

Comparison of Selection Methods in On-line Distributed Evolutionary Robotics

Iñaki Fernández Pérez, Amine Boumaza, François Charpillet

► **To cite this version:**

Iñaki Fernández Pérez, Amine Boumaza, François Charpillet. Comparison of Selection Methods in On-line Distributed Evolutionary Robotics. ALIFE 14: The fourteenth international conference on the synthesis and simulation of living systems, Jul 2014, New York, United States. Artificial Life 14 in Complex Adaptive Systems, MIT Press, 2014, Artificial Life 14. <<http://blogs.cornell.edu/alife14nyc/>>. <10.7551/978-0-262-32621-6-ch046>. <hal-01091119>

HAL Id: hal-01091119

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01091119>

Submitted on 5 Dec 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Comparison of Selection Methods in On-line Distributed Evolutionary Robotics

Iñaki Fernández Pérez

Université de Lorraine, LORIA
inaki.fernandez@loria.fr

Amine Boumaza

Université de Lorraine, LORIA
amine.boumaza@loria.fr

François Charpillet

INRIA Nancy Grand-Est, LORIA
francois.charpillet@loria.fr

Campus scientifique BP 239 Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy Cedex, F-54506,

January 7, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we study the impact of selection methods in the context of on-line on-board distributed evolutionary algorithms. We propose a variant of the mEDEA algorithm in which we add a selection operator, and we apply it in a task-driven scenario. We evaluate four selection methods that induce different intensity of selection pressure in a multi-robot navigation with obstacle avoidance task and a collective foraging task. Experiments show that a small intensity of selection pressure is sufficient to rapidly obtain good performances on the tasks at hand. We introduce different measures to compare the selection methods, and show that the higher the selection pressure, the better the performances obtained, especially for the more challenging food foraging task.

1 Introduction

Evolutionary robotics (ER) ([9]) aims to design robotic agents' behaviors using evolutionary algorithms (EA) ([7]). In this context, EA's are traditionally seen as a tool to optimize agents' controllers w.r.t to an explicit objective function (fitness).

This process is carried out in an off-line fashion; once the behavior is learned and the controller optimized, the agents are deployed and their controllers' parameters remain fixed.

On the other hand, on-line evolution ([15]) takes a different approach in which behavior learning is performed during the actual execution of a task. In these algorithms, learning or optimization is a continuous process, *i.e.* robotic agents are constantly exploring new behaviors and adapting their controllers to new conditions in their environment. Usually, this is referred to as adaptation.

These two visions of ER can be related to on-line and off-line approaches in Machine Learning (ML). Off-line ML algorithms learn a specific task and solutions should generalize to unseen situations after the learning process, whereas on-line ML algorithms progressively adapt solutions to new presented situations while solving the task. In this sense, both on-line ML algorithms and on-line EA's perform lifelong adaptation or learning, to possibly changing environments or objectives.

In this paper, we focus on on-line distributed evolution of swarm robotic agents. We are interested in learning individual agents behaviors in a distributed context where the agents adapt their controllers to environmental conditions independently while deployed. These agents may locally communicate with each other and do not have a global view of the swarm. In this sense, this approach finds many ties with Artificial Life, where the objective is to design autonomous organisms that adapt to their environment.

On-line distributed evolution may be viewed as distributing an EA on the swarm of agents. Traditional evolutionary operators (mutation, crossover etc.) are performed on the agents and local communication ensures the spread of genetic material in the population of agents.

In EA's, selection operators drive evolution toward fit individuals by controlling the intensity of selection pressure to solve the given task. These operators and their impact on evolutionary dynamics have been extensively studied in off-line contexts ([7]). In this paper, we study their impact in on-line distributed ER, where evolutionary dynamics are different to the off-line case: selection is performed locally on partial populations and fitness values on which selection is performed are not reliable. Our experiments show that, in this context, a strong selection pressure leads to the best performances, contrary to classical approaches in which lower selection pressure is preferred, to maintain diversity in the population. This result suggests that, in distributed ER algorithms, diversity is already maintained by the disjoint sub-populations.

