

Here, we seek to bring a state-of-the-art method for exact MOILP into the heuristic realm. In particular, we focus on *binary decision diagrams* (BDDs), traditionally an enumerative approach to MOILP. To solve an MOILP problem with a BDD, one first constructs the BDD, a directed acyclic graph that represents all feasible solutions. Not all problems are necessarily amenable to BDD-based approaches, but the literature shows that a vast collection of problems are, namely those that have succinct dynamic programming models. Then, this graph is traversed layer-by-layer to extract the Pareto frontier. An illustrative example is shown in Figure 1. Surprisingly, this approach has been shown to outperform other MOO methods, typically producing the Pareto frontier faster for problems with 2-10 objectives and tens to hundreds of variables [Bergman and Cire, 2016; Bergman *et al.*, 2021]. However, because the Pareto frontier may be extremely large, enumerating it over the BDD can be fairly time-consuming, delaying the delivery of decisions to the end user.

Size	(3, 60)	(3, 70)	(3, 80)	(4, 50)	(5, 40)	(6, 40)	(7, 40)
% Pareto	2	3	3	5	7	10	12

Table 1: Percentage (rounded) of Pareto nodes across different sizes (number of objectives, number of variables) for 10 instances per size.

Our goal then is to construct a *restricted* BDD – a sparser subgraph of the original, large BDD – so that enumerating solutions over the latter provides a good approximation of the Pareto frontier, in a much smaller amount of time. Table 1 shows that this is a good idea: for random instances of the knapsack problem, the fraction of BDD nodes that lead to Pareto-optimal solutions (which we call *Pareto nodes*) ranges between 2% and 12% for instances with 3-7 objectives and 40-80 variables. If one could identify the Pareto nodes before the extraction of the Pareto frontier, enumeration would be much faster. Figure 1 shows how only a subset of the BDD nodes are involved in the two Pareto solutions of that example, namely 6 out of 11 nodes (in red).

To this end, we will consider the problem of constructing a *restricted* BDD in a *data-driven* manner, where the user repeatedly solves the same high-level optimization problem (e.g. a knapsack problem with 5 objectives and 90 items) with varying parameters. For knapsack problems, the parameters are the item profits (coefficients of the objective functions) and sizes (constraint coefficients) which are assumed to be drawn from the same fixed but unknown probability distribution. We have access to a sufficiently large training set of such instances which we use to inform a strategy for constructing restricted BDDs. A learned strategy is evaluated out of sample on similar but previously unseen instances.

The contributions to the literature are as follows:

1. **Problem formulation:** We pose, for the first time, the problem of constructing restricted BDDs for the heuristic solution of MOILPs. Additionally, we propose to study it in a data-driven setting.
2. **Restriction via sparsification:** We show how the problem can be tackled by sparsifying a complete BDD be-

fore enumerating solutions. Eliminating nodes of the BDD that do not correspond to any Pareto-optimal solutions does not affect the correctness of the enumeration procedure. In the data-driven setting, machine learning (ML) can help identify such irrelevant nodes.

3. **Classification + Optimization:** We introduce MORBDD, an ML-based sparsifier, which operates in two stages: (1) a trained binary classifier proposes nodes to eliminate based on a training set of instances and corresponding relevant/irrelevant BDD nodes; and (2) an optimization algorithm post-processes the sparse BDD to enforce connectivity and thus the recovery of feasible solutions. For (1), we describe a generic set of features that succinctly capture characteristics of BDD nodes that are predictive of their importance. For (2), we formulate an integer linear program that enforces BDD connectivity post-sparsification and a much faster heuristic for “stitching” the sparse BDD together if disconnected.
4. **Evaluation:** We apply the methodology to the multi-objective knapsack problem, a canonical MOILP that remains computationally challenging for state-of-the-art algorithms. MORBDD sparsifies BDDs effectively, leading to much faster solution enumeration and the recovery of a substantial fraction of Pareto-optimal or near-Pareto solutions compared to width-limited restricted BDDs and the evolutionary algorithm NSGA-II.

2 Related Work

Exact approaches The literature on exact approaches to MOILPs is vast as surveyed in [Ehrgott *et al.*, 2016] and [Ehrgott, 2006] and is generally partitioned into decision space methods [Adelgren and Gupte, 2022] and objective space methods [Boland *et al.*, 2014; Boland *et al.*, 2015]. The former search in the space of feasible solutions whereas the latter search in the space of objective vectors. Many of these approaches are confined to biobjective and triobjective problems. Notable exceptions include the KSA algorithm [Kirlık and Sayın, 2014] and the decision diagram approach [Bergman and Cire, 2016]. The latter has been shown to outperform KSA by a substantial margin on combinatorial problems that are amenable to a dynamic programming formulation, which is why we focus on this promising algorithmic paradigm in this work. Note that the authors of [Bergman and Cire, 2016] enhance a basic decision diagram approach in [Bergman *et al.*, 2021] by introducing a series of Pareto frontier preserving operations. Those would directly apply here, but we utilize the basic decision diagram approach for transparency and ease of implementation, and also to see directly what the impact of our approach is.

