal solution of problem (1). In section 5, some promising numerical results of the proposed method are reported, with comparison to the multi-start method (the subroutine GlobalSearch.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment). Finally, some discussions and conclusions are

also given in section 6.  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean vector norm or its induced matrix norm throughout the paper.

## 2 Finding a critical point with the continuous Newton method

For the completeness of the paper, we restate the continuation Newton method with the trust-region updating strategy [30] for finding a solution of the nonlinear system (2).

If we consider the damped Newton method for the nonlinear system (2) [20, 21, 40], we have

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \alpha_k J(x_k)^{-1} F(x_k), \quad (3)$$

where  $J(x_k)$  is the Jacobian matrix of  $F(x_k)$ . We regard  $x_{k+1} = x(t_k + \alpha_k)$ ,  $x_k = x(t_k)$  and let  $\alpha_k \rightarrow 0$ , then we obtain the following continuous Newton flow [4, 6, 9, 30, 44]:

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -J(x)^{-1} F(x), \quad x(t_0) = x_0. \quad (4)$$

Actually, if we apply an iteration with the explicit Euler method [3] for the continuous Newton flow (4), we obtain the damped Newton method (3). Since the Jacobian matrix  $J(x) = F'(x)$  may be singular, we reformulate the continuous Newton flow (4) as the following general formula:

$$-J(x) \frac{dx(t)}{dt} = F(x), \quad x(t_0) = x_0. \quad (5)$$

The continuous Newton flow (5) is an old method and can be backtracked to Davidenko's work [9] in 1953. After that, it was investigated by Branin [6], Deuffhard et al [11], Tanabe [44] and Kalaba et al [18] in 1970s, and applied to nonlinear boundary problems by Axelsson and Sysala [4] recently. The continuous and even growing interest in this method originates from its some nice properties. One of them is that the solution  $x(t)$  of the continuous Newton flow (5) converges to the steady-state solution  $x^*$  from any initial point  $x_0$ , as described by the following property 2.1.

*Property 2.1* (Branin [6] and Tanabe [44]) Assume that  $x(t)$  is the solution of the continuous Newton flow (5), then  $E(x(t)) = \|F(x)\|^2$  converges to zero when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . That is to say, for every limit point  $x^*$  of  $x(t)$ , it is also a solution of the nonlinear system (2). Furthermore, every element  $F^i(x)$  of  $F(x)$  has the same convergence rate  $\exp(-t)$  and  $x(t)$  can not converge to the solution  $x^*$  of the nonlinear system (2) on the finite interval when the initial point  $x_0$  is not a solution of the nonlinear system (2).

**Proof.** Assume that  $x(t)$  is the solution of the continuous Newton flow (5), then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} (e^t F(x)) = e^t J(x) \frac{dx(t)}{dt} + e^t F(x) = 0.$$

Consequently, we obtain

$$F(x(t)) = F(x_0)e^{-t}. \quad (6)$$

From equation (6), it is not difficult to know that every element  $F^i(x)$  of  $F(x)$  converges to zero with the convergence rate  $e^{-t}$  when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, if the solution  $x(t)$  of the continuous Newton flow (5) belongs to a compact set, it has a limit point  $x^*$  when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and this limit point  $x^*$  is also a solution of the nonlinear system (2).

If we assume that the solution  $x(t)$  of the continuous Newton flow (5) converges to the solution  $x^*$  of the nonlinear system (2) on the finite interval  $(0, T]$ , from equation (6), we have

$$F(x^*) = F(x_0)e^{-T}. \quad (7)$$

Since  $x^*$  is a solution of the nonlinear system (2), we have  $F(x^*) = 0$ . By substituting it into equation (7), we obtain

$$F(x_0) = 0.$$

Thus, it contradicts the assumption that  $x_0$  is not a solution of the nonlinear system (2). Consequently, the solution  $x(t)$  of the continuous Newton flow (5) can not converge to the solution  $x^*$  of the nonlinear system (2) on the finite interval.  $\square$

*Remark 2.1* The inverse  $J(x)^{-1}$  of the Jacobian matrix  $J(x)$  can be regarded as the pre-conditioner of  $F(x)$  such that the solution elements  $x^i(t)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) of the continuous Newton flow (4) have the roughly same convergence rates and it mitigates the stiff property of the ODE (4) (the definition of the stiff problem can be found in [15] and references therein). This property is very useful since it makes us adopt the explicit ODE method to follow the trajectory of the Newton flow.

Actually, if we consider  $F(x) = Ax$ , from the ODE (5), we have

$$A \frac{dx}{dt} = -Ax, \quad x(0) = x_0. \quad (8)$$

By integrating the linear ODE (8), we obtain

$$x(t) = e^{-t}x_0. \quad (9)$$

From equation (9), we know that the solution  $x(t)$  of the ODE (8) converges to zero exponentially with the same rate  $e^{-t}$  when  $t$  tends to infinity.

When the Jacobian matrix  $J(x)$  is singular or nearly singular, the ODE (5) is the system of differential-algebraic equations (DAEs) and its trajectory can not be efficiently followed by the general ODE method such as the backward differentiation formulas [3, 15]. Thus, we need to construct the special method to handle this problem. We expect that the new method has the global convergence as the homotopy continuation methods and the fast convergence rate near the solution  $x^*$  as the merit-function methods. In order to achieve these two aims, we construct the special continuation Newton method with the new step size  $\alpha_k = \Delta t_k / (1 + \Delta t_k)$  [30–34]

and the time step  $\Delta t_k$  is adaptively adjusted by the trust-region updating strategy for problem (5).