Several authors have addressed on-line evolution of robotic agent controllers in different contexts: adaptation to dynamically changing environments ([5]), parameter tuning ([6]), evolution of self-assembly ([2]), communication ([11]), phototaxis and navigation ([8], [12]). Some of this work is detailed in the next section. The authors use different selection mechanisms inducing different intensities of selection pressure to drive evolution. In this paper, we compare different selection operators and measure the impact they have on the performances of learning two swarm robotics tasks: navigation with obstacle avoidance and collective food foraging.

We begin by reviewing different selection schemes proposed in the context of on-line distributed ER and then we present the algorithm that will serve as a test bed, along with the selection methods we compare. In the fourth section, we detail our experimental setting and discuss the results. Finally, we close with some concluding remarks and future directions of research.

2 Related Work

In the following, we review several on-line distributed ER algorithms and discuss the selection mechanisms that were applied to ensure the desired intensity of selection pressure in order to drive evolution.

A common characteristic of on-line distributed ER algorithms is that each agent has one controller at a time, that it executes (the active controller), and locally spreads altered copies of this controller to other agents. In this sense, agents have only a partial view of the population in the swarm (a local repository). Fitness assignment or evaluation of individual chromosomes is performed by the agents themselves and is thus noisy, as different agents evaluate their active controllers in different conditions. Selection takes place when the active controller is to be replaced by a new one from the repository.

PGTA (Probabilistic Gene Transfer Algorithm) introduced by [15], is commonly cited as the first implementation of a distributed on-line ER algorithm. This algorithm evolves the weights of fixed-topology neural controllers and agents exchange parts (genes) of their respective chromosomes using local broadcasts. The algorithm considers a virtual energy level that reflects the performance of the agent's controller. This energy level increases every time the agents reach an energy source and decreases whenever communication takes place. Furthermore, the rate at which the agents broadcast their genes is proportional to their energy level and conversely, the rate at which they accept a received gene is inversely proportional to their energy level. This way, selection pressure is introduced in that fit agents transmit their genes to unfit ones.

[12] introduced odNEAT, an on-line distributed version of NEAT (Neuro-Evolution of Augmenting Topologies) ([13]), where each agent has one active chromosome that is transmitted to nearby agents. Collected chromosomes from other agents are stored in a local repository within niches of species according to their topological similarities, as in NEAT. Each agent has a virtual energy level that increases when the task is performed correctly and decreases otherwise. This energy level is sampled periodically to measure fitness values and, whenever this level reaches zero, the active chromosome is replaced by one in the repository. At this point, a species is selected based on its average fitness value, then a chromosome is selected within this species using binary tournament. Each agent broadcasts its active chromosome at a rate proportional to the average fitness of the species it belongs to. This, added to the fact that the active chromosome is selected from fit niches, maintains a certain selection pressure toward fit individuals.

EDEA (Embodied Distributed Evolutionary Algorithm) ([8]), was applied to different swarm robotics tasks: phototaxis, navigation with obstacle avoidance and collective patrolling. In this algorithm, each agent possesses one chromosome, whose controller is executed and evaluated on a given task. At each iteration, agents broadcast their chromosomes alongside with their fitness to other nearby agents with a given probability (fixed parameter). Upon reception, an agent selects a chromosome from those collected using binary tournament. This last chromosome is then mutated and recombined (using crossover) with the current active chromosome with probability $\frac{f(x')}{s_c \times f(x)}$, where $f(x')$ is the fitness of the selected chromosome, $f(x)$ is the fitness of the agent's current chromosome and s_c is a scalar controlling the intensity of selection pressure. To ensure an accurate measure of fitness values, agents evaluate their controllers for at least a minimum period of time (maturation age),

during which agents neither transmit nor receive other chromosomes.

With mEDEA (minimal Environment-driven Distributed Evolutionary Algorithm), [3] address evolutionary adaptation with implicit fitness, *i.e.* without a task-driven fitness function. The algorithm takes a gene perspective in which successful chromosomes are those that spread over the population of agents and which requires: 1) to maximize mating opportunities and 2) to minimize the risk for agents (their vehicles).

