

Single- and Multi-Objective Stochastic Optimization for Next-Generation Networks in the Generative AI and Quantum Computing Era

Trinh Van Chien, *Member, IEEE*, Bui Trong Duc, Nguyen Xuan Tung, Van Duc Nguyen, Waqas Khalid, *Member, IEEE*, Symeon Chatzinotas, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Lajos Hanzo, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Next Generation (NG) networks move beyond simply connecting devices to creating an ecosystem of connected intelligence, especially with the support of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and quantum computation. These systems are expected to handle large-scale deployments and high-density networks with diverse functionalities. As a result, there is an increasing demand for efficient and intelligent algorithms that can operate under uncertainty from both propagation environments and networking systems. Traditional optimization methods often depend on accurate theoretical models of data transmission, but in real-world NG scenarios, they suffer from high computational complexity in large-scale settings. Stochastic Optimization (SO) algorithms, which are designed to accommodate extremely high density and extensive network scalability, have emerged as a powerful solution for optimizing wireless networks. This includes various categories that range from model-based approaches to learning-based approaches. These techniques are capable of converging within a feasible time frame while addressing complex, large-scale optimization problems. However, there is currently limited research on SO applied for NG networks, especially the upcoming Sixth-Generation (6G). In this survey, we emphasize the relationship between NG systems and SO by eight open questions involving the background, key features, and lesson learned. Overall, our study starts by providing a detailed overview of both areas, covering fundamental and widely used SO techniques, spanning from single to multi-objective signal processing. Next, we explore how different algorithms can solve NG challenges, such as load balancing, optimizing energy efficiency, improving spectral efficiency, or handling multiple performance trade-offs. Lastly, we highlight the challenges in the current research and propose new directions for future studies.

Index Terms—Next-generation network, stochastic optimization, generative AI, Quantum Computing (QC).

GLOSSARY

Abbreviation Definition

5G	Fifth-Generation
6G	Sixth-Generation
ABC	Artificial Bee Colony
ACO	Ant Colony Optimization
AI	Artificial Intelligence
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
AoI	Age of Information
AUV	Autonomous Underwater Vehicle

Trinh Van Chien and Bui Trong Duc are with the School of Information and Communications Technology, Hanoi University of Science and Technology, Hanoi 100000, Vietnam. (e-mail: chientv@soict.hust.edu.vn, duc.buitrong@hust.edu.vn).

Nguyen Xuan Tung is with Faculty of Interdisciplinary Digital Technology, PHENIKAA University, Yen Nghia, Ha Dong, Hanoi 12116, Viet Nam (email: tung.nguyexuan@phenikaa-uni.edu.vn).

Van Duc Nguyen is with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Hanoi University of Science and Technology, Hanoi 100000, Vietnam (e-mail: duc.nguyenvan1@hust.edu.vn).

Waqas Khalid is with the Institute of Industrial Technology, Korea University, Sejong 30019, South Korea. (e-mail: waqas283@gmail.com).

Symeon Chatzinotas is with the Interdisciplinary Centre for Security, Reliability and Trust (SnT), University of Luxembourg, L-1855 Luxembourg, Luxembourg. (e-mail: symeon.chatzinotas@uni.lu).

Lajos Hanzo is with the School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, U.K. (e-mail: lh@ecs.soton.ac.uk).

AWGN	Additive White Gaussian Noise
BCD	Block Coordinate Descent
BSs	Base Stations
CPU	Central Processing Unit
DDPG	Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient
DDQN	Double Deep Q-Network
DE	Differential Evolution
DNN	Deep Neural Network
DQN	Deep Q-Network
DRL	Deep Reinforcement Learning
EA	Evolutionary Algorithm
EE	Energy Efficiency
EP	Evolutionary Programming
ES	Evolutionary Strategy
FL	Federated Learning
GA	Genetic Algorithms
GP	Genetic Programming
GPU	Graphics Processing Unit
GSP	Genetic Simulated-Annealing-based PSO
GWO	Grey Wolf Optimizer
HT-PSO	Hyperbolic Tangent PSO
IoT	Internet of Thing
ISAC	Integrated Sensing and Communication
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
LLM	Large Language Model
LMEA	LLM-driven Evolutionary Algorithm
LS	Local Search
LSTM	Long Short-term Memory
MADDPG	Multi-Agent Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient
MARL	Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning
MDP	Markov Decision Process
MEC	Mobile Edge Computing
ML	Machine Learning
mmWave	Millimeter Wave
MODE	Multi-objective Differential Evolution
MOPSO	Multi-objective PSO
MU-MIMO	Multi-User Multi-Input Multi-Output
NFV	Network Function Virtualization
NG	Next Generation
NISQ	Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum
NOMA	Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access
NSGA-III	Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm III
NSGA-II	Non-Dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II
PPO	Proximal Policy Optimization
PQCs	Parameterized Quantum Circuits
PSD	Power Spectral Density
PSO	Particle Swarm Optimization
QA	Quantum Annealing
QC	Quantum Computing
QIGA	Quantum-inspired Genetic Algorithms
QIM	Quantum-inspired Metaheuristic
QoE	Quality of Experience
QoS	Quality of Service
QRL	Quantum Reinforcement Learning
QUBO	Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimization
RAN	Radio Access Network
RE	Resource Efficiency
RIS	Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces
RL	Reinforcement Learning
SAC	Soft Actor-Critic
SARSA	State-action-reward-state-action
SA	Simulated Annealing




Figure 1: Evolution of NG wireless networks and Evolutionary Algorithm (EA).

SDN	Software-Defined Network
SE	Spectral Efficiency
SGD	Stochastic Gradient Descent
SINR	Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio
SI	Swarm Intelligence
SNR	Signal-to-Noise Ratio
SoA	State-of-the-Art
SO	Stochastic Optimization
SPSO	Spherical Vector-based PSO
SWIPT	Simultaneous Wireless Information and Power Transfer
Tbps	Terabits per Second
TS	Tabu Search
UASN	Underwater Acoustic Sensor Networks
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
URLLC	Ultra-Reliable Low-Latency Communication
UUV	Unmanned Underwater Vehicle
VQCs	Variational Quantum Circuits
WSNs	Wireless Sensor Networks

I. INTRODUCTION

Given the rise of revolutionary technologies and the expanding reliance on multimedia content and data traffic, there is a growing demand to enhance contemporary communication systems [1], [2]. NG network deployments may face challenges due to this sharp rise in data demand, including the need for an increased system capacity, and improved mobility while still being able to keep the energy consumption at a low level [3]. Compared to previous generations, 6G is expected to offer improvements in transmission speed, data capacity, reliability, latency, and energy efficiency with the added features of connected intelligence [2]. In NG communication, the peak data rate is expected to reach the level of Terabits per second (Tbps) [4]. NG networks are also projected to provide significantly increased capacity, enabling more connections for radio devices and applications [5], [6]. In terms of latency, 6G networks are expected to outperform Fifth-Generation (5G) by reducing transmission delays below one millisecond [3], which enables new applications requiring near-real-time responses and high precision in self-driving cars, remote surgery, and smart-city technologies [7]. The NG network architecture is expected to foster advanced technologies, including integrated space-air-ground-underwater communication and cloud-based solutions. In a NG maritime network, underwater devices, such as Unmanned Underwater Vehicle (UUV), buoys and ships, may use acoustic links to connect with surface nodes and aerial relays. This integration enables new services like real-time oceanic monitoring, adaptive Autonomous Underwater Vehicle (AUV) swarms and extended coverage across the sea, air, and space. This network will create highly scalable, seamless and widespread connectivity. Additionally, by incorporating the Terahertz, visible light and unlicensed spectral bands, the architecture will support a full range of

frequencies for attaining improved performance. Other key innovations, including quantum communication and massive Multi-User Multi-Input Multi-Output (MU-MIMO) communications are also pushing the evolution of NG networks [8].