Firstly, we apply the implicit Euler method to the continuous Newton flow (5) [3, 15], then we obtain

$$J(x_{k+1})(x_{k+1} - x_k) = -\Delta t_k F(x_{k+1}). \quad (10)$$

The scheme (10) is an implicit formula and it needs to solve a system of nonlinear equations at every iteration. To avoid solving the system of nonlinear equations, we replace the Jacobian matrix  $J(x_{k+1})$  with  $J(x_k)$  and substitute  $F(x_{k+1})$  with its linear approximation  $F(x_k) + J(x_k)(x_{k+1} - x_k)$  into equation (10), respectively. Thus, we obtain the following explicit continuation Newton method:

$$J(x_k)s_k^N = -F(x_k), \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} s_k^N. \quad (11)$$

*Remark 2.2* The continuation Newton method (11) is similar to the damped Newton method (3) if we let  $\alpha_k = \Delta t_k / (1 + \Delta t_k)$  in equation (11). However, from the view of the ODE method, they are different. The damped Newton method (3) is obtained by the explicit Euler method applied to the continuous Newton flow (5), and its time-stepping size  $\alpha_k$  is restricted by the numerical stability [15]. That is to say, for the linear test equation  $dx/dt = -\lambda x$ , its time step size  $\alpha_k$  is restricted by the stable region  $|1 - \lambda \alpha_k| \leq 1$ . Therefore, the large time step  $\alpha_k$  can not be adopted in the steady-state phase. The continuation Newton method (11) is obtained by the implicit Euler method and its linear approximation applied to the continuous Newton flow (5), and its time step size  $\Delta t_k$  is not restricted by the numerical stability. Therefore, the large time step can be adopted in the steady-state phase for the continuation Newton method (11), and it mimics the Newton method near the solution  $x^*$  such that it has the fast local convergence rate. The most of all,  $\alpha_k = \Delta t_k / (\Delta t_k + 1)$  in equation (11) is favourable to adopt the trust-region updating strategy for adaptively adjusting the time step  $\Delta t_k$  such that the continuation Newton method (11) accurately traces the trajectory of the generalized continuous Newton flow in the transient-state phase and achieves the fast convergence rate near the equilibrium point  $x^*$ .

For a real-world problem, the analytical Jacobian  $J(x_k)$  may not be offered. Thus, in practice, we replace the Jacobian matrix  $J(x_k)$  with its difference approximation as follows:

$$J(x_k) \approx \left[ \frac{F(x_k + \varepsilon e_1) - F(x_k)}{\varepsilon}, \dots, \frac{F(x_k + \varepsilon e_n) - F(x_k)}{\varepsilon} \right], \quad (12)$$

where  $e_i$  represents the unit vector whose elements equal zeros except for the  $i$ -th element which equals 1, and the parameter  $\varepsilon$  can be selected as  $10^{-6}$  according to our numerical experiments.

Another issue is how to adaptively adjust the time step  $\Delta t_k$  at every iteration. There is a popular way to control the time step size based on the trust-region updating

strategy [10, 17, 24, 26–29, 31]. Its main idea is that the time step size  $\Delta t_{k+1}$  will be enlarged when the linear model  $F(x_k) + J(x_k)s_k$  approximates  $F(x_k + s_k)$  well, and  $\Delta t_{k+1}$  will be reduced when  $F(x_k) + J(x_k)s_k$  approximates  $F(x_k + s_k)$  badly. Thus, by using the relation (11), we enlarge or reduce the time step size  $\Delta t_k$  at every iteration according to the following ratio:

$$\rho_k = \frac{\|F(x_k)\| - \|F(x_k + s_k)\|}{\|F(x_k)\| + \|F(x_k) + J(x_k)s_k\|} = \frac{\|F(x_k)\| - \|F(x_k + s_k)\|}{(\Delta t_k / (1 + \Delta t_k)) \|F(x_k)\|}. \quad (13)$$

A particular adjustment strategy is given as follows:

$$\Delta t_{k+1} = \begin{cases} 2\Delta t_k, & \text{if } 0 \leq |1 - \rho_k| \leq \eta_1, \\ \Delta t_k, & \text{else if } \eta_1 < |1 - \rho_k| < \eta_2, \\ \frac{1}{2}\Delta t_k, & \text{others,} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where the constants are selected as  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$  according to our numerical experiments. When  $\rho_k \geq \eta_a$ , we accept the trial step and set

$$s_k = \frac{\Delta t_k}{1 + \Delta t_k} s_k^N, \quad x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k, \quad (15)$$

where the Newton step  $s_k^N$  is by equation (11) and  $\eta_a$  is a small positive number such as  $\eta_a = 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$ . Otherwise, we discard the trial step and set

$$x_{k+1} = x_k, \quad s_{k+1}^N = s_k^N, \quad F_{k+1} = F_k. \quad (16)$$

*Remark 2.3* This new time step selection based on the trust-region updating strategy has some advantages compared to the traditional line search strategy [25]. If we use the line search strategy and the damped Newton method (3) to track the trajectory  $x(t)$  of the continuous Newton flow (5), in order to achieve the fast convergence rate in the steady-state phase, the time step  $\alpha_k$  of the damped Newton method is tried from 1 and reduced by the half with many times at every iteration. Since the linear model  $F(x_k) + J(x_k)s_k^N$  may not approximate  $F(x_k + s_k^N)$  well in the transient-state phase, the time step  $\alpha_k$  will be small. Consequently, the line search strategy consumes the unnecessary trial steps in the transient-state phase. However, the time step selection method based on the trust-region updating strategy (13)-(14) can overcome this shortcoming.

According to the above discussions, we give the detailed descriptions of the continuation Newton method and the trust-region updating strategy for finding a critical point of  $f(x)$  (i.e. a solution of the nonlinear system (2)) in Algorithm 1. The global convergence and local suplinear convergence of Algorithm 1 can be found in [30].

