1 **Comparison of multi-objective optimization methods applied to**

2 **urban drainage adaptation problems**

3 Qi Wang[a] Ph.D., Qianqian Zhou[a,*] Ph.D., Xiaohui Lei[b] Ph.D., Dragan A. Savić[c] Ph.D.

4 [a]*School of Civil and Transportation Engineering, Guangdong University of Technology, Panyu*

5 *District, Guangzhou, China, 510006*

6 [b]*China Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Research, State Key Laboratory of*

7 *Simulation and Regulation of Water Cycle in River Basin, Beijing China, 100038*

8 [c]*Centre for Water Systems, College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences,*

9 *University of Exeter, North Park Road, Exeter, UK, EX4 4QF*

10 Corresponding author: Dr. Qianqian Zhou, qiaz@foxmail.com

11

12 **Abstract:** This article compares three multi-objective evolutionary algorithms (MOEAs) with

13 application to the urban drainage system (UDS) adaptation of a capital city in North China.

14 Particularly, the well-known NSGA-II, the built-in solver in the MATLAB Global Optimization

15 Toolbox (MLOT), and a newly-developed hybrid MOEA called GALAXY are considered. A

16 variety of parameter combinations of each MOEA are systemically applied to examine their

17 impacts on optimization efficiency. Results suggest that traditional MOEAs suffer from severe

18 parameterization issues. For NSGA-II, the distribution indices of crossover and mutation

19 operators were found to have dominant impacts, while the probabilities of the two operators

20 played a secondary role. For MLOT, the two-point and scattered crossover accompanying the

21 adaptive feasible mutation gained the best Pareto fronts, provided that the crossover fraction is

22 set to lower values. In contrast, GALAXY was the most robust and easy-to-use tool among the

23 three MOEAs, owing to its mechanism for substantially alleviating the parameterization issues.

24 This study contributes to the literature by showing how to improve solution robustness through

25 better selection of operators and associated parameter settings for real-world UDS applications.

26 **Keywords:** urban drainage system adaptation; multi-objective evolutionary algorithm; method

27 selection; parameter setting

Introduction

29 Many regions across the world are suffering from growing losses of life and property due to

30 urban floods, and the levels of risks are likely to increase due to impacts of climate change and

31 urbanization (IPCC 2014; Kaspersen et al. 2017). The urban drainage system (UDS) has been

32 a crucial infrastructure to manage floods in cities. The proper adaptation of existing UDSs to

33 meet challenges of future non-stationary conditions has significant socioeconomic benefits

34 (Ranger et al. 2011; Yazdanfar and Sharma 2015; Zhou et al. 2012). In research, links between

35 UDS adaptation and optimization methods are quickly made, since optimization tools can

36 provide much higher computational efficiency and stronger robustness in solving complex

37 problems compared to traditional design methods. Over the past two decades, applications of

38 multi-objective evolutionary algorithms (MOEAs) to UDSs have been greatly expanded

39 (Nicklow et al. 2010; Siriwardene and Perera 2006). Among those, the optimal design of system

40 configuration (e.g., layout and component design) considering the constraints of budget and

41 system performance has been one of the most popular topics (Giacomoni and Joseph 2017;

42 Haghighi 2013; Navin and Mathur 2016; Steele et al. 2016). Automated model calibration and

43 rehabilitation of UDS, particularly using Genetic Algorithms (GAs) and hydrological models,

44 have attracted the attention of a number of researchers (Barco et al. 2008; Barreto et al. 2010;

45   Efstratiadis and Koutsoyiannis 2010). Meanwhile, the application of MOEAs to optimizing

46   investment strategies (e.g., extent and timing) for UDS adaptation has also gained increasing

47   attention given the recent development in flood modeling and damage evaluation capabilities

48   (Barreto et al. 2010; Delelegn et al. 2011; Maharjan et al. 2009; Yazdi et al. 2017a).

49

50   Most comparative studies of MOEAs have been carried out in the field of water distribution

51   systems (WDSs) (Choi et al. 2017; Perelman and Ostfeld 2007; Zheng et al. 2016) and

52   groundwater management (Ketabchi and Ataie-Ashtiani 2015; Kollat and Reed 2006). It is

53   shown that certain MOEAs perform better than others for selected problems and case studies.

54   (Gibbs et al. 2010; Maier et al. 2014; Nicklow et al. 2010; Siriwardene and Perera 2006; Zheng

55   et al. 2017). In the field of urban drainage systems, however, understanding on the performances

56   of different MOEAs in solving UDS problems is still very limited (Yazdi et al. 2017a). Despite

57   a large number of applications of MOEAs to UDS design and management studies, there has

58   been surprisingly little research on how to robustly identify optimal solutions through more

59   powerful search operators and better settings of associated parameters. In a majority of the UDS

60   literature reviewed, besides the common parameters (e.g., population size, generations), the

61   settings of operators (e.g., crossover, mutation) are either not discussed (Barreto et al. 2010;

62   Dong et al. 2012; Muschalla 2008) or simply based on subjective judgment or recommended

63   values in literature (Delelegn et al. 2011; Udias et al. 2012). Even with limited studies exploring

64   the sensitivity of optimization results (Chui et al. 2016; Yazdi et al. 2017b; Zare et al. 2012;

65   Zhou et al. 2017), the major attention has been dedicated to examining the settings of decision

66   variables and objective functions rather than understanding the working principles of different

67   MOEAs.

68

69   Despite important conclusions made in previous comparative studies of MOEAs on other types

70   of design problems (e.g., WDS design), they offer limited insight into how the particular

71   algorithms perform in the UDS adaptation problems. It is not straightforward to directly transfer

72   the conclusions to the drainage systems due to the complexity and difference in hydrological

73   and hydraulic equations to be solved (Yazdi et al. 2017a). Gaining improved knowledge on the

74   linkage between algorithmic behaviors and associated parameter settings of different MOEAs

75   for UDS adaptation problems is important for practitioners who rely on the output of these tools

76   for design, planning, and management. This paper contributes to the urban water community

77   by exploring the suitability and efficiency of three representative MOEAs, thus offering

78   guidance for users who lack the expertise of optimization algorithms to select appropriate

79   MOEAs for UDS adaptation problems.

Methodology

The three MOEAs applied to the UDS adaptation in this study include: (1) the classic non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II); (2) the built-in multi-objective solver located in the MATLAB Global Optimization toolbox (MLOT); and (3) a newly developed hybrid MOEA called GALAXY. The three MOEAs are chosen to cover a range of user groups. First, NSGA-II is widely used to solve various multi-objective optimization problems in water resources due to its reliability and optimization efficiency (Nicklow et al. 2010). Nevertheless, the parameterization of this algorithm has not received sufficient attention in UDS applications. Second, MLOT is a popular optimization tool for practitioners who prefer a user-friendly interface. It reduces the burden of the coding work, thus often being regarded as an easy-to-use tool by users who are proficient in using MOEAs. Third, GALAXY is reported to perform competitively well with Borg (Hadka and Reed 2013) and other representative MOEAs for various design problems of water distribution systems (Wang et al. 2017), which have similar features (e.g., discrete variables, non-linear, and highly combinatorial) as the UDS. Therefore, GALAXY is included in this study to examine its performance in UDS adaptation problems.