At every time step, agents execute their respective active controllers and locally broadcast mutated copies of the corresponding chromosomes. Received chromosomes (transmitted by other agents) are stored in a local list. At the end of the execution period (*lifetime*), the active chromosome is replaced with a randomly selected one from the agent's list and the list is emptied. An agent dies if there are no chromosomes in its list (if it did not meet other agents) and it remains dead until it receives a chromosome from another agent passing by.

The authors show that the number of living agents rises with time and remains at a sustained level. Furthermore, agents develop navigation and obstacle avoidance capabilities that allow them to better spread their chromosomes. This work shows that environment-driven selection pressure alone can maintain a certain level of adaptation in a swarm of robotic agents. A slightly modified version of this algorithm is used in this work and is detailed in the next section.

[10] proposed MONEE (Multi-Objective aNd open-Ended Evolution), an extension to mEDEA adding a task-driven pressure as well as a mechanism (called market) for balancing the distribution of tasks among the population of agents, if several tasks are to be tackled. Their experiments show that MONEE is capable of improving mEDEA's performances in a collective concurrent foraging task, in which agents have to collect items of several kinds.

The authors show that the swarm is able to adapt to the environment (as mEDEA ensures), while foraging different kinds of items (optimizing the task-solving behavior). In this context, each type of item is considered a different task. The algorithm uses an explicit fitness function in order to guide the search toward better performing solutions. The market mechanism, which takes into account the scarcity of items, ensures that agents do not focus on the most frequent kind of items (the easiest task), thus neglecting less frequent ones. In their paper, the agent's controller is selected using rank-based selection from the agent's list of chromosomes. The authors argue that when a specific task is to be addressed, a task-driven selection pressure is necessary. This idea is discussed in the remainder of this paper.

In the aforementioned works, authors used different classical selection operators from evolutionary computation in on-line distributed ER algorithms. It is however not clear if these operators perform in the same fashion as when they are used in an off-line non-distributed manner. In an on-line and distributed context, evolutionary dynamics are different, since selection is performed locally at the agent level and over the individuals whose vehicles had the opportunity to meet. In addition, and this is not inherent to on-line distributed evolution but to many ER contexts, fitness evaluation is intrinsically noisy as the agents evaluate their controllers in different conditions, which may have a great impact on their performance. A legitimate question one could ask is: does it still make sense to use selection?

In this paper, we compare different selection methods corresponding to different intensities of selection pressure in a task-driven context. We apply these methods in a modified version of mEDEA and measure their impact on two different swarm

robotics tasks.

3 Algorithms

In this section, we describe the variant of mEDEA we used in our experiments (Algorithm 1). It is run by all the agents of the swarm independently in a distributed manner. At any time, each agent possesses a single controller which is randomly initialized at the beginning of evolution.

The main difference w.r.t. mEDEA is that the algorithm alternates between two phases, namely an evaluation phase, in which the agent runs, evaluates and transmits its controller to nearby listening agents, and a listening phase, in which the agent does not move and listens to incoming chromosomes, sent by nearby agents. The evaluation and the listening phases last T_e and T_l respectively, and, for different robots, they take place at different moments. Since the different robots are desynchronized, robots in the evaluation phase are able to spread their genomes to other robots that are in the listening phase.

If only one common phase takes place, an agent that turns on the spot transmits its controller to any fitter agent crossing it, as broadcast and reception are simultaneous. This separation in two phases is inspired from MONEE where it is argued that it lessens the spread of poorly achieving controllers. Also, task-driven selection was introduced in MONEE to simultaneously tackle several tasks.

The agent's controller is executed and evaluated during the evaluation phase. For each agent, this phase lasts T_e time-steps at most¹. During this phase, at each time-step the agent executes its current controller by reading the sensors' inputs and computing the motors' outputs. The agent also updates the fitness value of the controller, based on the outcome of the its actions, and locally broadcasts both the chromosome corresponding to its controller and its current fitness value.