---

**Algorithm 1** Continuation Newton methods and the trust-region updating strategy for finding a solution of nonlinear equations (The CNMTr method)

---

**Input:**

Function  $F : \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^n$ , the initial point  $x_0$  (optional), the Jacobian  $J$  of  $F$  (optional), the tolerance  $\varepsilon$  (optional).

**Output:**

An approximation solution  $x^*$  of nonlinear equations.

```

1: Set the default  $x_0 = \text{ones}(n, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$  when  $x_0$  or  $\varepsilon$  is not provided by the calling subroutine.
2: Initialize the parameters:  $\eta_a = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 2$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$ ,  $\text{maxit} = 400$ .
3: Set  $\Delta t_0 = 2$ ,  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ ,  $\text{itc} = 0$ ,  $k = 0$ .
4: while ( $\text{itc} < \text{maxit}$ ) do
5:   if ( $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} == 1$ ) then
6:     Set  $\text{itc} = \text{itc} + 1$ .
7:     Compute  $\text{Res}_k = \|F_k\|_\infty$ .
8:     if ( $\text{Res}_k < \varepsilon$ ) then
9:       break;
10:    end if
11:    Evaluate  $F_k = F(x_k)$  and  $J_k = J(x_k)$ .
12:    By using the qr decomposition  $[Q_k, R_k] = \text{qr}(J_k^T)$  of  $J_k^T$ , we obtain the orthogonal matrix  $Q_k$  and the upper triangle matrix  $R_k$ .
13:    By solving  $R_k^T b_k = -F_k$  and  $s_k^N = Q_k b_k$ , we obtain the Newton step  $s_k^N$ .
14:    end if
15:    Set  $s_k = \Delta t_k / (1 + \Delta t_k) s_k^N$ ,  $x_{k+1} = x_k + s_k$ .
16:    Evaluate  $F_{k+1} = F(x_{k+1})$ .
17:    if ( $\|F_k\| < \|F_{k+1}\|$ ) then
18:       $\rho_k = -1$ ;
19:    else
20:      Compute the ratio  $\rho_k$  from equation (13).
21:    end if
22:    Adjust the time-stepping size  $\Delta t_{k+1}$  according to the trust-region updating strategy (14).
23:    if ( $\rho_k \geq \eta_a$ ) then
24:      Accept the trial point  $x_{k+1}$ . Set  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 1$ .
25:    else
26:      Set  $x_{k+1} = x_k$ ,  $F_{k+1} = F_k$ ,  $s_{k+1}^N = s_k^N$ ,  $\text{flag\_success\_trialstep} = 0$ .
27:    end if
28:    Set  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ .
29: end while

```

---

### 3 The deflation technique

By using Algorithm 1 (i.e., the CNMTr method) in section 2, we can find a critical point  $x_1^*$  of  $f(x)$ . Our strategy is to use Algorithm 1 repeatedly, until the critical points  $x_k^*$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ) of  $f(x)$  are found as many as possible. Then, we select the first  $L$  minimizer of  $f(x)$  from the domain  $\{x_1^*, \dots, x_K^*\}$  as the initial seeds of the genetic algorithm in section 4.

If we directly use Algorithm 1 and the multi-start techniques, a starting point could easily lie in the basin of attraction of a previously found local minimum point and algorithm 1 might find the same local minimum point even if the searches are initiated from points that are far apart. In order to make up this disadvantage, we use the deflation technique [7] described as follows.

Assume that  $x_k^*$  is a zero point of  $G_{k-1}(x)$ . Our strategy is to construct another function  $G_k(\cdot)$  via eliminating the zero point  $x_k^*$  of  $G_{k-1}(x)$  as follows:

$$G_k(x) = \frac{1}{\|x - x_k^*\|} G_{k-1}(x), \quad (17)$$

where  $G_0(x) = F(x) = \nabla f(x)$ . Thus, from equation (17), we obtain

$$G_k(x) = \frac{1}{\|x - x_1^*\| \cdots \|x - x_k^*\|} F(x), \quad (18)$$

where  $x_i^*$  ( $i = 1 : k$ ) are the zero points of  $F(x)$ .

**Lemma 3.1** (Brow and Gearhart [7]) *Assume that  $x_i^*$  is a zero point of the continuously differential function  $F(\cdot)$  and its Jacobian matrix  $J(x_i^*)$  satisfies*

$$\|J(x_i^*)y\| \geq c_l \|y\|, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (19)$$

*Then  $x_i^*$  is not the zero point of  $G_k(x)$ , where function  $G_k(\cdot)$  is defined by equation (18).*

**Proof.** Since  $x_i^*$  is a zero point of  $F(x)$ , according to the first-order Taylor expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= F(x_i^*) + \int_0^1 J(x_i^* + t(x - x_i^*)) (x - x_i^*) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 J(x_i^* + t(x - x_i^*)) (x - x_i^*) dt, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $J(x) = F'(x)$  is the Jacobian matrix of  $F(x)$ . According to the nonsingular assumption (19) of  $J(x_i^*)$  and the continuity of  $J(\cdot)$ , we know that there exists a neighbourhood  $B_{\delta_i}(x_i^*) = \{x : \|x - x_i^*\| \leq \delta_i\}$  of  $x_i^*$  such that

$$\|J(x) - J(x_i^*)\| \leq \frac{c_l}{2} \quad (21)$$

holds when  $x \in B_{\delta_i}(x_i^*)$ . From equations (20)-(21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|F(x) - J(x_i^*)(x - x_i^*)\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 (J(x_i^* + t(x - x_i^*)) - J(x_i^*)) (x - x_i^*) dt \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|J(x_i^* + t(x - x_i^*)) - J(x_i^*)\| \|x - x_i^*\| dt \leq \frac{c_l}{2} \|x - x_i^*\|, \quad \forall x \in B_{\delta_i}(x_i^*). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Furthermore, from the triangle inequality  $\|x - y\| \geq \|x\| - \|y\|$  and the assumption (19), we have

$$\|F(x) - J(x_i^*)(x - x_i^*)\| \geq \|J(x_i^*)(x - x_i^*)\| - \|F(x)\| \geq c_l \|x - x_i^*\| - \|F(x)\|. \quad (23)$$