Future advances in mobile technology are expected to support more reliable connections and improved coverage in remote areas, despite hostile propagation conditions. This improved reliability will be crucial for critical emergency services, industrial automation, and healthcare. Additionally, NG systems are expected to be more energy-efficient than previous generations, aiming for reducing the carbon footprint [9], in the face of high demand for wireless access [10]. Numerous challenges need exploring, such as resource allocation, and spectrum management, and network security. Thus, effective optimization techniques are essential for NG networks. These techniques include mathematical modeling, powerful algorithms, and specific measures to find the optimal solution set. A convex optimization problem has mathematical properties allowing for well-established methods and existing solvers to reach the optimal solution. However, real-world optimization problems often exhibit non-convexity, making it difficult to guarantee the global optimum.

A. SO in NG networks

Several potent learning-based approaches, such as machine learning, deep learning, and game theory [11], have been demonstrated to be capable of tackling these nonconvex challenges. In many scenarios, such as large-scale Internet of Thing (IoT) networks [12], massive MU-MIMO systems, or Reconfigurable Intelligent Surfaces (RIS)-aided communications, the problem becomes highly complex, exhibiting multiple local optima and non-differentiable objective functions. Additionally, real-world environments are dynamic, implying that optimal solutions must promptly adapt to changes in traffic patterns, interference levels, and resource availability. Numerous extensive optimization algorithms exist that do not require such data. However, these optimization solvers tend to become excessively complex upon handling large-scale multi-objective problems. This makes real-time decision-making more challenging and less suitable for time-sensitive scenarios. In these cases, researchers often favor heuristic algorithms due to their low computational complexity, which can find sub-optimal solutions with modest complexity.

SO algorithms, which are part of the AI family, have gained popularity in research for their ability to provide high-quality solutions that are computationally feasible, while maintaining robustness and ensuring convergence. They offer several benefits over traditional methods and match well with the evolution of wireless network generations, as shown in Figure 1. They are easy to implement, facilitate global optimization, solve a diverse variety of problems, handle constraints, and support efficient parallel processing. Many algorithms are inspired by natural processes and are based on the broad principles of Evolutionary Algorithms (EAs) and Swarm Intelligence (SI). These algorithms are often inspired by nature, drawing on fields such as biology, physics, or animal behavior. They are stochastic, involving random elements, and typically including parameters that have to be tailored to the specific problem. EAs simulate natural selection using genetic techniques like crossover and mutation for gradually improving the solutions. Swarm-based approaches, on the other hand, draw their inspiration from the collective behavior of social animals to address optimization challenges. SO methods typically require a trial-and-error phase to select appropriate algorithmic parameters such as the population size, mutation rate, inertia weights, and the process of

tuning these parameters may significantly impact performance. However, unlike many AI techniques, which tend to rely on large training datasets and extensive training time, stochastic methods are generally more lightweight and data-independent, making them more practical for resource-constrained or real-time optimization scenarios.

B. Our key contributions

The rise of NG wireless technologies, generative AI, and quantum computing brings about both opportunities and significant challenges. Conducting an in-depth review of recent advances in SO for resource allocation in NG networks and addressing both the security and privacy concerns are of pivotal importance. We offer a critical appraisal of the latest stochastic optimization techniques, their roles in NG communications, and their applications in solving real-world problems. We characterize a suite of potent algorithms, and practical use cases. Additionally, we highlight existing research challenges and suggest directions for future studies, hence providing a resource for researchers focusing on SO of NG systems. Our key contributions are based on eight open questions and future search directions, as highlighted below:

- We offer an explicit explanation of the basics, definitions, classifications, and applications of stochastic features of NG networks as well as stochastic algorithms, and examine several notable ones.
- We provide design guidelines on how stochastic optimization techniques may be applied to address the challenges of NG resource allocation, security, and privacy issues.
- We highlight key challenges and suggest potential directions for future research and development in this area. In addition, we critically contrast stochastic optimization algorithms to traditional deterministic optimization techniques such as Block Coordinate Descent (BCD), for example, for highlighting the associated pros and cons.
- Finally, we present Table I, which provides a detailed comparison between our study and the latest research in the field. We discuss a suite of open issues, challenges, and the design guidelines of stochastic optimization conceived for resource allocation in NG networks.

The structure of this paper is illustrated in Fig. 2, providing a comprehensive overview of current research on SO algorithms in NG wireless systems. Section II presents the stochastic properties of NG networks and offers the background necessary for implementing optimization algorithms adopted for resource allocation. A detailed overview of the family of SO algorithms is given in Section III. Section IV presents the applications of SO in NG resource allocation. The intrinsic integration of SO with NG networks in the generative AI and quantum computation era is discussed in Section V. Finally, our design guidelines take away messages and main conclusions are offered in Section VI.

II. STOCHASTIC PROPERTIES & RADIO RESOURCE ALLOCATION OF NG NETWORKS

This section presents the inherent stochasticity of NG wireless networks. Resource allocation problems under stochastic conditions should be formulated and solved in ways that account for random factors influencing the system performance.

Open question one: What features contribute to the stochastic nature of NG networks?

1) *Background:* In NG systems, stochastic properties indicate that network performance is influenced by sources of uncertainty




Figure 2: Main content of the tutorials and surveys




Figure 3: Source of stochastic features in NG wireless networks: Channel fading, noise, and mutual interference.

originating from random propagation conditions, noise and interference, and dynamic user mobility [25]. These uncertainties may not be completely eliminated in typical propagation environments. Consequently, the same input conditions can lead to different solutions and strategies when designing and managing radio resources [26]. This stochastic characteristic challenges the conventional, optimistic assumptions of deterministic networks and calls for probabilistic modeling [27]. Note that the uncertainty may obey diverse probability distributions [28]. User mobility introduces temporal variability in the channel impulse response, which affects system performance in unpredictable ways [29], [30]. Noise and mutual interference arriving from nearby users, as well as the violent received signal fluctuation, further exacerbate the nondeterministic features [31].

2) *Key features and considerations:* We provide the principal reasons why NG wireless communications are stochastic and the related mathematical modeling, as shown in Fig. 3:

Table I: Comparison of systems and stochastic optimization topics across different recent surveys.