In the next section, a brief introduction to the three MOEAs is provided, with a special emphasis on the associated operators and parameterization. Note that this study focuses on the comparisons of features and performances of the three MOEAs under different parameter settings, rather than elaborating on their basic structures and functionalities. Readers are referred to the following references for further details on each method (Deb 2001; Deb et al. 2002; Wang et al. 2017).

NSGA-II

NSGA-II (Deb et al. 2002) is one of the most popular MOEAs in the community of water research (Maier et al. 2014; Reed et al. 2013). It is acknowledged as an ''industry standard'' algorithm and has been successfully applied to a variety of water resource optimization problems (Carlucci et al. 2015; Li et al. 2015). NSGA-II adopts a fast non-dominated sorting approach to rank solutions through an implicit elitist selection method based on the Pareto dominance concept and a secondary selection method based on the crowding distance. The use of the two selection methods can significantly improve its performance in solving complex multi-objective problems. Moreover, this MOEA provides a constraint-handling technique to efficiently deal with constrained problems and supports both binary and real coding representations. The standard NSGA-II applies the Simulated Binary Crossover (SBX) and the Polynomial Mutation (PM) to reproduce children from parental generations with designated probabilities. The functionalities of SBX and PM are further controlled by their distribution indices, respectively. A large value of the distribution index means a small variation in the distance from children to their parents during the reproduction process, and vice versa (Deb et al. 2002). For UDS adaptation problems, the default/recommended settings in the literature may not be suitable because the optimal settings of the SBX and PM operators can vary from case to case. Guidance on the selection of appropriate operators and associated parameters should be given individually according to the characteristics of the given problems.

MLOT

MATLAB is a well-known commercial software in scientific and technical computing. It

124 provides a broad range of functions and toolboxes in a number of application fields. The multi-

125 objective solver in MLOT is a variant of NSGA-II with controlled elitism, which favors

126 individuals with better fitness values in the Pareto sense (i.e., convergence), as well as those

127 helping to increase the population diversity (Matlab R2017b Documentation, 2017). The

128 balance between population convergence and diversity plays a key role in steering the search

129 towards the true optimal region, in particular for non-linear, multi-modal and non-convex

130 problems.

131

132 MLOT provides six crossover operators (i.e., heuristic, intermediate, scattered, single-point,

133 two-point, and arithmetic) and three mutation operators (i.e., adaptive-feasible, Gaussian and

134 uniform). The island model is also supported, in which the whole population is divided into a

135 series of subpopulations (i.e., islands). At first, the subpopulation evolves by itself in each

136 island. At a given interval, the best individuals from one island will replace the worst

137 individuals in another one (known as migration). Many papers show that using the island model

138 helps improve the quality of solutions (Alba and Tomassini 2002; Skolicki and De Jong 2005).

139 However, there is no intuitive rule-of-thumb for setting appropriate island models for UDS

140 problems, such as the direction, fraction, and interval of migration. Note that in comparison to

141 NSGA-II, MLOT provides more options for users to solve optimization problems. On the other

142 hand, it may require a large amount of extra work on the selection of appropriate operators and

143 parameters before using the tool. This is especially challenging for users who lack expertise in

144 MOEAs and usually, they are inclined to adopt the default or recommend settings in literature

145 with or without minor adjustments. To guarantee the efficiency of MLOT, a systematical tuning

146   approach is generally requested to deal with the parameterization issue.

147

GALAXY

149   GALAXY stands for the **G**enetically **A**daptive **L**eaping **A**lgorithm for appro**X**imation and

150   diversit**Y**, which is a brand-new hybrid MOEA proposed for solving discrete and combinatorial

151   multi-objective design problems (Wang et al. 2017). It is distinguished from traditional MOEAs

152   by employing six search operators simultaneously and adaptively. Specifically, the SBX and

153   PM are adapted to Simulated Binary Crossover for Integer (SBXI) and Gaussian Mutation (GM)

154   to fit in the integer coding scheme. Another four operators include Turbulence Factor (TF),

155   Differential Evolution (DE), Uniform Mutation (UM) and Dither Creeping (DC). GALAXY

156   relies on global searching operators (i.e., TF, DE and SBXI) to drive the population towards the

157   near-optimal region and then employs local searching operators (i.e., UM, GM and DC) to

158   improve the Pareto front through fine-grained tuning. In addition, this MOEA implements

159   several strategies (e.g., hybrid replacement, global information sharing, and duplicates handling)

160   to guarantee the quality of Pareto fronts obtained (Wang et al. 2017). Despite the multiple

161   operators employed, GALAXY eliminates the setting requirements in the reproduction process,

162   which to a great extent alleviates the parameterization issue and the high computational

163   overhead in optimization. The control parameters include only the population size and the

164   number of function evaluations which are common ones in MOEAs, thus making GALAXY

165   an easy-to-use optimization tool.

Applications

Case study

A portion of the drainage network in the city of Hohhot is selected for the case study to investigate the performance of the three MOEAs for UDS adaptation applications (Figure 1a). Hohhot, the capital of the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region located in the northern China, has experienced an accelerated demographic and spatial growth in the past 20 years (Ding and Zhang 2012). The city area is about 1,398 hectares and mainly covered by high-density residential districts, with an overall mean imperviousness of 71%. The case study is located within the watershed adjacent to the Xiaohei River. The main land-use is categorized into residential, commercial, green space and others (see Figure 1b). A few key public facilities, such as institutes, hospitals, municipal administrative buildings, sport and recreational sites, are scattered over the area.

The stormwater drainage system (Figure 1c) is composed of 53 manholes, pipelines, subcatchments, and 3 outlet structures, with a total pipe length of approximately 37 km. The stormwater flows are conveyed from north to south and discharged to the recipient river in the southeast part of the city. Due to past promotion of industrial and high-density residential constructions in the area and limited system upgrades since the early 1970s, flooding has occurred more frequently in the catchment (Zhou et al. 2016). The current drainage system cannot cope with even 1-yr rainfall event. With increasing flood losses in the study site, the local authorities are under intense pressure to implement effective adaptation plans in the near future to improve the system performance up to a 3-yr service level (Zhou et al. 2016). Pipe

188   enlargement is applied as the adaptation measures to enhance the hydraulic capacity of existing

189   pipelines (i.e., using larger pipes). Costs of pipe enhancement take into account primary

190   construction and maintenance costs, including the installation/relocation of new pipes, costs of

191   earthwork, and evacuation and clearing. The costs can vary depending on a number of factors,

192   such as pipe materials, soil conditions and types of roads. In this study, costs are calculated

193   using average costs derived from regional projects and construction budget manuals, which are

194   a function of pipe diameter, pipe length and buried depth of the pipeline.