Thus, from equations (22)-(23), we obtain

$$\|F(x)\| \geq \frac{c_l}{2} \|x - x_i^*\|, \quad \forall x \in B_{\delta_i}(x_i^*). \quad (24)$$



By substituting inequality (24) into equation (18), we obtain

$$\|G_k(x)\| \geq \frac{c_l}{2} \frac{1}{\|x-x_1^*\| \cdots \|x-x_{i-1}^*\| \|x-x_{i+1}^*\| \cdots \|x-x_k^*\|}, \quad \forall x \in B_{\delta_i}(x_i^*). \quad (25)$$

That is to say,  $x_i^*$  is not a zero point of  $G_k(x)$ .  $\square$

In practice, we need to avoid the numerical flow of  $G_k(x)$  when we use the continuation Newton method (Algorithm 1) to find the zero points of  $F(x)$  as many as possible. Thus, we modify  $G_k(x)$  defined by equation (17) as

$$G_k(x) = \frac{\alpha_k}{\|x-x_k^*\|_1} G_{k-1}(x), \quad (26)$$

where  $G_0(x) = F(x)$  and  $\alpha_k$  is defined by

$$\alpha_k = \begin{cases} n, & \text{if } \|x_k^*\|_1 \leq 10^{-6}, \\ \|x_k^*\|_1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Since  $G_k(x)$  has the special structure and its sub-differential exists except for finite points  $x_1^*, \dots, x_k^*$ , from equations (26)-(27), we can calculate its sub-differential  $\partial G_k(x)$  of  $G_k(x)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial G_k(x) &= \frac{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}{\|x-x_1^*\|_1 \cdots \|x-x_k^*\|_1} \frac{\partial F(x)}{\partial x} + \frac{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}{\|x-x_1^*\|_1 \cdots \|x-x_k^*\|_1} F(x) p(x)^T \\ &= \frac{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}{\|x-x_1^*\|_1 \cdots \|x-x_k^*\|_1} \left( \frac{\partial F(x)}{\partial x} + F(x) p(x)^T \right), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the column vector function  $p(\cdot)$  is defined by

$$p(x)^T = - \left( \frac{\text{sgn}(x-x_1^*)}{\|x-x_1^*\|_1} + \cdots + \frac{\text{sgn}(x-x_k^*)}{\|x-x_k^*\|_1} \right), \quad (29)$$

the sign function  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  of which is defined by

$$\text{sgn}(\beta) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \beta > 0, \\ 0, & \text{else if } \beta = 0, \\ -1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

Now, by using the strategy (26) of eliminating zero points of  $F(x)$  repeatedly, theoretically, we can find all critical points of  $f(x)$ . Then, we select the minimizer from the critical points of  $f(x)$ , which is the global minimizer of problem (1). Thus, by solving problem (2), we can obtain the global optimal solution of  $f(x)$ . We describe its details in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** Continuation Newton methods with the deflation technique for multi-solutions of nonlinear equations (The CNMDT method)

---

**Input:**

The gradient  $F(x) = \nabla f(x)$  of  $f(x)$ , the initial point  $x_0$  (optional), the tolerance  $\varepsilon$  (optional), the Jacobian  $J(x)$  of  $F(x)$  (optional).

**Output:**

The  $K$  approximation zero points  $x_1^*, \dots, x_K^*$  of  $F(\cdot)$  and the minimizer  $x_{ap}^*$  of  $f(x)$ .

```

1: Set Number_of_Critical_Points = 0.
2: Call Algorithm 1 to find a zero of  $F$  and we denote it as  $x_1^*$ .
3: Set Number_of_Critical_Points = Number_of_Critical_Points + 1.
4: Set  $G_0(x) = F(x)$ .
5: Set Flag_of_Fail = 0 and  $k = 0$ .
6: while (Flag_of_Fail == 0) do
7:   Call Algorithm 1 to find a zero of  $G_{k+1}(\cdot)$  and we denote it as  $x_{k+2}^*$ , where  $G_{k+1}(\cdot)$  is defined by
   equations (26)-(27).
8:   if ("A zero of  $G_{k+1}$  is obtained by Algorithm 1 successfully.") then
9:     Set Flag_of_Fail = 0.
10:    Set Number_of_Critical_Points = Number_of_Critical_Points + 1.
11:   else
12:     Set Flag_of_Fail = 1.
13:   end if
14:   Try again starting at step 6 with  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ .
15: end while
16: Set  $f_{ap} = f(x_1^*)$  and  $x_{ap}^* = x_1^*$ .
17: for  $k = 2 : \text{Number\_of\_Critical\_Points}$  do
18:   if  $f(x_k^*) < f_{ap}$  then
19:     Set  $f_a = f(x_k^*)$  and  $x_{ap}^* = x_k^*$ .
20:   end if
21: end for

```

---

#### 4 The quasi-genetic algorithm

By using the continuation Newton method with the deflation technique (Algorithm 2) in section 3, we can find the most of critical points of  $f(x)$  and the sub-optimal minimizer  $x_{ap}^*$  of  $f(x)$ . In order to find the global minimizer of  $f(x)$ , we introduce the idea of heuristic crossover in the genetic algorithm to evolve for finding the global minimizer of  $f(x)$  from the critical points, which are solved by Algorithm 2. Since we do not use the complete strategy of the genetic algorithm, we denote our method as the quasi-genetic algorithm.