Heuristic approaches Evolutionary or genetic algorithms (GAs) have long been used for multiobjective optimization. The Pymoo paper and software package [Blank and Deb, 2020b] summarize and implement state-of-the-art GAs such as NSGA-II, a baseline we will compare to and outperform. Note that the NSGA-II paper [Deb *et al.*, 2002] is widely used (45,000+ citations) so outperforming it is a good sanity check of the promise of any new method. However, it is

known that GAs typically struggle with integer variables and hard constraints, a limitation that is not exhibited by the BDD approach. Another class of heuristics based on integer and linear programming appear in [Pal and Charkhgard, 2019a; Pal and Charkhgard, 2019b; An *et al.*, 2022]. They extend the single-objective “Feasibility Pump” [Fischetti *et al.*, 2005] heuristic to the multiobjective case. The method in [An *et al.*, 2022] is evaluated only on biobjective set covering problems whereas MORBDD will be applied to knapsack problems with up to 7 objectives, a substantial generalization. With the expansive literature on heuristic approaches to MOILP, we opted to compare only with NSGA-II as it is the best known and has been a strong competitor and benchmark comparison algorithm for over two decades.

ML for MOO Relative to single-objective optimization, there has been much less work on ML for multiobjective discrete optimization. ML-based methods have been proposed for unconstrained continuous multiobjective problems that arise in deep learning applications such as multi-task learning [Navon *et al.*, 2020] or molecule generation [Jain *et al.*, 2023; Lin *et al.*, 2022]. Because they are not equipped to deal with hard constraints, these methods do not apply to combinatorial optimization.

More relevant to this paper is the work of [Wu *et al.*, 2022] who train a *graph neural network* (GNN) to guide the exact algorithm of [Tamby and Vanderpooten, 2021]. This GNN-based method is evaluated on knapsack problems with 3-5 objectives only and requires a much larger amount of time. For example, on instances with 4 objectives and 50 variables, MORBDD runs in about 11 seconds on average (Table 3) whereas the method in [Wu *et al.*, 2022] (Table 1) runs for 1,000 seconds on a faster CPU than ours. Additionally, no publicly available code was provided for this rather sophisticated GNN architecture, making a direct comparison challenging.

3 Problem Description

We begin by describing some preliminaries and introducing relevant notation before arriving at a formal problem statement for the task that MORBDD addresses.

3.1 Multiobjective Integer Linear Programming

A MOILP over K objectives can be described as $\mathcal{P} \equiv \min_x \{c(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^N\}$, where $x \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ is an N -dimensional decision vector, \mathcal{X} is the polyhedral set of feasible solutions, and $c : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ is a vector-valued linear function mapping a feasible solution to a vector of objective function values: $c(x) = Cx$, where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times N}$ is the matrix of objective function coefficients.

An objective vector $\bar{c}^1 = c(x^1)$ *dominates* $\bar{c}^2 = c(x^2)$ iff $\bar{c}^1 \leq \bar{c}^2$ (elementwise) and there exists some $\hat{k} \in [K]$ such that $\bar{c}^1_{\hat{k}} < \bar{c}^2_{\hat{k}}$. Let $\mathcal{Z} := \{c(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ represent the set of images of all feasible solutions, i.e. the set of objective vectors. Solving a MOILP amounts to finding all *nondominated* objective vectors $\mathcal{Z}_N \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ (and their corresponding solutions). \mathcal{Z}_N is also referred to as the Pareto frontier.

3.2 Binary Decision Diagrams

We will focus on 0-1 MOILPs that can be represented by a BDD, an instance of which is illustrated in Figure 1. A BDD \mathcal{B} is a layered directed acyclic graph $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$ that can succinctly represent the set of feasible solutions for a 0-1 MOILPs \mathcal{P} . It comprises of nodes \mathcal{N} and arcs \mathcal{A} . The nodes are partitioned into L layers, where $L = N + 1$. For all $l \in [L]$, the l -th layer is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_l := \{n \in \mathcal{N} : \ell(n) = l\}$, and has size $|\mathcal{L}_l|$, where $\ell : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow [L]$ maps a node n to its layer. The first and last layers consist of root node \mathbf{r} and terminal node \mathbf{t} , respectively. Each of the first $[N]$ layers corresponds to one of the N decision variables, the ordering of which often plays a critical role (see chapter 7 of [Bergman *et al.*, 2016]), but is not the subject of this work, so we assume the canonical ordering (as an example, Figure 1 uses the ordering x_1, x_2, \dots, x_5).

An arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ connects a tail node $t(a)$ to a head node $h(a)$, where $\ell(h(a)) = \ell(t(a)) + 1$. The maximum number of outgoing arcs from a node n is two, where $d(a) \in \{0, 1\}$ represents the *domain* of an arc. If it exists, a zero-arc from node n is represented as $a_0(n)$ and a one-arc from node n is represented by $a_1(n)$. Note that a node need not have both arcs as one of them could lead to the violation of the problem’s constraints. As an example, the leftmost node in the fourth layer of the BDD of Figure 1 does not have a one-arc because it represents solutions with $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 1$, a combination which leads to the saturation of the knapsack constraint at $3 + 1 + 6 = 10$.

Without loss of generality, assuming that node a_1 corresponds to variable x_1 , a_2 to x_2 , etc., a path $p = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ from the root to the terminal node in \mathcal{B} is associated with the solution vector $x(p) = (d(a_1), \dots, d(a_N))$. Additionally, an *arc-value* function $v : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ associates each arc a with a vector $v(a) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ in which each entry is the product of objective function coefficients of the variable indexed by $\ell(t(a))$ with $d(a)$. That way, the binary vector associated with any root-to-terminal path is associated with a solution vector $v(x(p)) = \sum_{i \in [N]} v(a_i)$.

Exact BDD Let $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B})$ be the set of binary vectors represented by a BDD, i.e., $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}) := \{x(p) : p \text{ is a } \mathbf{r} \text{ to } \mathbf{t} \text{ path in } \mathcal{B}\}$. A BDD is said to be *exact* for problem \mathcal{P} if $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{X}$. If we similarly define $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{B}) := \{v(x) : x \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B})\}$ it is clear that $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{Z}$.

Restricted BDD A BDD \mathcal{B}' is *restricted* for the solution set \mathcal{X} iff $\mathcal{X}(\mathcal{B}') \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. If BDD \mathcal{B} is exact for a solution set \mathcal{X} , then one can transform \mathcal{B} into a restricted BDD \mathcal{B}' by eliminating a subset $\mathcal{N}' \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ of the node set \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{B} , thus possibly eliminating some solutions of \mathcal{X} . For the instance in Figure 1, eliminating the leftmost node in the first layer would, for example, remove all feasible solutions that satisfy $x_1 = 1$. On the other hand, removing any of the white nodes in Figure 1 induces a restricted BDD representing a strict subset of the feasible set of the full BDD, but the complete Pareto frontier. This is because white nodes are not on the path from the root to the terminal node for any of the two Pareto optimal solutions of this instance.

Note that restricted BDDs can be constructed through a variety of approaches. In this work, we focus only on restricted

BDDs which are constructed from the induced sub-BDD via a selection of nodes within an exact BDD. In other words, we presuppose an exact BDD \mathcal{B} is constructed, select a subset of the nodes $\mathcal{N}' \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, find the subgraph $\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{N}']$ induced by \mathcal{N}' , and carry over the other objects of \mathcal{B} defined on the nodes and arcs to create sub-BDD \mathcal{B} . We let $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{N}']$ be the sub-BDD induced by node set \mathcal{N}' .

We define the *optimal restricted BDD* of BDD \mathcal{B} to be the unique BDD \mathcal{B}' induced by only the Pareto nodes of \mathcal{B} . Note that the optimal restricted BDD of a BDD is uniquely defined, and corresponds to a unique collection of nodes \mathcal{N}^* which induces a sub-BDD $\mathcal{B}[\mathcal{N}^*]$ of minimum size. It should further be noted that this may not result in the smallest possible BDD that represents only the solutions that result in solutions in the Pareto frontier.

Compiling BDDs We refer to chapter 3 of the textbook on BDDs for optimization [Bergman *et al.*, 2016] for a complete description of common BDD “compilation” algorithms that construct a BDD for a binary linear programming problem for which a dynamic programming formulation exists. In this work, we assume access to such a compilation algorithm that takes the objective function coefficients and constraints of a problem instance (e.g., top of Figure 1) and outputs an exact BDD representing all feasible solutions (e.g., bottom of Figure 1). Note that a BDD may have exponentially many nodes and arcs, even when the problem itself is not NP-Hard. However, in practice, it has been observed that such BDDs can be often be compiled rather efficiently, leading to their adoption in optimization [Bergman *et al.*, 2016].

Solving MOILPs with BDDs After constructing an exact BDD \mathcal{B} to represent a feasible set \mathcal{X} , one needs to enumerate the solutions on the Pareto frontier. In the simpler single-objective (minimization) case, an optimal solution can be computed in time polynomial in the size of the BDD by computing a shortest path from root to terminal and recording the domains of the arcs on that path. For the multiobjective case, this can be achieved by a *multicriteria* shortest path problem [Bergman and Cire, 2016]. While this can be done in time polynomial in the size of the BDD, the BDD itself may be extremely large. In experimental results appearing in the literature, BDD compilation has empirically accounted for only 5% of total solving time with the remaining 95% spent enumerating the Pareto frontier [Bergman and Cire, 2016].