Once the T_e evaluation steps are elapsed, the agent begins its listening phase, which lasts T_l time-steps. During this phase, the agent stops and listens for incoming chromosomes from nearby passing agents (agents that are in their evaluation phase). These chromosomes are transmitted along with their respective fitness values. Consequently, at the end of this phase, an agent has a local list of chromosomes and fitnesses, or local population. Another difference w.r.t mEDEA is that the local population also contains the agent's current chromosome. This is done to ensure that all agents always have at least one chromosome in their respective populations, which happens particularly when an agent is isolated during its listening phase and does not receive any other chromosome. In mEDEA, isolated agents stay inactive until they receive a chromosome from another agent passing by.

After the listening period, the agent needs to load a new controller for its next evaluation phase. To do so, it selects a chromosome from its list using one of the selection methods discussed further. The selected chromosome is then mutated and becomes the agent's active controller. In this case, mutation consists in adding a normal random variable with mean 0 and variance σ^2 to each gene (each synaptic weight of the neuro-controller).

Once the next controller is chosen, the list is emptied. This means selection is performed on a list of chromosomes that have been collected by the agent during the

¹A little random number is subtracted from T_e so as the evaluation phases of the agents are not synchronized.

Algorithm 1 mEDEA

```
1:  $g_a := random()$ 
2: while true do
3:    $\mathbf{l} := \emptyset$ 
4:   // Evaluation phase
5:   for  $t = 1$  to  $T_e$  do
6:      $exec(g_a)$ 
7:      $broadcast(g_a)$ 
8:   end for
9:   // Listening phase
10:  for  $t = 1$  to  $T_l$  do
11:     $\mathbf{l} := \mathbf{l} \cup listen()$ 
12:  end for
13:   $\mathbf{l} := \mathbf{l} \cup \{g_a\}$ 
14:   $selected := select(\mathbf{l})$ 
15:   $g_a := mutate(selected)$ 
16: end while
```

previous listening phase. At this time, the new controller’s evaluation phase begins. We consider one iteration of the algorithm (evaluation plus listening phase) as one generation.

The selection method selects the new chromosome among the collected ones based on their fitness. This can be done in different manners, depending on the desired intensity of selection pressure. In this paper we compare four different selection methods, each one defining a different intensity of task-driven selection pressure. The choice of these selection methods aims at giving a large span of intensities of selection pressure, from the strongest (*Best*), to the lowest (*Random*):

Best Selection: This method deterministically selects the controller with the highest fitness. This is the selection method with the strongest selection pressure, as the agent will never be allowed to select a controller with a lower fitness than the previous one. *Best* selection can be compared to an elitist selection scheme where the best fit controllers are always kept.

Algorithm 2 Best selection

```
1: order  $x_i$  and index as  $x_{i:n}$  such that:
    $f(x_{1:n}) \geq f(x_{2:n}) \geq \dots \geq f(x_{n:n})$ 
2: return  $x_{1:n}$ 
```

Rank-Based Selection: In this case, selection probabilities are assigned to each controller according to their rank, *i.e.* the position of the controller in the list, once sorted w.r.t. fitness values. The best controller has the highest probability of being selected; however, less fit controllers still have a positive probability of being selected. Traditionally, this method is preferred to Roulette Wheel selection that assigns individuals probabilities proportional to their fitness values, which highly biases evolution toward best individuals.

Algorithm 3 Rank-based selection

- 1: order x_i and index as $x_{i:n}$ such that:
 $f(x_{1:n}) \geq f(x_{2:n}) \geq \dots \geq f(x_{n:n})$
 - 2: select $x_{i:n}$ with probability $Pr(x_{i:n}) = \frac{n+1-i}{1+2+\dots+n}$
 - 3: **return** $x_{i:n}$
-

Binary Tournament: This method uniformly samples a number of controllers equal to the size of the tournament (two in our case) and selects the one with the highest fitness. Here, the selection pressure is adjusted through the size of the tournament: the higher the size, the higher the selection pressure, the extreme case being when the tournament size is equal to the size of the population. In this case, the best controller is chosen². Conversely, when the size of the tournament is two, the induced selection pressure is the lowest.