After we use Algorithm 2 to find the critical points of  $f(x)$  as many as possible, we denote these critical points as  $x_k^*$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ). Then, we select the first  $L$  minimizers of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $\{x_1^*, \dots, x_K^*\}$  and denote these  $L$  critical points as  $x_k^0$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, L$ ). We set  $S_0 = \{x_1^0, \dots, x_L^0\}$  and adopt them as the initial seeds of the quasi-genetic algorithm.

Then, we select any two elements  $x_i^0$  and  $x_j^0$  from the seed set  $S_0$ , and use the crossover strategy of the genetic algorithm to obtain the offspring. In other words, we set

$$\bar{x}_k^1 = \frac{1}{2} (x_i^0 + x_j^0), \quad i, j = 1 : L, \quad k = 1 : \frac{1}{2}L(L-1). \quad (31)$$

Similarly, we select the first  $L$  minimizers of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $S_0 \cup \{\bar{x}_1^1, \dots, \bar{x}_{L(L-1)/2}^1\}$  and denote these first  $L$  minimizers as  $x_k^1$  ( $k = 1, \dots, L$ ). We set  $S_1 = \{x_1^1, \dots, x_L^1\}$  and adopt them as the second-generation seeds of the quasi-genetic algorithm.

Repeatedly, after the  $N$ -th evolution, we obtain the offspring set  $S_N = \{x_1^N, \dots, x_L^N\}$  and stop evolving. We select the minimizer of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $S_N$  and denote it as  $x_{ag}^*$ . Finally, we use  $x_{ag}^*$  as the initial point of the continuation Newton method (Algorithm 1) and call Algorithm 1 to find the critical point  $x_{cn}^*$  of  $f(x)$ , where we set  $F(x) = \nabla f(x)$  in Algorithm 1. We output the minimum  $x_{min}^*$  of  $f(x)$  between  $x_{cn}^*$  and  $x_{ag}^*$ , i.e.

$$x_{min}^* = \arg \min \{f(x_{cn}^*), f(x_{ag}^*)\}.$$

We can select the parameter  $r = \min\{20, K\}$  and  $N = 10$  according to our numerical experiments. Now, we give the detailed descriptions of the quasi-genetic algorithm and the continuation Newton method for the global optimization problem in Algorithm 3.

---

**Algorithm 3** The quasi-genetic algorithm and the continuation Newton method for the global optimization problem (the QGACNM method)

---

**Input:**

The gradient  $F(x) = \nabla f(x)$  of  $f(x)$ , the initial point  $x_0$  (optional), the tolerance  $\varepsilon$  (optional), the Jacobian  $J(x)$  of  $F(x)$  (optional).

**Output:**

An approximation minimizer  $x_{min}^*$  of  $f(x)$ .

- 1: Call Algorithm 2 to find the critical points of  $f(x)$  as many as possible and denote these critical points as  $x_k^*$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ ).
  - 2: Select the first  $L$  minimizers of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $\{x_1^*, \dots, x_K^*\}$  and denote these first  $L$  minimizers as  $x_k^0$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, L$ ), where  $L = \min\{20, K\}$ . Set  $S_0 = \{x_1^0, \dots, x_L^0\}$ .
  - 3: Set the maximum evolution iterations  $N = 10$  and  $l = 0$ .
  - 4: **while** ( $l < N$ ) **do**
  - 5:   Set  $k = 1$ .
  - 6:   **for**  $i = 1 : L$  **do**
  - 7:     **for**  $j = i + 1 : L$  **do**
  - 8:       Set  $\bar{x}_k^{l+1} = \frac{1}{2} (x_i^l + x_j^l)$ ;
  - 9:       Set  $k = k + 1$ ;
  - 10:    **end for**
  - 11:   **end for**
  - 12:   Select the first  $L$  minimizers of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $S_l \cup \{\bar{x}_1^{l+1}, \dots, \bar{x}_{L(L+1)/2}^{l+1}\}$ , and denote these first  $L$  minimizers as  $x_i^{l+1}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, L$ ). Set  $S_{l+1} = \{x_1^{l+1}, \dots, x_L^{l+1}\}$ .
  - 13:   Set  $l = l + 1$ .
  - 14: **end while**
  - 15: Select the smallest minimizer  $x_{ag}^*$  of  $f(x)$  in the domain  $S_N$ .
  - 16: Call Algorithm 1 to find the critical point  $x_{cn}^*$  of  $f(x)$  by using  $x_{ag}^*$  as the initial point, where we set  $F(x) = \nabla f(x)$  in Algorithm 1.
  - 17: Set  $x_{min}^* = \arg \min \{f(x_{cn}^*), f(x_{ag}^*)\}$ .
-

## 5 Numerical Experiments

In this section, some numerical experiments are conducted to test the performance of Algorithm 3 (the QGACNM method). The codes are performed by a HP notebook with the Intel quad-core CPU and 8Gb memory. We compare QGACNM with the multi-start algorithm (the built-in subroutine GlobalSearch.m of the MATLAB R2020a environment) [36, 46] for 47 unconstrained global optimization problems which can be found in [1, 22, 42]. GlobalSearch is a stable and efficient global optimization solver and is widely used till today. Therefore, we select the GlobalSearch as the basis for comparison. The termination condition of Algorithm 1 for finding a solution of the nonlinear system (2) is

$$\|F(x_k)\|_\infty \leq 10^{-6}. \quad (32)$$

The scales of test problems vary from dimension 1 to 1000. The numerical results are arranged in Tables 1-2. The computational time of QGACNM and GlobalSearch is illustrated by Figure 1. From Tables 1-2, we find that QGACNM performs well for unconstrained global optimization problems and finds their global minimizers. GlobalSearch fails to find the global minimizers of about one quarter of test problems. Therefore, QGACNM is more robust than GlobalSearch to find the global minimizer of the unconstrained optimization problem.