195

196   *Drainage model*

197   SWMM (Rossman and Huber 2016) was used to simulate the hydrological and hydraulic

198   response of the drainage system. The model was built based on data such as rainfall hyetograph,

199   subcatchment properties (area, width, imperviousness and slope), network dimensions

200   (manholes and pipes) and related spatial locations and elevations. The kinematic-wave method

201   (Guo and Urbonas 2009; Xiong and Melching 2005) and the Horton equation were used in the

202   flood routing and infiltration calculations, respectively. The input rainfall series corresponded

203   to a 3-yr event with 45.6 mm rain depth over 4-hour duration, with a temporal resolution of 10

204   minutes. Evaluation of system performance after incorporating different pipe enhancement

205   measurements was conducted for each simulation during the optimization. Note that SWMM

206   is not capable of simulating 2D surface inundation conditions and overflow from overloaded

207   manholes is expressed as the value of total flood volume (TFV). As the adaptation goal in this

208   study is to upgrade the system to the 3-yr service level (i.e., no system overloading occurs under

209   3-yr event), it is reasonable to use TFV to reflect the UDS performance. Surface inundation

210 models, e.g. (Vojinovic and Tutulic 2009), are applicable if overland flow characteristics and

211 related damage assessment are desirable for system performance.

212

213 *Multi-objective optimization model*

214 The optimization problem concerned two objective functions: i.e., minimization of the expected

215 TFV provided by adapted pipe capacities and the related pipe enhancement costs. These two

216 objectives are conflicting, meaning that more investment reduces TFV and vice versa. There

217 were in total 53 decision variables (i.e., 53 pipelines) for the identification of optimal locations

218 and capacities of pipe enhancement. The optimization goal was to identify a set of optimal

219 solutions (i.e., Pareto front) which reflect the trade-off between system overloading and

220 required costs.

221

222 *Experimental setup*

223 The parameterization of MOEAs was investigated from two aspects: common parameters and

224 specific ones. The former refers to the parameters required by all MOEAs, including the

225 population size (PS) and the number of function evaluations (NFEs). The latter is related to the

226 individual MOEA applied to the optimization and may differ from case to case. Also note that

227 in some cases similar parameter terms may have very different meanings and functionalities

228 (e.g., the probability of SBX in NSGA-II versus the crossover fraction in MLOT). For a given

229 combination of parameter settings, each MOEA was run 10 times independently using different

230 random seeds. The main parameters considered for each MOEA are shown in Table 1.

231

232   The settings of common parameters were determined by preliminary sensitivity analyses to

233   ensure a satisfactory level of convergence of all MOEAs (see Figures S1-S3 and Tables S1-S3

234   in Supplemental Materials for more details). It was found that NSGA-II and MLOT with a PS

235   of 200 and 20,000 NFEs delivered the best results among all combinations. In contrast,

236   GALAXY with a PS of 20 (denoted as $GALAXY_{20}$) and 20,000 NFEs reported the best Pareto

237   fronts. To compare the performance of GALAXY with NSGA-II and MLOT, both $GALAXY_{20}$

238   and $GALAXY_{200}$ were tested in this study.

239

240   For NSGA-II, four specific parameters were selected, including the probabilities of SBX and

241   PM (denoted as P_c and P_m respectively) and the associated distribution indices (denoted as DI_c

242   and DI_m respectively). The P_c was varied from 0.6 to 0.9 with an increment of 0.1, which was

243   believed to cover the most effective range of SBX (Zheng et al. 2017). The recommended

244   setting of the P_m in the literature is the inverse of the number of decision variables (Wang et al.

245   2015). In this case, this rate is roughly equal to 0.02 (i.e., 1/53). Besides, three additional values

246   of the P_m (i.e., 0.002, 0.2 and 0.05) were examined to represent the much lower, much higher

247   and a comparable level of mutation rates, respectively. The minimum and maximum

248   distribution indices of SBX and PM (i.e., DI_c and DI_m) were bounded to 1 and 20, respectively,

249   based upon preliminary tests with 100,000 random samples from the decision variable space to

250   investigate their impacts on the distribution of children from parents (see Figures S4-S5 in

251   Supplemental Materials for details). As a result, there were in total 64 groups of parameter

252   combinations for NSGA-II.

253

254 The parameterization of MLOT was arranged in two stages. At the first stage, the focus was

255 given to examining the impact of operator settings (types of operators and related functional

256 options) on optimization. More specifically, the six crossover operators, the three mutation

257 operators and four types of island models (i.e., 1, 2, 4, and 8 subpopulations implemented on a

258 single processing core) were considered. The first stage only evaluated the performance of the

259 combination of the aforementioned operators and functional options with the associated

260 parameters set to their default values. As a result, there were a total of 72 groups of parameter

261 combinations for MLOT at this stage. At the second stage, only the combinations of operators

262 with high efficiency found at the first stage were considered. The focus was then shifted to

263 investigate the influence of the associated parameters within their corresponding effective

264 ranges.

265

266 *Performance Metrics*

267 Four kinds of performance criteria were used to evaluate the quality of solutions, including the

268 hypervolume (HV, Zitzler and Thiele 1999) and the generational distance (GD, Veldhuizen

269 1999) metrics to assess the diversity and convergence of Pareto fronts obtained by different

270 MOEAs, respectively. Both metrics range from 0 to 1, and a larger HV and a smaller GD

271 suggest better performance in terms of diversity and convergence, and vice versa. On the other

272 hand, since the solutions which can eliminate TFV (i.e., located on the x-axis) are of special

273 interest to local decision makers, the averaged costs of such solutions from multiple

274 independent runs (denoted as $Cost_{TFV=0}$) and the associated frequency to identify them are used

275 as complementary indicators to measure the convergence and reliability of MOEAs

276   simultaneously.

277

278   Note that the optimization efficiency in terms of CPU running time was not taken into

279   consideration in this study, because all the optimization tools were implemented within the

280   MATLAB environment, and the most time-intensive part during optimization came from the

281   hydraulic simulations via the SWMM toolkit. Therefore, the differences among three tools can

282   be neglected as long as the same NFEs are permitted.