Algorithm 4 k -Tournament selection

- 1: uniformly sample k x_i , noted $\{x_{1:k}, \dots, x_{k:k}\}$
 - 2: order $x_{i:k}$ such that:
 $f(x_{1:k}) \geq f(x_{2:k}) \geq \dots \geq f(x_{k:k})$
 - 3: **return** $x_{1:k}$
-

Random Selection: This method selects a controller in the local population at random, disregarding its fitness value and therefore inducing no task-driven selection pressure at all. *Random* selection is considered as a baseline for comparisons with the other methods that effectively induce a certain task-driven selection pressure. As discussed in the previous section, this is the selection operator used by mEDEA for evolving survival capabilities of the swarm without any task-driven explicit goal. By considering *Random* in our experiments, we aim to compare the original mEDEA selection scheme with more selective operators.

Each one of these four selection methods induces a different intensity of selection pressure on the evolution of the swarm. In the next section, we describe our experiments comparing the impact of each one of these intensities.

4 Experiments

We compare these selection methods on a set of experiments in simulation for two different tasks, fast-forward navigation and collective foraging, which are two well-studied benchmarks in swarm robotics. All our experiments were performed on the RoboRobo simulator ([4]).

4.1 Description

In all experiments, a swarm of robotic agents is deployed in a bounded environment containing static obstacles (black lines in Figure 1). Agents also perceive other agents as obstacles.

²It is assumed that sampling is performed without replacement.

All the agents in the swarm are morphologically homogeneous, *i.e.* they have the same physical properties, sensors and motors, and only differ in the parameters of their respective controllers. Each agent has 8 obstacle proximity sensors evenly distributed around the agent, and 8 food item sensors are added in the case of the foraging task. An item sensor measures the distance to the closest item in the direction of the sensor. These simulated agents are similar to Khepera or e-puck robots.

We use a recurrent neural network as the architecture of the neuro-controllers of the agents (Figure 1). The inputs of the network are the activation values of all sensors and the 2 outputs correspond to the translational and rotational velocities of the agent. The activation function of the output neurons is a hyperbolic tangent, taking values in $[-1, +1]$. Two bias connections (one for each output neuron), as well as 4 recurrent connections (previous speed and previous rotation for both outputs) are added. This setup yields 22 connection weights for the navigation task and 38 for the foraging task in the neuro-controller. The chromosome of the controller is the vector of these weights. Table 1 summarizes the different parameters used in our experiments.




Figure 1: Left: the simulation environment containing agents (red dots with thin hair-lines representing sensors), obstacles (dark lines) and food items (blue dots). Right: the architecture of the neuro-controller.

In the navigation task, agents must learn to move as fast and straight as possible in the environment while avoiding obstacles, whereas in the foraging task, agents must collect food items present in the environment (Figure 1). An item is collected when an agent passes over it, at which time it is replaced by another item at a random location.

We define the fitness function for the navigation task after the one introduced in

Table 1: Experimental settings.

Experiments	
Number of food items	150
Swarm size	50 agents
Exp. length	5×10^5 sim. steps
Number of runs	30
Evolution	
Evolution length	~ 250 generations
T_e	$2000 - rand(0, 500)$ sim. steps
T_l	200 sim. steps
Chromosome size	Nav.: 22, Forag.: 38
Mutation step-size	$\sigma = 0.5$

([9]). Each agent r computes its fitness at generation g as:

$$f_r^g = \sum_{t=1}^{T_e} v_t(t) \cdot (1 - |v_r(t)|) \cdot \min(a_s(t)) \quad (1)$$

where $v_t(t)$, $v_r(t)$ and $a_s(t)$ are respectively the translational velocity, the rotational velocity and the activations of the obstacle sensors of the agent at each time-step t of its evaluation phase.