4 The MORBDD approach

In what follows, we use the BDD compilation and enumeration algorithms of [Bergman and Cire, 2016] and then show how to transform the BDD into a smaller BDD with significantly fewer nodes, resulting in faster Pareto frontier enumeration. Evidently, some restricted BDDs are better than others in that they capture the Pareto frontier more completely. We will show how MORBDD finds such an “accurate” restricted BDDs using a data-driven approach.

4.1 ML formulation

Sparsifiers Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\Theta : \mathcal{N} \setminus \{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{t}\} \rightarrow [0, 1]\}$ represent a family of functions parametrized by Θ . A *sparsifier* $f_\Theta \in \mathcal{F}$

assigns a score between 0 and 1 to a node $n \in \mathcal{N}$, excluding root and terminal nodes, based on a set of features of n and BDD \mathcal{B} . BDD \mathcal{B} is restricted by sparsifier f_Θ at a threshold $\tau \in [0, 1]$ by keeping only the nodes of \mathcal{B} for which $f_\Theta(n) \geq \tau$, i.e. the set $\mathcal{N}' = \{n \in \mathcal{N} \mid f_\Theta(n) \geq \tau\}$. This process leads to a restricted BDD \mathcal{B}' .

Learning sparsifiers Can we avoid the problem of traversing non-Pareto nodes by learning sparsifiers on a set of training instances “labelled” with their optimal restricted BDDs? We are interested in repeatedly solving the same high-level MOILP (e.g. multiobjective knapsack with K objectives and N items) with varying objective function coefficients and constraint coefficients. The latter are assumed to be drawn uniformly at random from a fixed but unknown distribution \mathcal{D} . Each instance of the optimization problem of interest is described by its exact BDD. We have access to a set of m training instances $\{(\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{B}_i^*)\}_{i=1}^m$. These instances are labelled with their optimal restricted BDD \mathcal{B}_i^* . The family of sparsifiers corresponds to binary classification models with parameters Θ (e.g., random forests, neural networks, etc.), the best of which is the one that most accurately identifies nodes of the exact BDDs of our training instances that belong to the corresponding optimal restricted BDDs. If $\text{loss} : [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a *loss function* that penalizes outputs of a sparsifier relative to a binary label of a node and $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is a binary indicator function, we seek a sparsifier f_{Θ^*} that satisfies:

$$\Theta^* \in \arg \min_{\Theta} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i} \text{loss}(f_\Theta(n), \mathbb{I}\{n \in \mathcal{B}_i^*\}). \quad (1)$$

In other words, our supervised learning problem amounts to finding a function that accurately identifies nodes of training BDDs that are also Pareto nodes. We use the binary cross-entropy as the loss function of choice.

Dealing with class imbalance

As seen in Table 1, the number of Pareto nodes relative to the non-Pareto ones is very small. As a result, simply selecting all the nodes of a BDD will result in a highly unbalanced dataset. We deal with this issue by under-sampling the majority class, i.e., we select as many non-Pareto nodes as Pareto nodes. Furthermore, we want our models to have a higher recall, i.e., we are more sensitive to misclassifying the true Pareto nodes rather than the non-Pareto nodes. To bias the model accordingly, we assign sample weights based on the Pareto importance score. Specifically, for each node in the dataset, their sample weight is set to the fraction of Pareto solutions passing through it relative to other nodes on that layer.

4.2 Stitching

After solving the training problem in (1), and given an unseen test instance, we query the ML model to obtain node scores and prune low-scoring nodes, resulting in a faster approximation of the Pareto frontier. However, eliminating nodes based on mispredictions can disconnect the BDD such that there is no path from the root to the terminal node. For example, if one removes all white nodes in Figure 1 along with the rightmost (red) node in layer 2 and the leftmost (red) node in layer 3, layers 2 and 3 become disconnected and no feasible solution can be recovered. To handle such cases, we propose

to “stitch” together the BDD to ensure it is connected. We propose two optimization-based approaches that re-connect the graph by selectively adding back some nodes discarded based on their predicted scores.

MIP-based stitching A disconnected BDD \mathcal{B} results from mispredictions by the ML model at a given threshold τ . For instance, a Pareto node n with score $f_{\Theta}(n) = 0.4$ would be incorrectly eliminated if a threshold of $\tau = 0.5$ is used. We therefore formulate a *mixed-integer linear program* (MIP) designed to select a minimum-weight collection of nodes for which the resulting BDD \mathcal{B}' is connected. We weight the nodes by a *resistance* $r_n = \max\{0, \tau - f_{\Theta}(n)\}$ and formulate a MIP in Equation (2) to select the nodes.