283

284   **Results and discussion**

285   *Pareto fronts from tested MOEAs*

286   The best Pareto fronts (BPFs) obtained by each MOEA are shown as colored solid dots in Figure

287   2a, with the colored hollow circles demonstrating the corresponding Pareto fronts derived by

288   all parameter combinations. Both NSGA-II and MLOT suffered from severe parameterization

289   issues since their solutions disperse widely in the objective space. The Pareto fronts achieved

290   by NSGA-II are mainly within a range of costs less than \$4.5 million and a TFV lower than

291   60,000 m^3. Impacts of parameterization on MLOT are more pronounced as the obtained

292   solutions in Figure 2a disperse over a wider area than those by NSGA-II. In contrast, GALAXY

293   converged to a satisfactory level compared with the two traditional MOEAs despite the use of

294   two different population sizes. Main differences in MOEA performances are found in the

295   middle part of the BPFs, in which traditional MOEAs converged better. However, it should be

296   emphasized that the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$ and BPF_{MLOT} were not achieved by any single combination of

297   their parameters, but actually composed of Pareto fronts from several efficient parameter

298   combinations. In addition, in the region near the maximum TFV, NSGA-II converged worse

299   than GALAXY and MLOT, and missed the boundary point which represents the solution

300   without any pipe enlargement. In the region near the x-axis (Figure 2b), the differences between

301   GALAXY and traditional MOEAs become smaller. By comparing the solutions with zero TFV

302   (i.e., no system overloading) on each BPF (Figure 2c), results show that GALAXY with a PS

303   of 20 (i.e., the green solid dot) found the cheapest solution with an investment cost of

304   approximately \$4.4 million. This cost saves 0.3% and 16.2% of the ones found by NSGA-II

305   and MLOT, respectively.

306

307   A further quantitative comparison among three MOEAs is presented in Table 2. The BPF_{MLOT}

308   achieved the best convergence and diversity according to HV and GD indicators. Recall that

309   the BPF of each MOEA was generated by filtering all the non-dominated solutions via multiple

310   runs using the fast non-dominated sorting procedure (Deb et al. 2002); consequently, the HV

311   and GD values of each BPF (Rows 2-5) are superior to those of the averaged performance of

312   each MOEA through independent runs (Rows 6-9). Despite the BPF_{MLOT} exhibiting the best

313   diversity and convergence, it was actually achieved at the price of the highest computational

314   overhead (i.e., 810 runs). In contrast, GALAXY of both population sizes achieved a much

315   higher level of diversity and similar convergence compared with NSGA-II and MLOT when

316   comparing their averaged HV and GD values. Furthermore, there is a high reliability in

317    $GALAXY_{20}$'s performance to identify better (cheaper) boundary solutions on the x-axis (i.e.,

318   no TFV). In contrast, traditional MOEAs, especially the MLOT, suffered different levels of

319   difficulties in locating such boundary solutions (i.e., more expensive with lower frequencies).

320   This implies that GALAXY can provide better solutions to UDS problems at a much lower

321   computational burden.

322

Comparison of best solutions

324   Figure 3 shows the best pipe enlargement configurations (i.e., most economical solutions to

325   eliminate system overloading under 3-yr event) optimized by GALAXY, NSGA-II, and MLOT,

326   respectively. The extents of pipe increments are distinguished by the line thickness and

327   associated colors as shown in the figure legend. Note that pipe diameters were not enlarged

328   gradually, since different parts of current drainage networks are served with varying pipe

329   capacities due to uncoordinated historical adaptations in the area. Generally speaking, all the

330   three MOEAs found similar locations for pipe increment, but with different sizes. Pipelines in

331   the upstream were augmented appropriately through the optimization. It is agreed that the pipes

332   near the Outlet O1 have sufficient capacities to cope with the 3-yr event and are therefore kept

333   unchanged (black lines). Nevertheless, the pipes near the Outlet O2 and O3 are found to have

334   different extents of system overloading and were enlarged accordingly. In particular,

335   GALAXY$_{20}$ managed to identify the most cost-effective solution for pipe enlargement (i.e.,

336   about $4.4 million), with most of optimized pipe increments ranging between 0.2 m and 0.6 m.

337   In contrast, NSGA-II and MLOT suggested 0.4-0.8 m for the same pipelines, which resulted in

338   additional investment costs of $0.011 and $0.8 million, respectively.

339

Parameterization of MOEAs

NSGA-II

Figure 4 demonstrates the parameterization impacts of NSGA-II in the compass plot, in which

the combinations of controlling parameters of NSGA-II (i.e., DI_c, DI_m, P_c, and P_m) are shown

in four colored rings and their contributions to the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$ are shown in the outermost grey

ring. For each combination, the contribution is computed as the ratio of the number of solutions

by the specific parameter settings found in the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$ to the total number of solutions in the

$BPF_{NSGA-II}$. The whole plot is sorted by the contribution ratio in a descending order in the

counter-clockwise direction. Results show that DI_c and DI_m have significant impacts on the

performance of NSGA-II. That is, the combinations with a larger DI_c and a smaller DI_m made

more than 5% contributions (i.e., the top seven slots) to the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$. The DI_c seems to

dominate the NSGA-II performance in solving the UDS adaptation problem presented. With

the DI_c set to 1, the majority of the combinations made minor or no contributions to the

$BPF_{NSGA-II}$, regardless how the other three parameters were set. When the DI_c was set to 20, half

of associated parameter combinations (i.e., 16 out of 32 groups) made identifiable contributions.

In terms of delivering efficient solutions, the DI_m with a value of 20 has a 31.25% chance of

failure, which is 1.7 time the chance (i.e., 18.75%) of those with a value of 1. This finding is

essential to guide the further use of NSGA-II as previous applications neglected the setting of

these two parameters and default values were often adopted (Barreto et al. 2010; Jia et al. 2015;

Yazdi et al. 2017a) without investigating their impacts.

The probabilities of SBX and PM played a secondary role on NSGA-II's performance, when

362   the DI_c and DI_m were fixed at 20 and 1, respectively. The combination with P_c and P_m set to 0.9

363   and 0.05 obtained the best optimization results across all 64 groups. A larger P_m generally

364   yielded a higher contribution to the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$, despite the variations in the P_c. For example,

365   the second best combination had a contribution rate of 16.4% and was achieved with the P_m set

366   to 0.2. When reducing the P_m by an order of magnitude (i.e., from 0.2 to 0.02), a noticeable

367   damping effect on the contribution rate (i.e., from 9.2% to 1.7%, highlighted by the black

368   dashed line in Figure 4) was observed. In general, the combinations with larger P_c and P_m

369   captured more solutions in the $BPF_{NSGA-II}$. Nevertheless, both parameters, in particular the P_c,

370   showed no dominant impacts on the performance of NSGA-II. This is somewhat different to

371   the previous literature that treated the probabilities of SBX and PM as the main driving

372   parameters (Khu et al. 2006; Yazdi et al. 2017a). In summary, the results imply that for the case

373   study the best parameter settings for NSGA-II should consider a larger DI_c (i.e., a smaller search

374   step) with a higher crossover probability, coupling with a smaller DI_m (i.e., a larger search step)

375   with a much higher mutation probability than the recommended value in the literature (i.e.,

376   0.02).