In the foraging task, a controller’s fitness is computed as the number of items collected during its evaluation phase. Furthermore, since we are interested in the performance of the entire swarm, we define the swarm fitness as the sum of the individual fitness of all agents at each generation:

$$F_s(g) = \sum_{r \in \text{swarm}} f_r^g \quad (2)$$

4.2 Measures

A characteristic of on-line ER is that agents learn as they are performing the actual task in an open-ended way. In this context, the best fitness ever reached by the swarm is not a reliable measure, since it only reflects a ”good” performance at one point of the evolution. Furthermore, fitness evaluation is inherently noisy, due to different evaluation conditions encountered by the agents. Therefore, we introduce four measures that will be used to compare the impact of the different selection methods. These measures summarize information on the swarm spanning over several generations. They are used only for evaluation and comparison of the selection methods and are computed once the evolution has ended. A pictorial description of these four measures is shown in Figure 2.

- Average accumulated swarm fitness (f_c): is the average swarm fitness in the last generations. This metric reflects the performance of the swarm at the end of the evolution. In our experiments, we compute the average over the last 8% generations.
- Fixed budget swarm fitness (f_b): is the swarm fitness reached at a certain generation (computational budget). This measure helps to compare different




Figure 2: A pictorial description of the four comparison measures. From top to bottom and left to right: the average accumulated swarm fitness, the fixed budget swarm fitness, the time to reach target and the accumulated fitness above target.

methods on the same grounds. In our experiments, we measure this value at 92% of the evolution, which corresponds to the first generation considered in the computation of f_c .

- Time to reach target (g_f): is the first generation at which a predefined target fitness is reached. If this level is never reached, g_f corresponds to the last generation. We fixed the target at 80% of the maximum fitness reached over all runs and all selection methods. This metric reflects a certain convergence rate of the algorithms, *i.e.* how fast the swarm hits the target fitness on the task at hand.
- Accumulated fitness above target (f_a): is the sum of all swarm fitness values above a predefined target fitness. It reflects to which extent the target level is exceeded and if this performance is maintained over the long run. We used the same target fitness as with g_f .

These comparison measures are not to be taken individually. For instance f_c and f_b complement each other and give an indication of the level and stability of the performance reached by the swarm at the end of evolution. If f_b and f_c are close then performance of the swarm is stable. Also, g_f and f_a combined reflect how fast a given fitness level is reached and to which extent that level is exceeded. Adding the two latter measures to f_c shows if that trend is maintained.

4.3 Results and discussion

For both navigation and foraging tasks, we run 30 independent runs for each selection method, and we measured F_s at each generation in all runs. Figures 3 and 4 show the median F_s per generation over the 30 runs for each task. We computed the four performance metrics in the case of navigation (Figure 5) and of foraging (Figure 6). For both tasks, we performed pairwise³ Mann-Whitney tests at 99% confidence on these measures, between the four selection methods.




Figure 3: Median swarm fitness per generation over the 30 runs for the navigation task.

On the one hand, upon analysis of Figure 3 and Figure 4, we observe that the swarm rapidly reaches a high fitness level in both tasks whenever there is a task-driven selection pressure, *i.e.* with *Best*, *Rank-based* or *Binary tournament* selection. On the other hand, without any selection pressure (*Random*), learning is much slower. Furthermore, for the three former selection methods the algorithm reaches comparable levels of performance in terms of median values of the swarm fitness. An exception can be noted for *Best* selection in the foraging task, which outperforms *Rank-based* and *Binary tournament*.

Despite the lower performances achieved by *Random*, the swarm still manages to learn behaviors for both tasks. This can be seen in the increasing trend of the

³Pairwise in this context means all combinations of pairs of selection methods, six combinations in our case.




Figure 4: Median swarm fitness per generation over the 30 runs for the foraging task.

median swarm fitness in Figure 3 and Figure 4. This result is expected on the navigation task. As it is the case in ([3]), environmental pressure drives evolution toward behaviors that maximize mating opportunities and thus behaviors that explore the environment, increasing the swarm fitness.

The same trend is also observed on the foraging task. The improvement is slower but still present with *Random* selection. This could be explained by the fact that collecting items is a byproduct of maximizing mating opportunities. Agents collect items by chance while they navigate trying to mate. When inspecting the swarm in the simulator, we observed that, when selection pressure is present, the evolved behaviors drive the agents toward food items which means that the food sensors are in fact exploited. In other words, evolution drove the controllers to use these sensors. However, without any selection pressure (*Random*), there can not be a similar drive. We also observed this in the simulator: agents were not attracted by food items for *Random* selection.