References		[13]	[14]	[15]	[16]	[17]	[18]	[19]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	Our
Years		2020	2021	2021	2022	2023	2023	2024	2024	2024	2025	2025	2025	2026
Objective	Single Multiple	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Optimization	Local-search based algorithms EAs SI Cooperative Co-EAs Reinforcement Learning (RL) Hybrid algorithms	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓												
Use cases	RIS Massive MU-MIMO Satellite Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Sensing and communication Edge computing Underwater communication QC Large Language Model (LLM)	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓												

i) *Noise* is fundamentally owing to the Brownian motion of electrons in the receiver as highlighted in Fig. 3. This poses a multifaceted challenge across various communication environments, including space, ground, and underwater [32]. The impairments in satellite communications are exacerbated by cosmic radiation, atmospheric conditions, and hardware impairments [33]. UAV-based communications introduce additional noise due to amplifiers, mixers, vibration, and electromagnetic emissions from motors and propellers [34]. Terrestrial NG systems may operate in the millimeter-wave and terahertz bands, experiencing severe thermal noise due to the extremely high bandwidth [35]. Those sources of noise may be modeled by the Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) distribution having a flat Power Spectral Density (PSD) [36]. Involving underwater acoustic communications in NG networks introduces non-white (colored) noise, which is caused by marine life, water movement, and shipping. The iv) PSD of underwater noise is a fluctuation of the frequency [37]. Note that low-noise amplifiers, digital filters, and robust noise-mitigation algorithms must be designed and optimized to mitigate the effects of noise and hence improve the Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) [38]. However, mitigating colored noise requires extra effort due to its frequency-dependent power, and its success depends on accurately estimating the spectral shape [37].

ii) *Fading channels* are influenced by random physical phenomena in both the time and frequency [39]. These include multipath propagation, where signals are reflected by buildings, terrain, or other objects (modeled by the scatterers in Fig. 3), causing time-varying delays and phases [40]. Since the exact positions and properties of the propagation environment are unknown or constantly changing, the variations in the transmitted signal are modeled statistically [41]. The movement of the transmitter, receiver, or nearby objects introduces Doppler shifts and rapid changes in the channel profile [42]. Scattering and reflection from irregular surfaces add further randomness to the received signal, as shown in Fig. 3. This phenomenon is discussed in technical detail relying on the geometry-based stochastic model proposed in [43]. Environmental factors, including weather, temperature, and the presence of obstacles,

also evolve unpredictably, reinforcing the need for probabilistic modeling. As a result, the so-called frequency-flat fading is typically described using quasi-static models [44]. In satellite communication, tropospheric scintillation is more prominent at higher frequencies, such as Ka-band, and inflicts further degradations along with turbulent eddies caused by temperature and pressure fluctuations [45]. Space communications are also increasingly affected by dynamic frequency shifts in Low Earth Orbit (LEO) orbits, self-shadowing from satellite structures, and intensified rain fade due to climate variability as well as dense constellations [46], [47]. In underwater environments, temperature and salinity fluctuations, surface bubble clouds, and motion from autonomous vehicles create complex, time-varying multipath and Doppler-induced fading [48]. Furthermore, man-made underwater structures and biological activities contribute to frequency-selective fading.

Mutual interference refers to the unwanted interaction between transmitters operating in the same or adjacent frequency bands, especially when multiple devices transmit simultaneously, causing extra degradation in signal quality and reliability [49]. Mutual interference is especially critical in dense NG networks such as cell-free and machine-type communication having limited co-use bandwidth [50]. Coherent interference occurs when the interfering signal has a phase relationship consistent with the desired signal, often resulting from synchronized sources or reflections of the same signal, and significantly impacts signal integrity. In NG networks, pilot contamination is a key challenge, where identical or strongly correlated non-orthogonal pilot signals are reused across cells, leading to highly coherent interference during channel estimation and thereby degrading system performance [51]. Noncoherent interference, on the other hand, arises from sources that are almost completely uncorrelated in phase or modulation with the desired signal. These typically behave like random noise, hence they are often modeled as AWGN. The cutting-edge NG technologies typically aim for mitigating both coherent and noncoherent interference by dynamically controlling the occurrence and disappearance of propagation paths, smart pilot assignments, and distributed antennas close to users [52]. Additionally, learning-based interference predic-

tion and reconfigurable spectrum access have been developed to manage interference in high-dynamic network environments [53].

3) *Lessons learned:* The inherent stochasticity of NG networks, imposed by dynamic device mobility and time-frequency varying channel conditions, presents significant challenges in evaluating system efficiency and effective resource management. The unpredictable nature of multiple sources motivates us to observe the average system performance over multiple consecutive coherence intervals and over many realizations of small-scale fading coefficients, as well as device locations. Stochastic features also complicate the optimization of key resources such as spectrum, power, and computational capability. Conventional deterministic allocation schemes are often inadequate for addressing these uncertainties, leading to suboptimal system performance and eroded Quality of Service (QoS) guarantees. Furthermore, the need to support heterogeneous applications having diverse conditions exacerbates the complexity of resource allocation under stochastic conditions.

Open question two: How can resource allocation problems be formulated in NG networks exhibiting stochastic nature?

1) *Background:* Resource allocation is known as a key methodology for enhancing the efficiency of NG systems operating in the face of limited radio resources and stochastic behaviors, [54]. This involves the judicious allocation of resources among different users and their devices within a network. The main objective is to maximize performance, while satisfying the diverse requirements of devices, such as their throughput, spectrum, and energy efficiency, just to name a few. Moreover, high-performance, yet low-complexity and power-efficient algorithms are required for real-time implementation in the face of demanding network conditions and user requirements. The integration of optimization techniques into NG wireless systems aims for agile resource allocation, leading to smarter and more adaptive management for satisfying the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) [55].

2) *Key features and considerations:* An optimization problem is a mathematical formulation constructed to find the best solution from a set of feasible alternatives, according to a specific criterion [56]. It involves either the maximization or minimization of one or multiple objective functions subject to a set of constraints that define the feasible region.

Preliminaries: To provide a critical appraisal of the various algorithmic categories and their applications, we commence with a general single-objective optimization problem formulated in its maximization form as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}}{\text{maximization}} \quad f_0(\mathbf{s}) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad f_i(\mathbf{s}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \\ & \quad h_j(\mathbf{s}) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{s} = [s_1, \dots, s_N]^T$ includes the N optimization variables; the set \mathcal{D} defines the feasible region of the optimization problem; $f_0(\mathbf{s})$ is known as the objective function, also known as the cost or fitness function; and the sets of $\{f_i(\mathbf{s})\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\{h_j(\mathbf{s})\}_{j=1}^r$ represent inequality and equality constraints. We stress that the objective and constraints include the stochastic features of NG wireless networks as the large-scale and small-scale fading effects [57]. Hence, the feasible set \mathcal{D} may not always be explicitly defined in practice, but can be determined using an oracle, such as a user-provided software tool. The optimization variables in \mathbf{s}




Figure 4: Conflicting objective functions leading to drive multiobjective optimization problems.

are considered feasible if $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}$ and satisfy all the given inequality and equality constraints. A solution \mathbf{s}_{best} is globally optimal if it holds that $f_0(\mathbf{s}_{\text{best}}) \leq f_0(\mathbf{s}), \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}$. Conversely, a feasible vector $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ is locally optimal if there exists a small positive number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f_0(\bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq f_0(\mathbf{s}), \forall \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{s} - \bar{\mathbf{s}}\| \leq \epsilon$. The optimization problems may generally be categorized into convex and nonconvex problems, each requiring distinct solution approaches [58]. Convex optimization involves maximizing a convex objective function while satisfying convex constraints. These techniques play a crucial role in engineering applications because in a convex problem any local optimum is also a global optimum [24].