Binary variables x_n indicate whether node n is selected or not. Binary variables y_a are set to 1 iff both the tail and head nodes of arc a are selected, i.e., $y_a = 1 \leftrightarrow x_{h(a)} = x_{t(a)} = 1$. We minimize the total resistance of the selected nodes through the objective function (2a). Equation (2b) enforces that at least one outgoing arc is selected if a node is selected. We ensure that a node is selected if at least one of the incoming arcs is selected in Equation (2c). Similarly, we enforce that the node is not selected if none of the incoming arcs are selected in Equation (2d). Equation (2e) selects all the nodes with zero resistance. This ensures that solving this MIP leads to at least one connected path from the root to the terminal node.

$$\min_{x,y} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\}} r_n x_n \quad (2a)$$

$$x_n \leq y_{a_0(n)} + y_{a_1(n)}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\} \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{a:t(a)=n} y_a \leq M \cdot x_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\} \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_{a:t(a)=n} y_a \geq x_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\} \quad (2d)$$

$$x_n = 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\} : r(n) = 0 \quad (2e)$$

$$x_n \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{t\} \quad (2f)$$

$$y_a \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (2g)$$

Min-resistance stitching The drawback of the MIP-based stitching is the size of the resulting optimization problem, i.e., the number of variables is dependent on the size of the BDD, which can be in the order of millions. Formulating and solving such large MIPs can be prohibitively slow.

To circumvent this issue, we propose the Min-resistance stitching heuristic in Algorithm 1. It takes in an integer lookahead parameter $\alpha \geq 1$ and tries to find the minimum resistance paths from the *connected* nodes in the last *connected* layer l_c to layer $l_c + \alpha$, trying to resolve the disconnectivity locally. A connected node is one for which there exists a path from the root to that particular node; a connected layer is one with at least one connected node. We repeatedly apply this heuristic whenever disconnectivity is encountered at a particular layer. The lookahead parameter α controls how myopic the stitching algorithm is. Setting α to a large value might result in many intermediate paths, hindering its performance. The time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $\mathcal{O}(\max\{|\mathcal{L}_l|\} \cdot 2^\alpha)$, where the first term is the maximum layer width in the BDD

Algorithm 1 Min-resistance stitching

Input: Last connected layer l_c , sparsifier f_{Θ} , threshold τ

Parameter: Lookahead α

```

1: Initialize empty list pathRes
2: for all  $n$  in  $\{n' : n' \in \mathcal{L}_{l_c}, f_{\Theta}(n') \geq \tau\}$  do
3:   Get all paths starting from node  $n$  in layer  $l_c$  to nodes
   in  $l_c + \alpha$ 
4:   for all path in paths do
5:     Compute resistance of path by summing up
     resistance of nodes comprising it
6:     Append (path, resistance) to pathRes
7:   end for
8: end for
9: return all nodes on each path with minimum
   resistance in pathRes

```

and the second is the maximum number of paths from a node in layer l_c to layer $l_c + \alpha$.

4.3 Deployment

The MORBDD algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2, which takes as input an MOILP instance \mathcal{P} and a trained sparsifier f_{Θ} and generates an approximate Pareto frontier. Note that the algorithm is general enough and imposes no restrictions on the model class of sparsifiers or the stitching approach, both of which may be tailored to specific applications.

Algorithm 2 MORBDD+Stitching

Input: An MOILP \mathcal{P} , trained sparsifier f_{Θ}

Output: A set of feasible solutions approximating the Pareto frontier

```

1: Generate exact BDD  $\mathcal{B}$  for problem  $\mathcal{P}$ 
2: Score nodes of  $\mathcal{B}$  using sparsifier  $f_{\Theta}$  and construct re-
   stricted BDD  $\mathcal{B}'$ 
3: while  $\mathcal{B}'$  is not connected do
4:   Perform stitching on  $\mathcal{B}'$  using Algorithm 1 or MIP (2)
5: end while
6: return the Pareto frontier of  $\mathcal{B}'$ 

```

5 Computational Setup

Our code and instances will be available at <https://github.com/khalil-research/morbdd>. The experiments reported in this work are conducted on a computing cluster with Intel Xeon CPU E5-2683 CPUs, with a memory limit of 32GB. We use Python 3.8 for creating datasets, training, and deployment. The BDD manipulation code, responsible for generating exact, restricted, or reduced BDDs, is based on the openly available implementation of [Bergman and Cire, 2016] at <https://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/vanhoeve/mdd/>. We wrap this C++ code using pybind11 (<https://pybind11.readthedocs.io/>) and later access it using Python.