From Table 1 and Figure 1, we find that the computational time of QGACNM is slightly more than that of GlobalSearch for the large-scale unconstrained optimization problem. From Table 2 and Figure 1, we find that the computational time of QGACNM is about 1/5 of that of GlobalSearch for the small-scale unconstrained optimization problem. One of the reasons is that the large-scale unconstrained optimization problem has more local minima than the small-scale unconstrained optimization problem. Thus, QGACNM consumes the more time to find the critical points of the large-scale unconstrained optimization function than that of the small-scale unconstrained optimization function. However, according to Table 1, the computational time of QGACNM is not serious for the large-scale unconstrained optimization problem, since it only consumes several seconds to forty seconds.

When the unconstrained optimization problem (1) has many local minima, the numerical tests show that Algorithm 2 can find at least 20 critical points of  $f(x)$ , which are useful to make Algorithm 3 find the global minimizer of  $f(x)$  for the difficult problem. This result can be illustrated by Problem 1. Problem 1 [22] is a molecular potential energy problem and its objective function has the following form:

$$f(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( 1 + \cos(3\omega_i) + \frac{(-1)^i}{\sqrt{10.60099896 - 4.141720682(\cos\omega_i)}} \right), \quad (33)$$

where  $\omega_i$  is the torsion angle and  $n + 3$  is the number of atoms or beads in the given system. The number of its local minimizers increases exponentially with the size of the problem, which characterizes the principal difficult in minimizing molecular potential energy functions for the traditional global optimization methods. For problem




Fig. 1: The computational time of QGACNM and GlobalSearch for test problems.

1 with 50 atoms, the traditional global optimization methods such as the interval analysis method [19, 22] or the multi-start method [36, 46] are difficult to find its global minima. However, QGACNM can find its global minima  $f(\omega^*) = -41.118303$  of problem (33) with  $n = 1000$  at  $\omega^* = (1.039195, 3.141593, \dots, 1.039195, 3.141593)$ .

For problem 44, reference [42] gives its global minima  $-9.596407E + 02$  at  $x = (512, 404.2319)$ , when it is evaluated on the interval  $x_i \in [-512, 512]$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Since Algorithm 3 does not consider the constraint  $x_i \in [-512, 512]$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), QGACNM can find a smaller minima of  $f(x)$  than that of reference [42].

## 6 Conclusions

Based on the deflation technique and the continuation Newton method, we give an efficient quasi-genetic algorithm for the unconstrained global optimization problem. The numerical results show that QGACNM (Algorithm (3)) is quite reliable to find the global minimizer of the unconstrained optimization. And it is more robust and faster to solve the unconstrained global optimization problem than the multi-start algorithm [36, 46]. Therefore, QGACNM can be regarded as the workhorse for the unconstrained global optimization problems and we will extend it to the dynamic optimization problem [47, 48].

Table 1: Numerical results of large-scale unconstrained optimization problems.

Problem	QGACNM		GlobalSearch.m		Global Minimum
	CPU time (s)	min $f(x)$	CPU time (s)	min $f(x)$	
1. Molecular Energy Problem (n = 1000) [22]	3.58E+01	-41.118303	1.82E+01	-0.287637 (failed)	-41.118303
2. Ackley Function (n = 1000) [42]	4.79E+01	4.355212E-07	1.92E+01	8.881784E-16	0
3. Levy Function (n = 1000) [42]	1.88E+01	5.058714E-15	4.55	0.365112 (failed)	0
4. Schwefel Function (n = 1000) [42]	2.39E+01	0.01273	4.36E+01	4.790350E+03 (failed)	0.01273
5. Rastrigin Function (n = 1000) [42]	2.71E+01	0	3.16	0	0
6. Styblinski-Tang Function (n = 1000) [42]	5.89	-3.916617E+04	4.38	-2.501332E+04 (failed)	-3.916617E+04
7. Trid Function (n = 1000) [42]	1.92	-1.671660E+08	4.50	-2.492082E+04 (failed)	-1.671660E+08
8. Sum Squares Function (n = 1000) [42]	3.65	1.252871E-15	3.49	0	0
9. Sphere Function (n = 1000) [42]	3.73E-01	0	2.95	3.980015E-11	0
10. Rotated Hyper-Ellipsoid Function (n = 1000) [42]	3.79	1.252871E-15	1.46E+01	0	0
11. Zakharov Function (n = 1000) [42]	7.20	7.909548E-23	3.42	0	0
12. Dixon-Price Function (n = 1000) [42]	9.48	2.617603E-16	3.73	0.729387 (failed)	0
13. Rosenbrock Function (n = 1000) [42]	5.83	2.543989E-09	3.76	30.630045 (failed)	0
14. Powell Function (n = 1000) [42]	9.73	2.580784E-10	4.06	0	0
15. Quartic With Noise Function (n = 1000) [1]	5.84	0.500000	3.74	0.500000	0.5
16. Schubert Function (n = 1000) [1]	2.41E+01	-1.203124E+04	6.02E+01	-9.494704E+03 (failed)	-1.203124E+04

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Grant 61876199 from National Natural Science Foundation of China, Grant YBWL2011085 from Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., and Grant YJCB2011003HI from the Innovation Research Program of Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd..

Table 2: Numerical results of small-scale unconstrained optimization problems.