In NG networks, we typically have multiple objectives $f_{01}(\mathbf{s}), \dots, f_{0M}(\mathbf{s})$, with M being the number of objectives. A fundamental assumption is that the M objectives are unordered and thus analyzed without bias or predetermined preferences, allowing all possible outcomes to be considered. One might aim for maximizing the M objectives simultaneously as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}}{\text{maximization}} \quad \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{s}) = [f_{01}(\mathbf{s}), \dots, f_{0M}(\mathbf{s})]^T \\ & \text{subject to} \quad f_i(\mathbf{s}) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \\ & \quad h_j(\mathbf{s}) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, r, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the bold faced notation $\mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{s})$ emphasized the vector-valued nature of the objective function. The M objectives in (2) are inherently conflicting, and due to the absence of ordering among the vector-valued objectives, a global optimum generally does not exist. As only subjectively optimal solutions exist, the multi-objective problem (2) cannot be solved in a globally optimal sense. Let us denote the achievable objective set as $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{s}) : \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}\}$, which involves all the possibilities of objective values. The set \mathcal{F} is usually compact in the sense that $\mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ leads to $\alpha \mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}, \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$. Most points within the set \mathcal{F} are strictly suboptimal; specifically, any point located in the interior of \mathcal{F} can be excluded, as there are other points in \mathcal{F} that are superior across all the M objectives. The set of points that cannot be outperformed in terms of all objectives constitutes the Pareto boundary, see Fig. 4 for its illustration. None of the solutions on the objectives of the Pareto boundary can be improved without degrading at least one of the others.

Definition 1. *The strong Pareto boundary comprises all points in $\mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ where there is no feasible point $\tilde{\mathbf{f}} \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{\mathbf{f}_0\}$ with $f_{0m} \geq f_{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}m}, \forall m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.*

The strong Pareto boundary comprises all the feasible points that cannot be objectively rejected because improving any one of the objectives would necessarily degrades at least one of the others. Clearly, any point not lying on the strong Pareto boundary is suboptimal, since there exist other points that are superior or equally effective across all the objectives. In the context of multi-objective optimization, the strong Pareto boundary represents the closest possible approximation to the global optimality. The

strong Pareto boundary is a subset of the upper boundary of \mathcal{F} . The full upper boundary, known as the weak Pareto boundary, also includes points where some - but not all - objectives can be improved without eroding others. The utopia point is defined as $\mathbf{s}_{\text{utopia}} = [\max_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}} f_{01}(\mathbf{s}), \dots, \max_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{D}} f_{0M}(\mathbf{s})]^T$, which concurrently maximizes all the M objectives and a representative toy example is shown in Fig. 4. If we have $\mathbf{s}_{\text{utopia}} \in \mathcal{F}$, the multi-objective optimization problem is trivial, since the strong Pareto boundary is the utopia point, which is the global optimum. In NG networks, the multi-objective optimization problems having multiple conflicting objectives are nontrivial and the global optimum does not exist as we have $\mathbf{s}_{\text{utopia}} \notin \mathcal{F}$. Because the Pareto boundary includes all potentially optimal operating points, the network should be optimized to represent these points.

Definition 2. A feasible point $\mathbf{s}^* \in \mathcal{D}$ is the Pareto optimal point if $\mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{s}^*)$ belongs to the strong Pareto boundary.

We emphasize that multiple feasible points in \mathcal{D} might give exactly the same objective point and therefore the multi-objective function is not bi-objective. The design of NG networks is expected to tackle the nonconvex-nonsmooth optimization problems in the face of stochasticity.

Key features & contemporary issues: Convex optimization may, for example, be harnessed for minimizing the total power consumption by ensuring convergence to a unique global optimum. This defines the optimal power allocation strategy, while meeting specific Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio (SINR) thresholds for each receiver [59]. Advances in modern systems have significantly transformed the mathematical optimization problems underlying system design. These changes have introduced substantial challenges in understanding, analyzing, and solving these optimization problems. Many of the single- and multi-objective optimization problems are complex, often being non-convex and non-deterministic [60]. Additionally, the design variables may vary widely, from continuous to integer or even mixed types. These emerging complexities have driven the development of advanced optimization theories, algorithms, and techniques to improve the suboptimal solutions, guiding them toward the global optimum [61].

Non-convex problems present additional difficulties as they may not converge to a single global optimum. Instead, they often exhibit multiple local optima due to the inherent non-linear dynamics of wireless networks [62]. This further complicates the optimization process, requiring specialized techniques for effectively navigating the complex solution space. Traditional algorithms conceived for solving non-convex problems are often resource-intensive and computationally expensive. They typically rely on iterative approximations through convex formulations [63]. Alternatively, one can decompose the original problem into smaller, more manageable subproblems such as exploiting the block-coordinate descent [64]. Despite their widespread use, these methods exhibit inherent limitations, including slow convergence, high computational complexity, and the inability to guarantee global optimality. Consequently, approximate approaches have emerged as a practical alternative, providing high-quality solutions within a reasonable time frame [65]. Non-convex problems often arise in optimization tasks like pilot assignment [66] or beamforming design [67], where the objective function is a complex nonlinear function of its parameters.

In the realm of small-scale optimization problems, exhaustive

(or brute-force) search-based algorithms are capable of solving non-convex and deterministic problems due to their ability to systematically explore all possible solutions. These methods guarantee the finding of the optimal solution by evaluating every feasible option, making them particularly suitable for optimization problems where the global optimum can be reliably identified [68]. For instance, brute force algorithms can be used in combination with general-purpose solvers to address deterministic optimization problems, delivering accurate results despite their high computational costs, expanding exponentially with the network scale [69]. More explicitly, the efficiency of these algorithms is constrained by the problem size, rendering them impractical for complex large-scale scenarios. This fact makes traditional exhaustive search methods impractical due to their excessive computational costs and time requirements. Additionally, many optimization problems of NG wireless networks are NP-hard, as noted in authoritative studies [21] and operate in uncertain environments [70]–[72]. Consequently, exhaustive search algorithms face significant limitations, necessitating the use of stochastic algorithms. These stochastic methods are crucial for efficiently handling the dynamic and fluctuating heterogeneous nature of NG systems, which are expected to support large-scale ultrahigh density networks. As exemplified by the framework in [73], the NG network performance may be readily enhanced by stochastic algorithms conceived for coordinated management, congestion control, and scheduling. This approach aims for improving network efficiency and minimizing latency by integrating multi-layer optimization strategies that maximize network utility and employ SO methods. These features support rapid convergence and long-term optimization in dynamic networks. On a similar note, distributed machine learning techniques, which often rely on SO, are also popular in the context of large-scale optimization, offering near-optimal performance and high computational efficiency [11].

3) Lessons learned: Resource allocation operating in the face of stochastic features imposes significant uncertainty on the network performance. Single-objective optimization techniques typically aim for maximizing a specific metric, possibly subject to some constraints. While effective in well-defined scenarios, single-objective methods often fail to capture the trade-offs that must be met in complex environments, where multiple performance criteria must be satisfied simultaneously. Multi-objective optimization, on the other hand, provides a more flexible framework by considering conflicting objectives. However, the stochastic nature complicates the identification of Pareto-optimal solutions, requiring robust algorithms capable of dynamically adapting to time-varying conditions. Addressing these challenges is critical for ensuring efficient operation of NG networks.