Problem instances We conduct our experimentation on the multiobjective knapsack instances, which are generated similarly to [Bergman *et al.*, 2021]. Particularly, the weights and profits are sampled from discrete uniform distribution

Feature scope	Feature	Count
Instance features	The number of objectives	1
	The number of items (or variables)	1
	The capacity of the knapsack	1
	The mean, min., max., and std. of the weights	4
	The mean, min., max., and std. of the values	12
Current variable features	The weight associated with variable	1
	Average value across objectives	1
	Maximum value across objectives	1
	Minimum value across objectives	1
	Standard deviation across objectives	1
	Ratio of average value across objectives to weight	1
	Ratio of maximum value across objectives to weight	1
Current node features	Normalized state (weight of the knapsack at the current node)	1
	Ratio of state by capacity	1
	Normalized layer index	1
Parent variable features	Variable features detailed above for the parent variable	8
Parent node features	Node features detailed for the parent nodes	6
Total		44

Table 2: Features for Pareto node prediction in the knapsack problem.

from 1 to 1000 and the weight is set to the ceiling of half of the total of item weights. We create instances with sizes $\{(7, 40), (4, 50), (3, 80)\}$, where the first element of the tuple is the number of objectives and the second element is the number of variables. We thus create instances with enough variation in the number of objectives and items such that the generalization of the approach can be robustly established. The training, validation, and testing sets for each size contain 1000, 100, and 100 instances, respectively.

Sparsifiers The sparsifiers developed in this work are based on XGBoost [Chen and Guestrin, 2016], which is a highly efficient implementation of gradient-boosted trees. The major motivation to use XGBoost stems from the fact that even with little to no tuning one can achieve reasonably good performance and develop powerful models as compared to neural network-based approaches. Also, these models can be efficiently trained on CPUs, which might not be the case for neural networks. We perform a grid search to find the best-performing model on the validation set and use it to evaluate on the test set. The best models were able to achieve accuracies in the range of 85% to 88% when thresholding predicted scores at $\tau = 0.5$. Mean absolute errors are in the range of 0.18 to 0.23, where the absolute error of a prediction is calculated as $|f_{\Theta}(n) - \mathbb{I}\{n \in \mathcal{B}_i^*\}|$ (without any thresholding).

Feature Engineering To predict a Pareto node, the proposed sparsifier leverages three types of features: instance features, variable features and node features. The instance features summarize the global-level information about the knapsack. The information about the variable corresponding to the layer to which the node of interest belongs is captured by the variable features. Note that we use variable features for the current layer and also the previous layer. The node features capture information about the current node’s state. For knapsack, this corresponds to the weight of the items that

have already been added to the knapsack. We also extract the node features of the parent nodes, resulting in a total of 44 features. Table 2 gives a detailed description of the features.

Baselines We test MORBDD against three baselines. The exact BDD is denoted as EBDD. EBDD might be slower than other methods but it can compute the true Pareto frontier. RBDD(β) refers to the width-restricted BDD, where β indicates the width percentage of the restricted BDD compared to the exact one. For example, RBDD(20) refers to the BDD whose width is 20% as compared to the exact BDD. The evolutionary algorithm baseline is given by NSGA-II. We use the pymoo package [Blank and Deb, 2020a] in Python for implementing the same. MORBDD+MIP, MORBDD+MR(α), and MORBDD-NoStitch refer to the proposed approach in conjunction with MIP-based stitching, Min-resistance stitching, and no stitching, respectively. If the sparsifier produces a connected restricted BDD, no stitching method is invoked. This happens for all instances of size $(3, 80)$, hence only MORBDD-NoStitch is reported.

Metrics We report average normalized BDD-based metrics such as the initial number of nodes in the BDD (INC), the number of nodes in the reduced BDD (RNC), and the total number of Pareto checks to enumerate the Pareto frontier (Comp.) compared to its exact counterpart EBDD. To assess the quality of the approximate Pareto frontier, we compute the mean percentage of true Pareto frontier recovered (Card.) and the normalized approximate Hypervolume (HV). Note that we compute the approximate HV and not the exact one, as computing HV in higher dimensions can be computationally intractable. We use the pygmo2 (<https://esa.github.io/pygmo2/>) package for computing the approximate HV, with parameters delta and epsilon set to 0.1. Averages over HV values are restricted to instances for which the estimate for the exact BDD (EBDD) is strictly larger than