Problem	QGACNM		GlobalSearch.m		Global Minimum
	CPU time (s)	min $f(x)$	CPU time (s)	min $f(x)$	
17. Griewank Function (n = 10) [42]	3.04E-01	2.492474E-08	2.79	1.718736E-12	0
18. Levy Function N. 13 (n = 2) [42]	3.73E-01	1.583347E-14	2.74	0.109874 (failed)	0
19. Hosaki Function (n = 2) [1]	3.80E-01	-2.345811	3.32	-1.127794 (failed)	-2.345811
20. Beale Function (n = 2) [42]	8.14E-02	0	2.29	0	0
21. Easom Function (n = 2) [42]	1.30E-01	-1.000000	2.55	-1.000000	-1
22. Price Function (n = 2) [1]	2.59E-02	4.066531E-12	5.26	1.114944E-12	0
23. Branin Function (n = 2) [42]	7.32E-02	0.397887	2.53	0.397887	0.397887
24. Trecanni Function (n = 2) [1]	8.95E-02	3.971352E-18	2.02	1.831335E-15	0
25. Booth Function (n = 2) [42]	8.62E-02	1.360371E-15	2.36	4.119317E-15	0
26. Matyas Function (n = 2) [42]	5.83E-02	0	2.12	6.937854E-16	0
27. McCormick Function (n = 2) [42]	3.09E-01	-1.913222	2.20	-1.913222	-1.913222
28. Power Sum Function (n = 4) [42]	3.25E-01	4.402109E-18	4.80	2.047295E-07	0
29. Colville Function (n = 4) [42]	8.76E-02	3.963071E-19	3.18	5.343617E-13	0
30. Schaffer Function N. 2 (n = 2) [42]	2.47E-01	3.330669E-16	3.30	0	0
31. Bohachevsky Function (n = 2) [42]	3.51E-01	1.099120E-13	2.41	0	0
32. Three-Hump Camel Function (n = 2) [42]	7.52E-01	1.299475E-13	2.09	3.264044E-16	0
33. Six-Hump Camel Function (n = 2) [42]	3.86E-01	-1.031628	2.27	-1.031628	-1.031628
34. Drop-Wave Function (n = 2) [42]	2.42E-01	-1.000000	3.43	-1.000000	-1
35. Perm Function 0, d, $\beta$ (n = 4) [42]	5.91E-01	4.954896E-21	5.22	6.302533E+02 (failed)	0
36. Hartmann 3-D Function (n = 3) [42]	4.13E-01	-3.862779	2.56	-3.862779	-3.862779
37. Trefethen 4 Function (n = 2) [1]	2.61E-01	-3.306868	4.46	-2.837655 (failed)	-3.306868
38. Zettl Function (n = 2) [1]	9.29E-02	-0.003791	2.16	-0.003791	-0.003791
39. Exp2 Function (n = 2) [1]	7.50E-01	3.224839E-13	2.79	4.879355E-14	0
40. Hansen Function (n = 2) [1]	2.64E-01	-1.765418E+02	2.84	-1.765418E+02	-1.765418E+02
41. Sheaffer Function N. 4 (n = 2) [42]	1.68E-01	0.292579	1.05E+01	0.292579	0.292579
42. Holder Table Function (n = 2) [42]	3.09E-01	-19.208502	2.45	-19.208502	-19.208502
43. Gramacy & Lee (2012) Function (n = 1) [42]	1.99E-01	-0.869011	2.27E-01	-0.869011	-0.869011
44. Eggholder Function (n = 2) [42]	1.89E-01	-1.435465E+03	2.67	-9.353379E+02 (failed)	-9.596407E+02
45. Michalewicz Function (n = 2) [42]	5.59E-01	-1.801303	3.54	-1.801303	-1.801303
46. Box-Betts Exponential Quadratic Function (n = 3) [1]	8.75E-01	4.578708E-19	2.50	6.800008E-17	0
47. Cross-in-Tray Function (n = 2) [42]	4.81E-01	-2.062611	2.21	-2.062611	-2.062611