III. TAXONOMY OF STOCHASTIC OPTIMIZATION

This section outlines the foundational taxonomy of SO by addressing its core principles and algorithmic diversity. First, we elucidate the fundamental characteristics that distinguish SO from deterministic approaches, emphasizing the role of randomness in modeling optimization problems (open question three). Subsequently, we classify the algorithmic landscape, reviewing the design methodologies that span from population-based metaheuristics to learning-driven frameworks (open question four).

Open question three: What are the fundamental principles and characteristics of SO?

1) Background: SO refers to a class of mathematical and computational techniques that incorporate randomness into the




Figure 5: The fundamental principles of SO.

optimization process to solve problems characterized by uncertainty, noise, or incomplete information [74]. This approach is particularly useful for complex, non-deterministic problems where traditional deterministic optimization methods pose challenges, owing to having unknown parameters or data [75]. Fig. 6 illustrates the intersection of various algorithms across different characteristics, including metaheuristics, RL, and a range of other methods, such as Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), approximate algorithms, and hybrid approaches that innovatively combine multiple strategies. Specifically, metaheuristics refer to high-level strategies that proficiently guide the search process for efficiently exploring the solution space and finding optimal or near-optimal solutions [76]. These algorithms are generally categorized into two types: *population-based*, which explore a diverse set of candidate solutions, promoting global search space exploration, and *trajectory-based*, which follow a single solution path, emphasizing local refinement. By contrast, RL is a branch of Machine Learning (ML) focused on training an agent to make a sequence of decisions by interacting with an operational environment [77]. The agent aims to maximize cumulative rewards through trial-and-error learning. RL algorithms are divided into three categories: value-based methods, policy-based methods, and actor-critic/hybrid methods, which are inherently stochastic due to their exploration policies and environmental uncertainties.

2) *Key features and considerations*: SO relies on the fundamental principles, shown in Fig. 5 and interpreted as follows:

- i) *Incorporation of randomness*. While deterministic algorithms produce consistent solutions from identical starting points, SO introduces randomness at various stages of the optimization process, such as solution initialization or through stochastic perturbations in iterative updates [78]. Random factors generate deliberate perturbations into the search process, allowing the optimizer to jump to hitherto unexplored areas that may contain better solutions. This mechanism is critical in complex high-dimensional landscapes, where local traps are difficult to avoid through deterministic schemes. Additionally, randomness enhances the robustness by reducing sensitivity to modeling inaccuracies and noisy observations, where deterministic methods may be impacted by imperfect information. Therefore, randomness serves as a crucial component that diversifies the search and enables the algorithm to continuously generate new candidate solutions in optimization [79].
- ii) *Balance between exploration and exploitation*. The ability

to strike a trade-off between exploration and exploitation is considered in the solution search process [80]. Exploration refers to the capability of the algorithms to investigate diverse, previously unvisited regions of the solution space, increasing the likelihood of discovering globally optimal or near-optimal solutions. By contrast, exploitation focuses on intensively refining high-quality candidate solutions already identified, allowing for local improvements and faster convergence in promising regions. We emphasize the balance of factors in SO, where excessive exploration may lead to inefficiency and slow convergence, whereas a lack of strategic exploitation can cause premature convergence to local optima. SO methods incorporate stochastic mechanisms that adaptively regulate search behavior throughout the optimization process. In metaheuristic frameworks, randomized variation operators are employed to promote exploration, while selection and intensification mechanisms guide exploitation toward promising solution regions [81]. In terms of RL, typically ϵ -greedy or policy-gradient methods are utilized for explicitly managing the trade-off between exploration and exploitation through policies that strike a balance between learning new strategies and exploiting known high-reward actions [82]. Similarly, other stochastic algorithms, such as stochastic gradient-based approaches and Bayesian optimization, incorporate probabilistic rules or noise to escape from local optima and encourage robust search dynamics. Therefore, the robustness and efficiency of a SO method critically depend on the ability to adaptively balance exploration and exploitation across different stages of the search under uncertainty and problem complexity.

- iii) *Adaptability to noisy, uncertain, or incomplete information*. SO is particularly well-suited to realistic, practical contexts due to the inherent capability to handle uncertainty by harnessing adaptive mechanisms. While deterministic approaches often assume complete and accurate information, SO relies on probabilistic models, such as modeling noise, sampling from probability distributions, or evaluating solutions over repeated trials. This mitigates the impact of outliers or fluctuations in objective evaluations [74]. Some techniques, such as Monte Carlo sampling, allow the algorithm to form stable estimates of solution quality over time, thus avoiding premature convergence driven by incomplete data [83]. In EAs, SI, and stochastic gradient methods, robustness is embedded in the algorithmic design through randomized operators, adaptive sampling, or ensemble-based evaluations. Regarding RL, stochastic policies and reward estimators promote policy robustness by learning from diverse trajectories and variable feedback. Moreover, SO often prioritizes expected performance or risk-aware objectives, rather than optimizing for a single deterministic scenario. This makes the resultant solutions more robust to future variations or incomplete knowledge.
- iv) *Iterative improvement mechanisms*. SO typically employs iterative improvement mechanisms for gradually approaching optimal solutions [78], [81]. The search process is initialized either from a single solution or from a diverse population of candidate solutions generated via randomization or heuristic strategies to promote unbiased exploration. At each iteration, candidate solutions are evaluated using an objective function, and new solutions are produced through stochastic perturbations, recombination, or probabilistic selection. Feedback from these evaluations is then used to adaptively guide subsequent updates, enabling the search to increasingly focus on promising regions of the solution space while preserving sufficient

diversity to avoid premature convergence. The cyclical process of evaluation and adaptation mimics a guided trial-and-error approach, where poorly performing solutions are either improved or discarded, while superior solutions are preserved and further exploited. This iterative refinement framework is harnessed in many well-known metaheuristic algorithms. Specifically, Genetic Algorithms (GA) evolves a population through selection, crossover, and mutation, balancing exploration and exploitation across generations [81]. Simulated Annealing (SA) iteratively perturbs a single solution, using a temperature-based probability function to accept inferior solutions early on and gradually focus on exploitation as the temperature cools [84]. Regarding SI, Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), and Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) utilize population-level dynamics and stochastic interactions for iteratively improving candidate solutions based on both individual and collective experiences [85]. Additionally, feedback from environmental observation is used to adjust model parameters or policies for stochastic gradient-based methods and RL [86]. The iterative nature of these algorithms increases the likelihood of converging to optimal or near-optimal solutions given sufficient runtime and diversity, while allowing flexible stopping criteria based on convergence behavior, computational budgets, or application-specific requirements.