Size	Method	INC	RNC	Comp.	Time (s) ↓	Card. (%) ↑	HV ↑
(7, 40)	RBDD(20)	29	12	0	0	0	0.006
	RBDD(40)	53	44	2	2	0	0.052
	RBDD(60)	72	71	14	15	0	0.193
	NSGA-II				900	6	0.755
	MORBDD+MIP	29	40	41	90	75	0.767
	MORBDD+MR(2)	29	39	38	29	77	0.777
	EBDD	100	100	100	145	100	0.804
(4, 50)	RBDD(20)	29	18	0	0	0	0.048
	RBDD(40)	53	50	4	2	0	0.175
	RBDD(60)	72	75	22	8	0	0.385
	NSGA-II				120	1	0.865
	MORBDD+MIP	21	35	25	53	68	0.920
	MORBDD+MR(2)	21	34	24	11	70	0.922
	EBDD	100	100	100	36	100	0.954
(3, 80)	RBDD(20)	30	26	0	2	0	0.099
	RBDD(40)	53	58	7	21	0	0.268
	RBDD(60)	72	80	28	61	0	0.485
	NSGA-II				300	34	0.954
	MORBDD-NoStitch	25	35	38	61	58	0.956
	EBDD	100	100	100	169	100	0.966

Table 3: Results on knapsack test instances for all methods using the metrics defined in Section 5. Bolded values are the best ones achieved by either MORBDD variants or NSGA-II.

those of the other methods. Furthermore, we report the average running time in seconds (Time).

6 Results

Performance of size-specific models The performance of size-specific models, i.e., models trained on instances of the same size as instances they are tested on, is reported in Table 3. The metrics for EBDD, which is an exact method, will be used to benchmark the performance of other methods in terms of BDD topology and Pareto frontier quality. Across all sizes, the MORBDD-based approaches achieved the best trade-off between running time and Pareto frontier quality metrics (cardinality and hypervolume). They can enumerate $\sim 60 - 75\%$ of the Pareto frontier in about $20 - 40\%$ of the time required by EBDD. Specifically, for sizes (7, 40) and (4, 50), MORBDD+MR(2) can recover 77% and 70% of the true Pareto frontier, respectively. For size (3, 80), MORBDD-NoStitch can recover 58% of the true Pareto frontier. These methods also achieved the best normalized HV compared to other heuristics, and are extremely close to the true normalized HV as expected. The MORBDD+MIP approach closely follows MORBDD+MR(2) in terms of Pareto frontier quality, however, it necessitates significantly more time to enumerate. As mentioned in the Section 4.2, the MIPs being solved in this case are quite large and thus computationally challenging. This underscores the importance of the lightweight stitching heuristic MR(2) compared to its optimization-based counterpart. Note that the predicted Pareto BDD is significantly

smaller and performs fewer Pareto checks to enumerate the Pareto frontier.

The evolutionary algorithm NSGA-II performs reasonably well in terms of the normalized HV, closely following MORBDD+MR(2). However, it is not efficient in recovering the true Pareto frontier. To be specific, even after taking $5 - 30x$ more time than MORBDD+MR(2), it can only recover $10 - 50\%$ of the number of solutions. The width-restricted BDDs perform the worst in terms of the quality of the approximate Pareto frontier. They all have a cardinality of zero. In terms of normalized HV, RBDD(60) performs almost twice as poorly as the NSGA-II, with the performance going further south for smaller-width BDDs. Notice that RBDD(60) have more nodes than the MORBDD BDDs, yet they perform much more poorly. This highlights the importance of the sparsifier, which is trained to prune the BDD along with preserving the underlying Pareto frontier.

Performance of a size-agnostic model We further test the out-of-distribution generalization of MORBDD by training a size-agnostic model. We create a training dataset containing 250, 50, and 100 training/validation/test instances per size for sizes (3, 30), (3, 40), (4, 30), and (4, 40). We observe that MORBDD+MR(2) can recover north of 60% of the true Pareto frontier while achieving near-optimal normalized HV. This result is possible because the features we use (Appendix Table 2) as well as the model architecture can accommodate varying input sizes, similar to how set-based deep learning or GNN models operate.

Size	Method	Card. \uparrow	HV \uparrow
(3, 30)	MORBDD+MR(2)	64	0.932
	EBDD	100	0.962
(3, 40)	MORBDD+MR(2)	62	0.947
	EBDD	100	0.979
(4, 30)	MORBDD+MR(2)	66	0.908
	EBDD	100	0.960
(4, 40)	MORBDD+MR(2)	68	0.918
	EBDD	100	0.958

Table 4: Results of the size-agnostic model on knapsack instances of different sizes.

7 Conclusion

MORBDD is the first learning-based method for restricting BDDs and accelerating multiobjective binary linear optimization over them. In fact, to our knowledge, we are the first to invoke restricted BDDs in the context of multiobjective optimization as they have only appeared in the single-objective case. We focus on the knapsack problem, which is a canonical problem in the multiobjective realm and remains central to the computational evaluation of new algorithms. The remarkable performance of MORBDD both in terms of running time and approximation quality is promising. There is a lot of future work that can expand on this paper. Implementation-wise, one such improvement is the acceleration by incremental compilation of the BDD, whereby we generate a layer, sparsify it, and then move on to the next layer. Methodologically, exploring graph neural network sparsifiers could alleviate the need for feature engineering, especially when extending MORBDD to new problems. The stitching problem bears some resemblance to the classical min-cost flow problem and further investigating this may result in faster computation. Revisiting it under theoretical and approximation lenses could also constitute future work. While our experiments have focused on the multiobjective knapsack problem, MORBDD can be directly instantiated for other combinatorial problems for which BDDs can be compiled, e.g., set covering, independent set, graph coloring, single-machine scheduling, etc. [Bergman *et al.*, 2016].