377

378   **MLOT**

379   Impacts of the investigated operators on the performance of MLOT are shown in Figure 5a.

380   There were only four combinations leading to noticeable contributions (i.e., with contribution

381   rates larger than 5%) to the BPF_{MLOT}. Surprisingly, all these combinations corresponded to the

382   use of a complete population rather than the island models. The scattered, two-point, and single-

383   point crossover functions accompanying with the adaptive feasible mutation are found to be

384   more efficient in identifying optimal solutions. Although the Gaussian mutation was also

385   competitive, it was not included at the second stage since it has two additional parameters and

386   may yield infeasible solutions. The other three types of crossover operators (i.e., heuristic,

387   intermediate and arithmetic) were generally inefficient no matter what types of mutation and/or

388   island models were used.

389

390   To verify the effect of island models, additional sensitivity analyses were conducted to expand

391   the testing ranges of the migration fraction (i.e., 0.5 and 0.8, the default value was 0.2) for island

392   models with two subpopulations, using the top three combinations found in Figure 5a. No

393   improvement was identified from the BPF_{MLOT} over the initial 720 runs (Figure 5b), which

394   implies that the island models do not fit well to the optimization problem in this study.

395   Consequently, at the second stage, only the three efficient crossover operators (i.e., scattered,

396   two-point, and single-point), as well as the adaptive feasible mutation, were employed as the

397   underlying settings, combined with varying crossover fractions (i.e., 0.6, 0.7, and 0.9, the

398   default value was 0.8). It is worth noting that the crossover fraction controls both the crossover

399   and mutation rates in MLOT, which is intrinsically different from the P_c in NSGA-II. For

400   instance, a crossover fraction of 0.7 means that 70% of the population will undergo crossover

401   randomly and the remaining 30% will be mutated. However, in NSGA-II a child may be

402   generated via both crossover and mutation. Figure 5c shows the Pareto fronts obtained by the

403   additional 90 runs. It is clear that the original BPF_{MLOT} over the 720 runs was further improved

404   by the combination of the two-point crossover, the adaptive feasible mutation, and the newly

405   set crossover fraction with a value of 0.6. A subsequent statistical analysis revealed that the

two-point and scattered crossover functions with a relatively low crossover fraction (i.e., less

than 0.8) delivered more efficient solutions, which gained more than 7.5% of the improved

BPF_{MLOT} over the 810 runs.

GALAXY

Figure 6 shows the dynamics of the six searching operators employed by GALAXY throughout

the optimization process for solving the UDS adaptation problem. It is shown that the operators

which are good at global search (i.e., TF, DE and SBXI) are found to dominate the behavior of

GALAXY at very early generations (with clearer tendency in Figure 6b due to fewer

generations). Afterwards, the operators which are good at local search (i.e., UM, GM and DC)

gradually stepped in and steered the optimization from diversification to intensification. The

patterns observed are in line with the original design concept of this algorithm, as well as the

searching behavior when applied this MOEA to the WDS applications (Wang et al. 2017).

Conclusions

Three types of MOEAs, namely the NSGA-II, MLOT, and GALAXY, were compared in an

application to the multi-objective adaptation of a district-wide urban drainage system in

northern China. With a focus on the impacts of parameterization, the efficiency of each MOEA

was evaluated to gain improved understanding of how different operators and associated

parameter settings affect the performances of these MOEAs. Results indicate that both NSGA-

II and MLOT suffered from severe parameterization issues due to the fact that they involve

many controlling parameters for fine-tuning. It seems that the more parameters an MOEA

428   contains, the more significantly its performance would be affected. Among the three MOEAs,

429   GALAXY turned out to be the most robust and easy-to-use tool for UDS users, especially for

430   those who lack the expertise in evolutionary computation and are challenged by the parameter

431   settings of MOEAs.

432

433   The distribution indices of SBX and PM dominate the optimization efficiency of NSGA-II,

434   which have been generally ignored in previous applications. This implies that users need to pay

435   special attention to fine-tuning of those two parameters before applying NSGA-II to given

436   optimization problems. The reason lies in the fact that the variations of children from their

437   parents mainly depend on the values of the distribution indices. The smaller the distribution

438   indices are, the farther the children will be evolved from their parents. Proper settings of the

439   two parameters will benefit the search by ensuring more balanced convergence and diversity in

440   the population. The probabilities of SBX and PM play a secondary role in NSGA-II on the

441   problem studied. A larger SBX rate (i.e., 0.9) with a relatively higher PM rate (i.e., 0.05) than

442   the recommended literature value (i.e., the inverse of the number of decision variables)

443   delivered the best performance. However, note that this finding is perhaps more suitable for

444   problems involving only discrete decision variables. For those concerning continuous variables,

445   the best combinations of SBX and PM rates should be fine-tuned via trial runs.

446

447   MLOT provides a good deal of flexibility, although the various options and parameters without

448   appropriate/efficient guidance can also frustrate or even mislead users who are proficient in

449   MOEAs. It was found that the two-point and scattered crossover functions accompanying the

450   adaptive feasible mutation gained the best Pareto fronts, provided that the crossover fraction

451   was set to a lower value (e.g., 0.6 or 0.7). Importantly, this study showed that using the island

452   GA models for multi-objective optimization seemed to be inefficient. The failure might be due

453   to the loss of diversity by dividing the entire population into subgroups.

454

455   GALAXY has distinct advantages in comparison to the two traditional MOEAs. First, except

456   the common parameters (i.e., PS and NFEs), there is no need to set any accompanying

457   parameters for GALAXY's searching operators, which inherently ensures the robustness of its

458   performance. Second, it deploys six searching operators based on their features in terms of the

459   scale of variations in the objective space, and employs them adaptively and simultaneously

460   rather than using them individually. This mechanism releases the capabilities of various

461   operators in a synergetic way. Third, the performance of GALAXY is insensitive to the settings

462   of population sizes as long as the NFEs are sufficient, which further simplifies the usage of this

463   tool for real-world applications. In contrast, a sufficient population size is requested for

464   traditional MOEAs to work properly. In summary, GALAXY can save substantial time and

465   effort to cope with the parameterization issue of MOEAs. This is essential for users from a

466   practical perspective as they only need to set up the appropriate objective functions and NFEs

467   according to the scale/characteristics of the optimization problem at hand.