- v) *Flexibility and hybridization.* SO distinguish themselves through a high degree of flexibility in both algorithmic design and implementation. This flexibility arises from their problem-agnostic and modular structures, which make SO readily adaptable to domain-specific requirements. Key components of SO can be modified or extended without altering the core search paradigm [76]. Additionally, parameters may be tuned to fit particular problem characteristics, while domain knowledge can be injected via customized operators or initialization strategies [87]. Furthermore, specific constraints can be bespoke integrated seamlessly either into the solution evaluation or generation process. We emphasize an important extension of hybridization, which involves combining multiple optimization techniques for enhancing their robustness. Hybrid metaheuristics that combine EAs either with Local Search (LS) or unified SI techniques may be created as memetic algorithms to solve different optimization problems [8], [88]. These hybrid designs are capable of balancing global exploration versus local exploitation, thereby improving robustness, convergence rate, and solution quality. Regarding RL and ML, hybrid techniques that combine metaheuristic and gradient-based optimization have emerged as powerful solutions for non-convex or non-differentiable problems. These methods leverage the global search capabilities of metaheuristics combined with the precision of gradient-based or policy-learning adjustment, often yielding superior results.
- vi) *Toward multi-objective optimization.* SO algorithms are highly adaptable methods that can be extended to effectively tackle multi-objective optimization problems, which are designed to identify a set of Pareto-optimal solutions, where improving one objective necessarily leads to a trade-off with others [87], [89]. This flexibility allows for the exploration of multiple conflicting objectives.

3) *Lessons learned:* A comprehensive investigation into SO highlights the strong potential of this paradigm to address a wide range of resource allocation challenges in NG networks. Firstly, incorporating randomness enhances the robustness of the algorithms against noise and uncertainty, while improving global




Figure 6: Classification of SO.

exploration, hence mitigating the risk of premature convergence. Secondly, SO strikes a trade-off between exploration and exploitation. This is achieved by mechanisms such as mutation, policy variation, and stochastic sampling that are capable of successfully navigating complex solution spaces. Additionally, the adaptability of SO to environments characterized by noisy, incomplete data demonstrates its efficiency across complex problems. Iterative mechanisms such as population evolution, stochastic perturbation, and reinforcement-based updates play a key role in guiding convergence toward optimal solutions. The modular and hybrid nature of SO enables seamless integration of domain knowledge with diverse strategies for improving performance across various problem domains. Moreover, the ability of SO as a robust and principled framework to tackle multi-objective problems demonstrates its flexibility in handling conflicting objectives and generating Pareto-optimal solutions.

Open question four: How are the SO algorithms designed and classified?

1) *Background:* SO algorithms are designed and classified based on diverse criteria, including search strategies, reliance on gradient information, and learning paradigms. These algorithms can be categorized into three main groups: 1) metaheuristics, 2) RL, and 3) other stochastic methods, as depicted in Fig. 6. Each category encompasses diverse principles and mechanisms tailored to different optimization challenges. Metaheuristic algorithms are generally classified into population-based and trajectory-based approaches according to how they explore the search space [90]. Population-based metaheuristics maintain and evolve a set of candidate solutions simultaneously. This category includes EAs, which mimic natural evolution, and SI algorithms inspired by collective animal behavior observed, such as the foraging and hunting behaviors of animal groups, e.g., PSO, ACO. Trajectory-based metaheuristics, on the other hand, iteratively improve a single candidate solution by exploring its neighborhood, including SA [84], Tabu Search (TS) [91], and a suite of other algorithms. On the other hand, metaheuristic algorithms are classified based on their search type: 1) implicit, 2) explicit, and 3) direct search. Implicit search methods rely on indirect mechanisms, such as probabilistic transitions or stochastic choices, to explore the solution space without explicitly computing gradients or directional moves. By contrast, explicit search algorithms generate candidate solutions using well-defined operators informed by heuristics or learned models. Finally, direct search algorithms operate by evaluating objective function values at sampled points and guiding the search solely based on these values, without requiring derivative or probabilistic models.

Regarding RL, the algorithms include three primary categories: value-based, policy-based, and hybrid methods. Value-based RL learns an estimate of the expected return (value functions) for different states or state-action pairs and derives policies indirectly by choosing actions that maximize these values [92]. Policy-based methods optimize the policy directly through parameterized functions, often using gradient ascent on expected returns [93]. Hybrid methods combine value and policy learning to leverage the strengths of both approaches, such as Soft Actor-Critic (SAC), Asynchronous Advantage Actor Critic (A3C), and Advantage Actor-Critic (A2C) [94]. Further classification in RL distinguishes algorithms based on their interaction with the environment: off-policy and on-policy, or model-based and model-free. On-policy algorithms learn solely from data collected by the current policy being optimized, promoting stable but sometimes sample-inefficient learning (e.g., State-action-reward-state-action (SARSA)). Off-policy methods learn from data generated by different behavior policies, which enhances sample efficiency, albeit at the cost of increasing complexity (e.g., Q-learning). Model-based RL incorporates an explicit or learned model of the environmental dynamics to plan or simulate future states, yielding potentially expedited learning, whereas model-free RL relies entirely on direct interactions.

Additionally, other SO methods include randomized algorithms such as 1) stochastic gradient descent variants, 2) stochastic approximate algorithms, and 3) Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods, or hybrid algorithms which often combine metaheuristics and RL by providing additional robustness in noisy or complex solution spaces. Specifically, RL can be employed to initialize solutions or tune parameters within a metaheuristic framework, improving convergence speed and solution quality. Conversely, metaheuristics are capable of controlling hyperparameters or of guiding exploration strategies in RL or ML models, helping the optimizer to escape local optima or adapt dynamically to changing environments. Such synergistic designs support more flexible and resilient optimization frameworks adapted to the multifaceted challenges of real-world problems.

2) *Key features and considerations:* Metaheuristics are high-level optimization frameworks designed to address complex problems where traditional methods are impractical due to non-linearity, discontinuity, large search spaces, or the absence of gradient information [90]. By employing stochastic operators to explore the solution space, metaheuristics provide an efficient alternative to exhaustive search when computational complexity is prohibitive [8], [81]. Their effectiveness largely stems from the ability to balance exploration and exploitation, thereby improving the likelihood of attaining high-quality, near-optimal solutions.

The general framework of EAs is depicted in Fig. 7, consisting of two key steps: 1) reproduction and 2) natural selection. Reproduction enables the inheritance of favorable traits from parents to offspring through crossover of genes, while mutation introduces random variations that preserve genetic diversity. Natural selection ensures that fitter individuals, i.e., those better adapted to their environment, are more likely to survive and pass on their traits, whereas weaker individuals are gradually eliminated. By imitating these mechanisms, EAs iteratively improve solution quality over successive generations, making them a powerful paradigm for solving complex optimization problems. A central component of EAs is the representation of solutions. Each individual encodes a candidate solution in a bespoke structure tailored to the problem, and a collection of




Figure 7: The framework of EAs.

individuals forms the population. The encoded structure, called the genotype, is decoded into the corresponding phenotype, which can be evaluated against the problem objectives. For instance, individuals can be encoded as phase-shift matrices for RIS optimization, where decoding yields passive beamforming configurations that directly enhance system performance [75]. Likewise, in UAV-enabled systems, individuals may represent flight schedules or trajectories, with each genome encoding task assignments or waypoint sequences for coordinated UAV operations [80], [95].

The parent selection mechanism determines which individuals are chosen to reproduce. Hence, parent selection is often biased toward fitter individuals to exploit promising solutions, while maintaining some degree of randomness to preserve population diversity. New solutions are then created through genetic operators, including crossover and mutation [96]. Crossover combines information from parents to generate offspring that inherit the advantageous traits of both, while mutation introduces random modifications to preserve genetic diversity and allow exploration of new solution regions.