When we analyze the comparison measures we introduced earlier, similar trends are observed. Figure 5 (respectively Figure 6) shows the box and whiskers plots of the four measures for each selection method over the 30 runs for the navigation task (respectively the foraging task).

On the navigation task, the pairwise comparisons of the four measures, using Mann-Whitney tests at 99% confidence level, yield significant statistical difference between all selection methods except between *Best* and *Rank-based* (p-value=0.0795)




Figure 5: Box and whisker plots (30 independent runs) of the comparison measures for the four selection methods on the navigation task. From top to bottom and left to right: f_c , f_b , g_f and f_a . The label $p > 0.01$ indicates no statistical difference for the corresponding two selection methods.

and between *Rank-based* and *Binary tournament* (p-value 0.0116) in the case of the time to reach target (g_f).

We also observe that *Best* reaches a higher swarm fitness for the fixed budget than the rest of selection methods, and this level is maintained at the end of evolution, as is shown in f_c and f_b (upper left and right in the figure). The target fitness level is rapidly reached for the three methods inducing selection pressure, and there is not significant difference between *Best* and *Rank-based*, nor between *Rank-based* and *Binary Tournament* w.r.t g_f (lower left). Furthermore, in the case of *Best*, the required level is not only reached but surpassed during the entire evolution, leading to a value of f_a much higher than the ones of the rest of selection methods (lower right). However, this is not the case for *Random* selection that has much lower f_b (upper right) and f_c (upper left), and does not reach the target fitness level on more than half the runs that were launched (lower left and right).

On the foraging task, there is a significant difference for all pairwise comparisons, except between *Binary Tournament* and *Random* in the case of the time to reach




Figure 6: Box and whisker plots (30 independent runs) of the comparison measures for the four selection methods on the foraging task. From top to bottom and left to right: f_c , f_b , g_f and f_a . The label $p > 0.01$ indicates no statistical difference for the corresponding two selection methods.

target, g_f , and the accumulated fitness above target, f_a , (p-value=0.0419 in both cases). This is explained by the fact that very few runs attained the target fitness⁴ in which case g_f is the last generation and f_a is almost zero. There is also no statistical difference between *Rank-based* and *Binary Tournament* on the fixed budget swarm fitness, f_b , (p-value=0.0105). This means that *Binary Tournament* reaches a fitness at the given budget that is comparable to the one of *Rank-based*, but it does not maintain this level, since for these two methods the difference is significant on f_c .

Best also gives better results on the foraging task: a high swarm fitness is reached and maintained at the end of evolution (f_b and f_c , upper left and right). It surpasses the target fitness level in almost all runs much faster and to a larger extent than *Rank-based*, that also manages to reach the required level for most runs (g_f , lower left), although by a lower level (f_a , lower right). This is not the case for *Tournament* and *Random* that do not achieve the target fitness level for most runs (lower left and

⁴For both tasks, the target fitness is 80% of the highest fitness reached by all methods during all runs.

right).

We can observe that all task-driven selection pressures yield much better performances on both tasks compared to *Random* selection. Consequently, we may conclude that selection pressure has a positive impact on performances, when solving a given task, and when the objective is not only to achieve adaptation of the swarm as it was the original motivation of mEDEA. Further, statistical tests show a direct correlation between the selection pressure and the performances achieved by the swarm on the two considered tasks. In other words, the stronger the selection pressure, the better the performances reached by the swarm.