References

- [Adelgren and Gupte, 2022] Nathan Adelgren and Akshay Gupte. Branch-and-bound for biobjective mixed-integer linear programming. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 34(2):909–933, 2022.
- [An *et al.*, 2022] Duleabom An, Sophie N Parragh, Markus Sinnl, and Fabien Tricoire. A matheuristic for tri-objective binary integer programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.03386*, 2022.
- [Bergman and Cire, 2016] David Bergman and Andre A Cire. Multiobjective optimization by decision diagrams. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, pages 86–95. Springer, 2016.
- [Bergman *et al.*, 2016] David Bergman, Andre A Cire, Willem-Jan Van Hoeve, and John Hooker. *Decision diagrams for optimization*, volume 1. Springer, 2016.
- [Bergman *et al.*, 2021] David Bergman, Merve Bodur, Carlos Cardonha, and Andre A Cire. Network models for multiobjective discrete optimization. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 2021.
- [Blank and Deb, 2020a] J. Blank and K. Deb. pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in python. *IEEE Access*, 8:89497–89509, 2020.
- [Blank and Deb, 2020b] Julian Blank and Kalyanmoy Deb. Pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in Python. *IEEE Access*, 8:89497–89509, 2020.
- [Boland *et al.*, 2014] Natashia Boland, Hadi Charkhgard, and Martin Savelsbergh. The triangle splitting method for biobjective mixed integer programming. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 17th International Conference, IPCO 2014, Bonn, Germany, June 23–25, 2014. Proceedings 17*, pages 162–173. Springer, 2014.
- [Boland *et al.*, 2015] Natashia Boland, Hadi Charkhgard, and Martin Savelsbergh. A criterion space search algorithm for biobjective integer programming: The balanced box method. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 27(4):735–754, 2015.
- [Chen and Guestrin, 2016] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '16*, pages 785–794, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM.
- [Deb *et al.*, 2002] Kalyanmoy Deb, Amrit Pratap, Sameer Agarwal, and TAMT Meyarivan. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, 6(2):182–197, 2002.
- [Ehrgott *et al.*, 2016] M. Ehrgott, X. Gandibleux, and A. Przybylski. Exact methods for multi-objective combinatorial optimisation. In *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis*, pages 817–850. Springer, 2nd edition, 2016.
- [Ehrgott, 2006] M. Ehrgott. *Multicriteria optimization*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [Fischetti *et al.*, 2005] Matteo Fischetti, Fred Glover, and Andrea Lodi. The feasibility pump. *Mathematical Programming*, 104:91–104, 2005.
- [Jain *et al.*, 2023] Moksh Jain, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Alex Hernández-García, Jarrid Rector-Brooks, Yoshua Bengio, Santiago Miret, and Emmanuel Bengio. Multi-objective gflownets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 14631–14653. PMLR, 2023.
- [Kirlik and Sayin, 2014] Gokhan Kirlik and Serpil Sayin. A new algorithm for generating all nondominated solutions of multiobjective discrete optimization problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 232(3):479–488, 2014.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2022] Xi Lin, Zhiyuan Yang, Xiaoyuan Zhang, and Qingfu Zhang. Pareto set learning for expensive multi-objective optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19231–19247, 2022.
- [Navon *et al.*, 2020] Aviv Navon, Aviv Shamsian, Ethan Fetaya, and Gal Chechik. Learning the pareto front with hypernetworks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [Pal and Charkhgard, 2019a] Aritra Pal and Hadi Charkhgard. A feasibility pump and local search based heuristic for bi-objective pure integer linear programming. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 31(1):115–133, 2019.
- [Pal and Charkhgard, 2019b] Aritra Pal and Hadi Charkhgard. Fpbh: A feasibility pump based heuristic for multi-objective mixed integer linear programming. *Computers & Operations Research*, 112:104760, 2019.
- [Tamby and Vanderpooten, 2021] Satya Tamby and Daniel Vanderpooten. Enumeration of the nondominated set of multiobjective discrete optimization problems. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 33(1):72–85, 2021.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2022] Yaoxin Wu, Wen Song, Zhiguang Cao, Jie Zhang, Abhishek Gupta, and Mingyan Lin. Graph learning assisted multi-objective integer programming. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 17774–17787. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.