The next step involves survivor selection, where a strategy determines which individuals traverse into the next generation. Common approaches include elitism [87], where the best individuals are preserved unchanged, generational replacement, where the entire population is replaced, or steady-state replacement, where only a subset is updated. Finally, the evolutionary process proceeds until a specific termination condition is met. Termination may be defined by a fixed number of generations, convergence of the population (e.g., minimal improvement over iterations), or achievement of a desired fitness threshold. In multi-objective optimization problems, termination can also depend on the stabilization of the Pareto front [97].

Leveraging the general framework of EAs, GA inherit the core components, such as the representation of individuals and fitness evaluation, yet distinguish themselves through the design of more effective genetic operators and selection mechanisms. Various crossover strategies have been developed to address different problem structures: shuffle one-point and multi-point [98]; cyclic crossover ensures that superior parental information is preserved; ordered-crossover and partially matched crossover are widely applied to permutation-based problems; and simulated binary crossover has proven effective for real-valued representations [99]. The mutation operator introduces stochastic variation that prevents premature convergence and maintains genetic diversity. The most common form is bit-flip based mutation for binary-encoded solutions, while Gaussian or polynomial mutations are typically employed for continuous-valued vectors.




Figure 8: Flowchart of NSGA-II.

Moreover, depending on the representation, it is possible to design problem-specific crossover and mutation operators that exploit the specific structural characteristics of the encoding, such as swapping mutation and exchange-based mutation for virtual network function placement [100]. In GA, offspring are merged with the parent population, and selection is then applied to determine the survivors for the next generation.

While single-objective GAs have enjoyed popularity, many wireless communication problems are inherently of multi-objective nature requiring simultaneous optimization of conflicting criteria, which leads to the concept of multi-objective GAs becoming indispensable. Pareto-based approaches, including Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II) [101], and Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm III (NSGA-III) [102], extend GA by integrating non-dominated sorting and diversity-preserving mechanisms for efficiently approximating the Pareto front. These algorithms generate a set of trade-off solutions. As illustrated in Fig. 8, the key distinction between standard GA and NSGA-II lies in their survivor selection strategy. Instead of evaluating individuals solely by fitness, the combined parent–offspring population is partitioned into non-dominated fronts; lower-rank fronts are preserved first, while the last admissible front is truncated using the so-called crowding distance metric to maintain solution diversity. This mechanism ensures a well-distributed Pareto front across multiple objectives. However, NSGA-II often struggles when the number of objectives grows beyond three, since the crowding distance becomes less effective in preserving diversity in high-dimensional spaces. To address this limitation, NSGA-III [102] introduces reference points as a diversity-preserving mechanism. These reference points are pre-defined or adaptively generated along a normalized hyperplane in the objective space. During selection, if the number of individuals in the last front exceeds the population limit, candidates are chosen based on their proximity to these reference points, ensuring population diversity across all objectives.

Differential Evolution (DE) [75] has emerged as another powerful population-based EA, which is particularly well-suited for continuous-valued optimization problems [75], [103]. DE generates offspring through a process of differential mutation, where new candidate solutions are created by perturbing existing individuals using scaled differences between randomly chosen members of the population. Several popular mutation strategies exist, such as DE/rand/1, DE/best/1, and DE/current-to-best/1, each striking a different balance between exploration and exploitation [104]. One of the key strengths of DE lies in its simplicity and efficiency when dealing with real-valued search spaces, since the mutation mechanism naturally adapts to the scale of the problem and encourages robust global search. Another distinguishing feature of DE is its selection mechanism, where DE employs a one-to-one comparison, where each offspring directly competes with its parent, and only the

better of the two survives into the next generation. This effective greedy strategy ensures steady improvement of the population, while maintaining computational efficiency.

Multi-objective Differential Evolution (MODE) [105] extends the DE framework by integrating the selection mechanisms inspired by Pareto dominance and diversity preservation. MODE evaluates solutions through non-dominated sorting, assigning ranks based on Pareto fronts and employing additional diversity measures such as crowding distance or ϵ -dominance to maintain a well-distributed set of trade-off solutions. Reference point-based techniques can also be incorporated, enabling decision makers to guide the search toward preferred regions of the Pareto front, while preserving DE’s flexible mutation strategies [106]. A notable variant enhances this framework by integrating immediate parent replacement with an external population archive [107]. If a trial solution dominates its parent, it replaces the parent directly to accelerate convergence, while the replaced solution is stored in the archive; otherwise, the trial solution is archived. At each generation, the current population and archive are merged and then truncated using elite- and diversity-preserving strategies inspired by NSGA-II. This design prevents the premature loss of dominated yet potentially valuable solutions, thereby balancing convergence pressure with diversity preservation and enabling more effective exploration of the Pareto front [99].

Beyond GA and DE, other paradigms within the EAs family include Genetic Programming (GP), Evolutionary Strategies (ES), and Evolutionary Programming (EP), each distinguished by their representation and variation mechanisms [108]. GP evolves solutions represented as tree structures, which are computer programs or symbolic expressions, allowing simultaneous adaptation of both structure and parameters. This makes GP particularly effective for challenging tasks such as symbolic regression and automated design. By contrast, ES is developed mainly for continuous-valued optimization, and it is characterized by self-adaptive control of mutation parameters, especially step sizes. In contrast to GA’s emphasis on recombination, ES relies heavily on Gaussian mutations and employs (μ, λ) or $(\mu + \lambda)$ selection schemes to balance exploration and exploitation, while dynamically adjusting the search. Additionally, EP, originally motivated by AI applications, entirely dispenses with crossover and uses mutation as its sole variation operator. Its individuals are often modeled as finite-state machines or real-valued vectors, and evolutionary progress is achieved through stochastic perturbations combined with tournament selection.

In parallel to EAs, the second major branch of population-based metaheuristics is SI, which is driven by the collective behavior of agents, such as particles, ants, and bees. Specifically, SI exploits self-organization and local interactions among agents to achieve global problem-solving [89], [109]. Agents exchange heuristic information to collaboratively guide the optimization process. Inspired by natural phenomena, such as bird flocks, ant colonies, and fish schools, SI is inherently decentralized and self-organized, with intelligence emerging from distributed interactions among agents and their environment rather than from a central controller. Operationally, swarm systems are typically composed of simple agents that follow basic behavioral rules, such as attraction or repulsion, and interact locally without global knowledge. Although each agent is individually simple, their collective interactions give rise to emergent intelligent behaviors that enable the swarm to perform complex tasks, such as discovering optimal paths or forming efficient group




Figure 9: Applications of SI.

structures. This bottom-up paradigm underscores the power of self-organization and has been formalized into a diverse range of algorithms, such as PSO [79], ACO [89], and Artificial Bee Colony (ABC). Each of these approaches leverages collective behavior and local interactions of swarms to address a wide spectrum of optimization problems across various domains.