468

469   In addition to the parameterization strategy as suggested in the GALAXY, there are other two

470   ways to solve the parameterization issue: (1) the development of the self-adaptive strategy that

471   is able to automatically adjust the parameters based on the searching performance, with a typical

472   example by Zheng et al. (2013) applied to WDS design problems; and (2) the development of

473   the hybrid methods to reduce the impacts of the parameterizations, as the starting positions of

474   MOEAs are the optimal solutions from some deterministic methods (e.g., Linear Programming

475   or Non-Linear Programming) rather than the randomly generated solutions. A number of

476   studies have been undertaken in the latter area, such as Ostfeld (2012) and Zheng et al. (2011).

477

478   For simplicity, this study only considered two-objective functions and one type of variables.

479   Nevertheless, the approach adopted in this study can be applied to other types of optimization

480   problems where different objectives and/or decision variables are concerned. However, it

481   should be born in mind that if more objectives (e.g., 3 or 4) are considered the performances of

482   tested MOEAs in identifying the near-optimal Pareto front may deteriorate dramatically due to

483   the "dominance resistance" encountered in the hyper Pareto space (Hadka and Reed 2013). In

484   that case, more efficient sorting procedures are required to maintain appropriate selection

485   pressure and prevent the population from premature. Moreover, given the complexity and

486   variability in applicable optimization methodologies (e.g., approach, configuration and

487   parameter), the role of this work is to propose appropriate optimization strategies that not only

488   enable an assessment of optimal measures in compliance with the predefined physical and/or

489   economic objectives, but more importantly provide insightful guidance on the selection and use

490   of efficient optimization approaches for UDS applications. In particular, a systematical analysis

491   on the impacts of parameter settings should be conducted before using any MOEAs, rather than

492   simply following the recommended settings in other applications. Furthermore, the fewer

493   parameters that require fine-tuning, the more robust an MOEA tends to be. On top of that, an

494   MOEA with multiple searching operators employed simultaneously is likely to provide a more

495   balanced behavior between exploration and exploitation during optimization.

496

497   Although benchmark models are widely applied to WDS design problems to test the robustness

498   of the performance of MOEAs (Choi et al. 2017; Zheng et al. 2016), due to a lack of well-

499   acknowledged and publicly available benchmark drainage networks for UDS problems (Yazdi

500   et al. 2017b), this work used only one case study for the comparative assessment of the MOEAs.

501   Future work is planned on the applications of these MOEAs to multiple benchmark drainage

502   networks of different scales and types. For instance, the current work only considers the option

503   of drainage pipe enlargement. The potential of low impact development measures, such as green

504   roofs and rain gardens, are not incorporated into the structure of decision variables. The

505   increased complexity of decision variables and performance criteria will undoubtedly make the

506   optimization even more challenging and is consequently worth investigating.

Acknowledgements

Supplemental Data

512   Figs. S1–S5 are available online in the ASCE Library (ascelibrary.org).

513   Tables. S1–S5 are available online in the ASCE Library (ascelibrary.org).

References

515   Alba, E., and Tomassini, M. (2002). "Parallelism and evolutionary algorithms." *Ieee*
516   *Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 6(5), 443-462.

Barco, J., Wong Kenneth, M., and Stenstrom Michael, K. (2008). "Automatic Calibration of the U.S. EPA SWMM Model for a Large Urban Catchment." *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering*, 134(4), 466-474.

Barreto, W., Vojinovic, Z., Price, R., and Solomatine, D. (2010). "Multiobjective Evolutionary Approach to Rehabilitation of Urban Drainage Systems." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management-Asce*, 136(5), 547-554.

Carlucci, S., Cattarin, G., Causone, F., and Pagliano, L. (2015). "Multi-objective optimization of a nearly zero-energy building based on thermal and visual discomfort minimization using a non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm (NSGA-II)." *Energy and Buildings*, 104, 378-394.

Choi, Y. H., Jung, D., Lee, H. M., Yoo, D. G., and Kim, J. H. (2017). "Improving the Quality of Pareto Optimal Solutions in Water Distribution Network Design." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 143(8), 04017036.

Chui, T. F. M., Liu, X., and Zhan, W. T. (2016). "Assessing cost-effectiveness of specific LID practice designs in response to large storm events." *Journal of Hydrology*, 533, 353-364.

Deb, K. (2001). *Multi-Objective Optimization Using Evolutionary Algorithms* John Wiley & Sons.

Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., and Meyarivan, T. (2002). "A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II." *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 6(2), 182-197.

Delelegn, S. W., Pathirana, A., Gersonius, B., Adeogun, A. G., and Vairavamoorthy, K. (2011). "Multi-objective optimisation of cost-benefit of urban flood management using a 1D2D coupled model." *Water Science and Technology*, 63(5), 1053-1059.

Ding, T., and Zhang, W. (2012). "Analysis of urbanization process in Hohhot " *China Economist*, 12, 230-207.

Dong, X., Zeng, S., and Chen, J. (2012). "A spatial multi-objective optimization model for sustainable urban wastewater system layout planning." *Water Science and Technology*, 66(2), 267-274.

Efstratiadis, A., and Koutsoyiannis, D. (2010). "One decade of multi-objective calibration approaches in hydrological modelling: a review." *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 55(1), 58-78.

Giacomoni, M. H., and Joseph, J. (2017). "Multi-Objective Evolutionary Optimization and Monte Carlo Simulation for Placement of Low Impact Development in the Catchment Scale." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 143(9), 04017053.

Gibbs, M. S., Maier, H. R., and Dandy, G. C. (2010). "Comparison of Genetic Algorithm Parameter Setting Methods for Chlorine Injection Optimization." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 136(2), 288-291.

Guo, J. C. Y., and Urbonas, B. (2009). "Conversion of Natural Watershed to Kinematic Wave Cascading Plane." *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 14(8), 839-846.

Hadka, D., and Reed, P. (2013). "Borg: An Auto-Adaptive Many-Objective Evolutionary Computing Framework." *Evolutionary Computation*, 21(2), 231-259.

Haghighi, A. (2013). "Loop-by-Loop Cutting Algorithm to Generate Layouts for Urban Drainage Systems." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 139(6),

693-703.

IPCC. (2014). "Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change." *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/.*

Jia, H. F., Yao, H. R., Tang, Y., Yu, S. L., Field, R., and Tafuri, A. N. (2015). "LID-BMPs planning for urban runoff control and the case study in China." *Journal of Environmental Management*, 149, 65-76.

Kaspersen, P. S., Ravn, N. H., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Madsen, H., and Drews, M. (2017). "Comparison of the impacts of urban development and climate change on exposing European cities to pluvial flooding." *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21(8), 4131-4147.