In general, it has been argued that elitist strategies are not desirable in traditional EA's, and the same argument holds for traditional ER. This is due to the fact that elitist strategies may lead to a premature convergence at local optima. There exists an extensive body of work, especially in non-convex optimization, where it is preferable to explicitly maintain a certain level of diversity in the population to escape local optima and to deal with the exploration vs. exploitation dilemma. This requirement is perhaps not as strong in the context of distributed ER as our experiments show. Selection is performed among a portion of the population at the agent level, therefore, one might argue that these algorithms already maintain a certain level of diversity inherent to the fact that sub-populations are distributed on the different agents. Comparisons with other approaches in which separated sub-populations are evolved, such as spatially structured EA's ([14]) and island models ([1]), could give further insights on the dynamics of this kind of evolution.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we studied the impact of task-driven selection pressures in on-line distributed ER for swarm behavior learning. This kind of algorithms raises several questions concerning the usefulness of selection pressure (partial views of population, noisy fitness values, etc.). We compared four selection methods inducing different intensities of selection pressure on two tasks: navigation with obstacle avoidance and collective foraging. Our experiments show that selection pressure largely improves performances, and that the intensity of the selection operator positively correlates with the performances of the swarm.

Foraging and navigation can be considered as relatively simple tasks and we believe that more complex and challenging ones, involving deceptive fitness functions, could give further insights on selection and evolution dynamics in the distributed case.

References

- [1] Enrique Alba and Marco Tomassini. Parallelism and evolutionary algorithms. *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, 6(5):443–462, 2002.
- [2] Raffaele Bianco and Stefano Nolfi. Toward open-ended evolutionary robotics: evolving elementary robotic units able to self-assemble and self-reproduce. *Connection Science*, 16(4):227–248, 2004.

- [3] Nicolas Bredeche and Jean-Marc Montanier. Environment-driven Embodied Evolution in a Population of Autonomous Agents. In *PPSN 2010*, pages 290–299, Krakow, Poland, 2010.
- [4] Nicolas Bredeche, Jean-Marc Montanier, Berend Weel, and Evert Haasdijk. Roborobo! a fast robot simulator for swarm and collective robotics. *CoRR*, abs/1304.2888, 2013.
- [5] Cristian M Dinu, Plamen Dimitrov, Berend Weel, and AE Eiben. Self-adapting fitness evaluation times for on-line evolution of simulated robots. In *Proc. of GECCO'13*, pages 191–198. ACM, 2013.
- [6] AE Eiben, Giorgos Karafotias, and Evert Haasdijk. Self-adaptive mutation in on-line, on-board evolutionary robotics. In *Fourth IEEE Int. Conf. on Self-Adaptive and Self-Organizing Systems Workshop (SASOW), 2010*, pages 147–152. IEEE, 2010.
- [7] Agoston E. Eiben and Jim E. Smith. *Introduction to Evolutionary Computing*. Springer, 2003.
- [8] Giorgos Karafotias, Evert Haasdijk, and Agoston Endre Eiben. An algorithm for distributed on-line, on-board evolutionary robotics. In *Proc. of GECCO '11*, pages 171–178, New York, NY, 2011. ACM.
- [9] Stefano Nolfi and Dario Floreano. *Evolutionary Robotics: The Biology, Intelligence, and Technology*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2000.
- [10] Nikita Noskov, Evert Haasdijk, Berend Weel, and A.E. Eiben. Monee: Using parental investment to combine open-ended and task-driven evolution. In Esparcia-Alcázar, editor, *App. of Evol. Comput.*, volume 7835 of *LNCS*. Springer Berlin, 2013.
- [11] LuisE. Pineda, A.E. Eiben, and Marteen Steen. Evolving communication in robotic swarms using on-line, on-board, distributed evolutionary algorithms. In Cecilia *et al.* Chio, editor, *Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, volume 7248 of *LNCS*, pages 529–538. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
- [12] Fernando Silva, Paulo Urbano, Sancho Oliveira, and Anders Lyhne Christensen. odneat: an algorithm for distributed online, onboard evolution of robot behaviours. In *Artificial Life*, volume 13, pages 251–258. MIT Press, 2012.
- [13] Kenneth O. Stanley and Risto Miikkulainen. Evolving neural networks through augmenting topologies. *Evol. Comput.*, 10(2):99–127, June 2002.
- [14] Marco Tomassini. *Spatially structured evolutionary algorithms*. Springer Berlin, 2005.
- [15] Richard A. Watson, Sevan G. Ficici, and Jordan B. Pollack. Embodied evolution: Distributing an evolutionary algorithm in a population of robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 39:1–18, 2002.