## References

1. E. P. Adorio and U. P. Diliman, *MVF-Multivariate test functions library in C for unconstrained global optimization*, available at <http://www.geocities.ws/eadorio/mvf.pdf>, 2005.
2. E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, *Introduction to Numerical Continuation Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
3. U. M. Ascher and L. R. Petzold, *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1998.
4. O. Axelsson and S. Sysala, *Continuation Newton methods*, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **70** (2015), 2621-2637.
5. Boender, C. G. E., *Bayesian stopping rules for multistart global optimization methods*, *Math. Program.* **37** (1987), 59-80.
6. F. H. Branin, *Widely convergent method for finding multiple solutions of simultaneous nonlinear equations*, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **16** (1972), 504-521.
7. K. M. Brow and W. B. Gearhart, *Deflation techniques for the calculation of further solutions of a nonlinear system*, *Numer. Math.* **16** (1971), 334-342.
8. A. R. Conn, N. Gould and Ph. L. Toint, *Trust-Region Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2000.
9. D. F. Davidenko, *On a new method of numerical solution of systems of nonlinear equations* (in Russian), *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **88** (1953), 601-602.
10. P. Deufflhard, *Newton Methods for Nonlinear Problems: Affine Invariance and Adaptive Algorithms*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
11. P. Deufflhard, H. J. Pesch and P. Rentrop, *A modified continuation method for the numerical solution of nonlinear two-point boundary value problems by shooting techniques*, *Numer. Math.* **26** (1975), 327-343.
12. J. E. Dennis and R. B. Schnabel, *Numerical Methods for Unconstrained Optimization and Nonlinear Equations*, Science Press, 2009.
13. H. C. Dong, B. W. Song, Z. M. Dong and P. Wang, *Multi-start space reduction (MSSR) surrogate-based global optimization method*, *Struct. Multidisc. Optim.* **54** (2016), 907-926.
14. G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computation (4th ed.)*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2013.
15. E. Hairer and G. Wanner, *Solving Ordinary Differential Equations II, Stiff and Differential-Algebraic Problems*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
16. W. E. Hart, *Adaptive Global Optimization with Local Search*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego, CA, USA, 1994.
17. D. J. Higham, *Trust region algorithms and timestep selection*, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **37** (1999), 194-210.
18. R. F. Kalaba, E. Zagustin, W. Holbrow and R. Huss., *A modification of Davidenko's method for nonlinear systems*, *Comput. Math. Appl.* **3** (1977), 315-319.
19. R. B. Kearfott, *Rigorous Global Search: Continuous Problems*, Nonconvex Optimization and Applications, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1996.
20. C. T. Kelley, *Solving Nonlinear Equations with Newton's Method*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2003.
21. C. T. Kelley, *Numerical methods for nonlinear equations*, *Acta Numer.* **27** (2018), 207-287.
22. C. Lavor, N. Maculan, *A function to test methods applied to global minimization of potential energy of molecules*, *Numer. Algorithms* **35** (2004), 287-300.
23. Y.-W. Leung and Y. P. Wang, *An orthogonal genetic algorithm with quantization for global numerical optimization*, *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* **5** (2001), 41-53.
24. S.-T. Liu and X.-L. Luo, *A method based on Rayleigh quotient gradient flow for extreme and interior eigenvalue problems*, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **432** (2010), 1851-1863.
25. Luo, X.-L.: *Singly diagonally implicit Runge-Kutta methods combining line search techniques for unconstrained optimization*, *J. Comput. Math.* **23**, 153-164 (2005)
26. X.-L. Luo, C. T. Kelley, L.-Z. Liao and H.-W. Tam, *Combining trust region techniques and Rosenbrock methods to compute stationary points*, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **140** (2009), 265-286.
27. X.-L. Luo, *A second-order pseudo-transient method for steady-state problems*, *Appl. Math. Comput.*, **216** (2010), 1752-1762.
28. X.-L. Luo, *A dynamical method of DAEs for the smallest eigenvalue problem*, *J. Comput. Sci.* **3** (2012), 113-119.
29. X.-L. Luo, J.-H. Lv and G. Sun, *Continuation method with the trusty time-stepping scheme for linearly constrained optimization with noisy data*, *Optim. Eng.*, published online at published online, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11081-020-09590-z>, 1-32, January 2021.



30. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao and J.H. Lv, *Continuation Newton methods with the residual trust-region time-stepping scheme for nonlinear equations*, Numer. Algorithms, published online at <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11075-021-01112-x>, 1-25, April 2, 2021.
31. X.-L. Luo and Y. Y. Yao, *Primal-dual path-following methods and the trust-region strategy for linear programming with noisy data*, J. Comput. Math., published online at <http://doi.org/10.4208/jcm.2101-m2020-0173>, or available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.07568>, 1-21, March 15, 2021.
32. X.-L. Luo, H. Xiao, J.-H. Lv and S. Zhang, *Explicit pseudo-transient continuation and the trust-region updating strategy for unconstrained optimization*, Appl. Numer. Math., **165** (2021), 290-302.
33. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao, *Generalized continuation Newton methods and the trust-region updating strategy for the underdetermined system*, J. Sci. comput. **88** (2021), published online at <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10915-021-01566-0>, 1-22.
34. X.-L. Luo and H. Xiao, *The regularization continuation method with an adaptive time step control for linearly equality-constrained optimization problems*, submitted, arXiv preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.01122>, July 7, 2021.
35. K. F. Man, K. S. Tang and S. Kwong, *Genetic Algorithms: Concepts and Designs*, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
36. MATLAB v9.8.0 (R2020a), The MathWorks Inc., <http://www.mathworks.com>, 2020.
37. M. Mitchell, *An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms*, MIT press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.
38. J. J. Moré, B. S. Garbow and K. E. Hillstom, *Testing unconstrained optimization software*, ACM Trans. Math. Soft. **7** (1981), 17-41.
39. J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
40. J. M. Ortega and W. C. Rheinboldt, *Iteration Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2000.
41. R. G. Regis and C. A. Shoemaker, *A quasi-multistart framework for global optimization of expensive functions using response surface models*, J. Glob. Optim. **56** (2013), 1719-1753.
42. S. Surjanovic and D. Bingham, *Virtual library of simulation experiments: test functions and datasets*, available at <http://www.sfu.ca/~ssurjano>, January 2020.
43. W.-Y. Sun and Y.-X. Yuan, *Optimization Theory and Methods: Nonlinear Programming*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
44. K. Tanabe, *Continuous Newton-Raphson method for solving an underdetermined system of nonlinear equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **3** (1979), 495-503.
45. A. Teughels, G. De Roeck and J. A. K. Suykens, *Global optimization by coupled local minimizers and its application to FE model updating*, Comput. Struct. **81** (2003), 2337-2351.
46. Z. Ugray, L. Lasdon, J. Plummer, F. Glover, J. Kelly and R. Marti, *Scatter search and local NLP solvers: A multistart framework for global optimization*, INFORMS J. Comput. **19** (2007), 328-340.
47. D. Yazdani, R. Cheng, D. Yazdani, J. Branke, Y.-C. Jin and X. Yao, *A survey of evolutionary continuous dynamic optimization over two decades- Part A*, IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput., <http://doi.org/10.1109/TEVC.2021.3060014>, 1-21, 2021.
48. D. Yazdani, R. Cheng, D. Yazdani, J. Branke, Y.-C. Jin and X. Yao, *A survey of evolutionary continuous dynamic optimization over two decades- Part B*, IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput., <http://doi.org/10.1109/TEVC.2021.3060012>, 1-21, 2021.
49. Y. Yuan, *Recent advances in trust region algorithms*, Math. Program. **151** (2015), 249-281.