Ketabchi, H., and Ataie-Ashtiani, B. (2015). "Evolutionary algorithms for the optimal management of coastal groundwater: A comparative study toward future challenges." *Journal of Hydrology*, 520, 193-213.

Khu, S. T., di Pierro, F., Savić, D., Djordjević, S., and Walters, G. A. (2006). "Incorporating spatial and temporal information for urban drainage model calibration: An approach using preference ordering genetic algorithm." *Advances in Water Resources*, 29(8), 1168-1181.

Kollat, J. B., and Reed, P. M. (2006). "Comparing state-of-the-art evolutionary multi-objective algorithms for long-term groundwater monitoring design." *Advances in Water Resources*, 29(6), 792-807.

Li, Y. Q., Liao, S. M., and Liu, G. (2015). "Thermo-economic multi-objective optimization for a solar-dish Brayton system using NSGA-II and decision making." *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 64, 167-175.

Maharjan, M., Pathirana, A., Gersonius, B., and Vairavamoorthy, K. (2009). "Staged cost optimization of urban storm drainage systems based on hydraulic performance in a changing environment." *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 13(4), 481-489.

Maier, H. R., Kapelan, Z., Kasprzyk, J., Kollat, J., Matott, L. S., Cunha, M. C., Dandy, G. C., Gibbs, M. S., Keedwell, E., Marchi, A., Ostfeld, A., Savic, D., Solomatine, D. P., Vrugt, J. A., Zecchin, A. C., Minsker, B. S., Barbour, E. J., Kuczera, G., Pasha, F., Castelletti, A., Giuliani, M., and Reed, P. M. (2014). "Evolutionary algorithms and other metaheuristics in water resources: Current status, research challenges and future directions." *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 62, 271-299.

Matlab R2017b Documentation. (2017). "Find Pareto front of multiple fitness functions using genetic algorithm." <http://www.mathworks.com/help/gads/gamultiobj.html> (Nov. 15, 2017).

Muschalla, D. (2008). "Optimization of integrated urban wastewater systems using multi-objective evolution strategies." *Urban Water Journal*, 5(1), 57-65.

Navin, P. K., and Mathur, Y. P. (2016). "Layout and Component Size Optimization of Sewer Network Using Spanning Tree and Modified PSO Algorithm." *Water Resources Management*, 30(10), 3627-3643.

Nicklow, J., Reed, P., Savic, D., Dessalegne, T., Harrell, L., Chan-Hilton, A., Karamouz, M., Minsker, B., Ostfeld, A., Singh, A., and Zechman, E. (2010). "State of the Art for Genetic Algorithms and Beyond in Water Resources Planning and Management."

Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, 136(4), 412-432.

Ostfeld, A. (2012). "Optimal reliable design and operation of water distribution systems through decomposition." *Water Resources Research*, 48(10), W10521.

Perelman, L., and Ostfeld, A. (2007). "An adaptive heuristic cross-entropy algorithm for optimal design of water distribution systems." *Engineering Optimization*, 39(4), 413-428.

Ranger, N., Hallegatte, S., Bhattacharya, S., Bachu, M., Priya, S., Dhore, K., Rafique, F., Mathur, P., Naville, N., Henriet, F., Herweijer, C., Pohit, S., and Corfee-Morlot, J. (2011). "An assessment of the potential impact of climate change on flood risk in Mumbai." *Climatic Change*, 104(1), 139-167.

Reed, P. M., Hadka, D., Herman, J. D., Kasprzyk, J. R., and Kollat, J. B. (2013). "Evolutionary multiobjective optimization in water resources: The past, present, and future." *Advances in Water Resources*, 51, 438-456.

Rossman, L., and Huber, W. (2016). "Storm Water Management Model Reference Manual " *EPA/600/R-15/162A*.

Siriwardene, N. R., and Perera, B. J. C. (2006). "Selection of genetic algorithm operators for urban drainage model parameter optimisation." *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 44(5-6), 415-429.

Skolicki, Z., and De Jong, K. (2005). *The influence of migration sizes and intervals on island models*.

Steele, J. C., Mahoney, K., Karovic, O., and Mays, L. W. (2016). "Heuristic Optimization Model for the Optimal Layout and Pipe Design of Sewer Systems." *Water Resources Management*, 30(5), 1605-1620.

Udias, A., Galbiati, L., Elorza, F. J., Efremov, R., Pons, J., and Borras, G. (2012). "Framework for multi-criteria decision management in watershed restoration." *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 14(2), 395-411.

Veldhuizen, D. A. V. (1999). "Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: Classifications, analyses, and new innovations," Air Force Inst. of Technol., Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

Vojinovic, Z., and Tutulic, D. (2009). "On the use of 1D and coupled 1D-2D modelling approaches for assessment of flood damage in urban areas." *Urban Water Journal*, 6(3), 183-199.

Wang, Q., Guidolin, M., Savic, D., and Kapelan, Z. (2015). "Two-Objective Design of Benchmark Problems of a Water Distribution System via MOEAs: Towards the Best-Known Approximation of the True Pareto Front." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 141(3), 14.

Wang, Q., Savic, D. A., and Kapelan, Z. (2017). "GALAXY: A new hybrid MOEA for the optimal design of Water Distribution Systems." *Water Resources Research*, 53(3), 1997-2015.

Xiong, Y. Y., and Melching, C. S. (2005). "Comparison of kinematic-wave and nonlinear reservoir routing of urban watershed runoff." *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 10(1), 39-49.

Yazdanfar, Z., and Sharma, A. (2015). "Urban drainage system planning and design-challenges with climate change and urbanization: a review." *Water Science & Technology*, 72(2),

649   165-179.

650   Yazdi, J., Sadollah, A., Lee, E. H., Yoo, D. G., and Kim, J. H. (2017a). "Application of multi-
651   objective evolutionary algorithms for the rehabilitation of storm sewer pipe networks."
652   *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 10(3), 326-338.

653   Yazdi, J., Yoo, D. G., and Kim, J. H. (2017b). "Comparative study of multi-objective
654   evolutionary algorithms for hydraulic rehabilitation of urban drainage networks."
655   *Urban Water Journal*, 14(5), 483-492.

656   Zare, S. O., Saghafian, B., and Shamsai, A. (2012). "Multi-objective optimization for combined
657   quality-quantity urban runoff control." *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16(12),
658   4531-4542.

659   Zheng, F., Simpson, A. R., and Zecchin, A. C. (2011). "A combined NLP-differential evolution
660   algorithm approach for the optimization of looped water distribution systems." *Water*
661   *Resources Research*, 47(8), n/a-n/a.

662   Zheng, F., Zecchin, A. C., and Simpson, A. R. (2013). "Self-Adaptive Differential Evolution
663   Algorithm Applied to Water Distribution System Optimization." *Journal of Computing*
664   *in Civil Engineering*, 27(2), 148-158.

665   Zheng, F. F., Qi, Z. X., Bi, W. W., Zhang, T. Q., Yu, T. C., and Shao, Y. (2017). "Improved
666   Understanding on the Searching Behavior of NSGA-II Operators Using Run-Time
667   Measure Metrics with Application to Water Distribution System Design Problems."
668   *Water Resources Management*, 31(4), 1121-1138.

669   Zheng, F. F., Zecchin, A. C., Maier, H. R., and Simpson, A. R. (2016). "Comparison of the
670   Searching Behavior of NSGA-II, SAMODE, and Borg MOEAs Applied to Water
671   Distribution System Design Problems." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and*
672   *Management*, 142(7), 16.

673   Zhou, Q., Blohm, A., and Liu, B. (2017). "Planning Framework for Mesolevel Optimization of
674   Urban Runoff Control Schemes." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and*
675   *Management*, 143(4).

676   Zhou, Q., Mikkelsen, P. S., Halsnaes, K., and Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K. (2012). "Framework for
677   economic pluvial flood risk assessment considering climate change effects and
678   adaptation benefits." *Journal of Hydrology*, 414, 539-549.

679   Zhou, Q., Ren, Y., Xu, M., Han, N., and Wang, H. (2016). "Adaptation to urbanization impacts
680   on drainage in the city of Hohhot, China." *Water Science and Technology*, 73(1), 167-
681   175.

682   Zitzler, E., and Thiele, L. (1999). "Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: A comparative case
683   study and the strength Pareto approach." IEEE Transaction on Evolutionary
684   Computation, 3(4), 257-271.

685

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Location (a), main land-use (b), and drainage system(c) of the case study in the city of Hohhot, North China

Fig. 2. Best Pareto fronts discovered by each MOEA via multiple independent runs

Fig. 3. Comparison of optimized pipe increments to upgrade the drainage to planned service level suggested by the three MOEAs

Fig. 4. Parameterization of NSGA-II contributing to its BPF over 640 runs (source data can be found in Table S4 in Supplemental Materials)

Fig. 5. Parameterization of MLOT contributing to the best Pareto front over 810 runs through two stages of test: (a) Parameterization over 720 runs at the 1st Stage (source data can be found in Table S5 in Supplemental Materials); (b) Pareto fronts considering the migration fraction; and (c) Pareto fronts obtained over 90 runs at the 2nd Stage

Fig. 6. Dynamics of search operators within GALAXY over 10 runs

700 **Tables**

701 <div style="text-align:center">**Table 1**. Main parameters and the corresponding ranges of three MOEAs</div>

MOEAs	Main Parameters	Effective Range	Number of Combinations	Number of Runs
NSGA-II	P_c	[0.6,0.7,0.8,0.9]	4x4x2x2=64	64x10=640
	P_m	[0.002,0.02,0.05,0.2]		
	DI_c	[1,20]		
	DI_m	[1,20]		
$MLOT_1$	crossover operators	[heu,sca,int,sin,two,ari]	6x3x4=72	72x10=720
	mutation operators	[unif,adap,gaus]		
	number of subpopulations	[1,2,4,8]		
$MLOT_2$	crossover operators	[sca,two,sin]	3x3=9	9x10=90
	crossover fraction	[0.6,0.7,0.9]		
$GALAXY_{20}$	PS	20	1	1x10=10
	NFEs	20,000		
$GALAXY_{200}$	PS	200	1	1x10=10
	NFEs	20,000		

702 Notes: The subscripts of MLOT refer to different stage of parameterization. The full spellings
703 of the abbreviations of crossover and mutation operators in MLOT can be found in the
704 corresponding subsection in Methodology. The subscripts of GALAXY denote the minimum
705 and maximum population sizes used in this study.

706

Table 2. Comparison of Pareto fronts obtained by three MOEAs

Row No.	Pareto Fronts	HV (-)	$HV_{relative}$ (-)	GD (-)	Avg($Cost_{TFV=0}$)/Frequency million \$/%
1	Best-Known PF	0.8705	-	-	-
2	$BPF_{NSGA-II}$	0.8491	0.9754	0.0044	-
3	BPF_{MLOT}	**0.8663**	**0.9951**	**0.0009**	-
4	$BPF_{GALAXY20}$	0.8388	0.9636	0.0239	-
5	$BPF_{GALAXY200}$	0.8434	0.9689	0.0268	-
6	NSGA-II (640 runs)	0.7259	0.8339	**0.0223**	4.8774/99.2%
7	MLOT (810 runs)	0.5391	0.6193	0.0494	5.9189/1%
8	$GALAXY_{20}$ (10 runs)	0.8166	0.9380	0.0319	**4.5502/100%**
9	$GALAXY_{200}$ (10 runs)	**0.8244**	**0.9470**	0.0440	5.9941/100%

708 Notes: The maximum values of cost and TFV objectives were set to \$8 million and 70,000 m^3,
709 respectively (i.e., the upper-right corner in Figure 2a). To avoid the impacts of different scales
710 of the two objectives, the Pareto front obtained by each MOEA was first normalized using the
711 maximum values of both objectives. The HV indicators of the four BPFs and the best-known
712 PF were then calculated using the reference point (1,1). The $HV_{relative}$ indicator refers to the ratio
713 of each HV indicator obtained by a specific MOEA to that of the best-known PF. The best value
714 according to each criterion is shown in bold.

715

Figures

Fig. 1. Location (a), main land-use (b), and drainage system(c) of the case study in the city of

Hohhot, North China

721

722 **Fig. 2**. Best Pareto fronts discovered by each MOEA via multiple independent runs

723

Fig. 3. Comparison of optimized pipe increments to upgrade the drainage to planned service

level suggested by the three MOEAs

728

Fig. 4. Parameterization of NSGA-II contributing to BPF$_{NSGA-II}$ over 640 runs (Each colored

ring represents one controlling parameter with different levels of darkness showing the

considered values in the legend on the right-hand side. Therefore, every four-slot in the radial

direction corresponds to a specific parameter combination of NSGA-II. The outermost grey

ring indicates the contribution rates of different parameter combinations sorted in the

descending order in the counter-clockwise direction. Source data can be found in Table S4 in

Supplemental Materials)

Fig. 5. Parameterization of MLOT contributing to the best Pareto front over 810 runs through two stages of test: (a) Parameterization over 720 runs at the 1ˢᵗ Stage (source data can be found in Table S5 in Supplemental Materials); (b) Pareto fronts considering the migration fraction; and (c) Pareto fronts obtained over 90 runs at the 2ⁿᵈ Stage

Fig. 6. Dynamics of search operators within GALAXY over 10 runs