PSO represents candidate solutions as particles that move through the search space according to both the personal best experience and the information shared by other particles [79], [109]. Position updates are governed by velocity equations that combine inertia, cognitive, and social components, striking a balance between exploration and exploitation. Several extensions of PSO have been introduced to enhance its convergence behavior to reduce the risk of stagnation. Hybrid paradigms with sorted particles improve optimization performance by integrating diverse search strategies, while adaptive schemes dynamically adjust paradigm ratios and constriction coefficients across iterations to balance exploration and exploitation. Fully informed search strategies, which incorporate information from the global best solution in each generation, further mitigate premature convergence by encouraging escape from local optima [79]. Moreover, leader-adaptive PSO combined with dimensionality reduction has been proposed to improve scalability in high-dimensional problems [110]. Multi-objective PSO (MOPSO) introduces an external archive of Pareto-optimal solutions and diversity-preserving selection strategies [111]. Instead of converging to a single optimum, MOPSO maintains a set of trade-off solutions, with global exemplars selected from the archive based on crowding distance, clustering, or grid-based approaches. These advances extend the applicability of PSO and its variants to both single-objective and multi-objective optimization problems. Apart from this, ACO is inspired by the collective foraging behavior of ants, in which artificial agents construct solutions probabilistically based on their pheromone trails and heuristic information [87]. Pheromone levels are updated through evaporation and deposition, reinforcing components associated with higher-quality solutions [89].

In multi-objective contexts, extensions employ either multiple




Figure 10: LS strategies.

pheromone matrices [112] or aggregation strategies to approximate the Pareto front [113]. Similarly, the ABC concept divides the population into employed, onlooker, and scout bees to search the solution space [114]. Employed bees refine known food sources, onlookers probabilistically select promising candidates, and scouts introduce random solutions to preserve diversity. Extensions focus on improving neighborhood search or biasing exploration toward high-quality regions, while multi-objective variants incorporate Pareto dominance to address conflicting objectives.

Trajectory-based algorithms are single-solution metaheuristics that explore the search space by iteratively transforming a current solution along a guided trajectory defined by neighborhood structures and acceptance criteria [85], [115], [116]. The algorithms maintain and refine only one solution at a time. Representative approaches include SA, which employs probabilistic acceptance to escape local optima [85]; TS, which uses memory-based mechanisms to prevent cycling; Iterated Local Search (ILS), which alternates local search with solution perturbations [115]; and Guided Local Search (GLS), which dynamically penalizes frequently visited suboptimal features [116]. These methods are effective for combinatorial and numerical optimization problems where exploiting local structure and avoiding premature convergence are critical.

Specifically, SA modifies the LS framework by introducing a probabilistic acceptance criterion, allowing it to escape local optima more effectively. SA accepts worse solutions with a probability that decreases as the algorithm progresses, controlled by a temperature parameter [117]. This modification enables SA to explore a broader solution space and potentially find the global optimum. A key difference between SA and LS lies in their specific neighbor selection and acceptance criteria. LS follows a deterministic strategy, choosing the best-improving solution, whereas SA uses the Metropolis criterion [118] to probabilistically accept worse solutions, enhancing exploration.

Regarding memory-based approaches, TS guides the search process using deterministic rules augmented with adaptive memory structures. TS overcomes key limitations such as entrapment in local optima regions through the use of memory-based constraints and historical search information. In particular, a tabu list is employed to temporarily forbid recently visited solutions or prohibited moves, thereby preventing cycling and promoting exploration of new solution regions [119]. The memory mechanisms in TS are typically hierarchical and adaptive, encompassing short-term memory (e.g., tabu lists), long-term memory for intensification and diversification, and aspiration criteria that allow tabu restrictions to be overridden when a

solution is sufficiently promising [91], [119]. These features enable TS to dynamically adjust neighborhood structures based on search history and problem-specific constraints. In summary, Table. II illustrates the innovative metaheuristic strategies implemented for specific allocation of resources, probably in wireless communication.

RL have recently emerged as a promising class of SO techniques for tackling high-dynamic resource allocation problems in NG networks. RL methods are designed as a dynamic and adaptive framework that fits naturally within the SO family, especially in sequential decision-making problems in the face of uncertainty [94]. In RL, an agent interacts with an environment to learn a policy that maximizes long-term cumulative reward through trial-and-error, making it well-suited for online and adaptive optimization in time-varying wireless systems. The foundation of RL is modeled as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), defined by a tuple $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, R, \gamma)$, explicitly \mathcal{S} is the set of states; \mathcal{A} is the set of actions; $P(s'|s, a)$ is the probability of transitioning to state s' after taking action a in state s ; $R(s, a)$ is the expected immediate reward; and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor reflecting the importance of future rewards. Additionally, a policy $\pi(a|s)$ specifies the agent's behavior by defining a probability distribution over actions. The objective is to find an optimal policy π^* that maximizes the expected return

$$G_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1}, \quad (3)$$

where G_t denotes the return at time step t , R_{t+k+1} is the reward received $(k+1)$ steps ahead, and the discount factor γ controls the trade-off between immediate and long-term rewards, with smaller values favoring short-term gains and larger values emphasizing future returns. Additionally, value functions are used to evaluate policy performance. The state-value function $V_{\pi}(s)$ denotes the expected return from state s under policy π , while the action-value function $Q_{\pi}(s, a)$ represents the expected return obtained by taking action a in state s and subsequently following π . These quantities can be computed recursively using the Bellman equations as [94]

$$V_{\pi}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma^k R_{t+k+1} | S_t = s \right\}, \quad (4)$$

$$Q_{\pi}(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \{ G_t | S_t = s, A_t = a \}. \quad (5)$$

Here, S_t and A_t are the state and action at time step t , respectively. The optimal state-value function $V^*(s)$ is the maximum expected return achievable from state s over all policies and satisfies the Bellman optimality equation, which expresses the state value as the maximum expected sum of the immediate reward and the discounted value of subsequent states [94]

$$V^*(s) = \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} [R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) V^*(s')]. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, the optimal action-value function $Q^*(s, a)$ estimates the maximum expected return. The relationship between $Q^*(s, a)$ and future reward is formally based on the Bellman optimality equation, which is defined as follows [94]

$$Q^*(s, a) = R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, a) \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}} Q^*(s', a'). \quad (7)$$

In terms of the value-based approach, such as those in Q-learning, SARSA and Deep Q-Network (DQN), methods focus on estimating the action-value function, which is then used to derive the optimal policy. These methods leverage the Bellman equation to update value functions over time, gradually refining their estimation of long-term rewards. The stochastic nature of

wireless environments, characterized by random state transitions due to fading channels or user mobility, is addressed by averaging over multiple experiences to obtain robust value estimates. For instance, Q-learning has been applied to dynamic spectrum access and transmit power control [123], where channel conditions vary probabilistically, and the agent must learn optimal strategies without explicit knowledge of the system model [82]. However, value-based methods often struggle in continuous action spaces and may require discretization, which can limit performance in fine-grained control tasks such as beamforming or power allocation. Policy-based methods, including REINFORCE [124], Twin Delayed Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (TD3), Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) [94], Trust Region Policy Optimization (TRPO) [125], and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [126], directly parameterize and optimize the policy function, making these methods particularly effective in modeling stochastic policies, where actions are selected according to a state-dependent stochastic policy. Additionally, RL approaches are adaptive and can be tuned according to the context of the problem, as illustrated in Table III.

3) *Lessons learned:* No single SO algorithm is universally optimal; instead, performance depends strongly on problem characteristics. GAs are particularly effective for discrete or mixed optimization problems due to their effective exploration of large search spaces via crossover and mutation. DE and PSO are eminently well-suited for continuous optimization problems, particularly for those having non-linear objective functions and multiple local optima, and can be combined to enhance search efficiency, while also offering faster convergence. Other SI algorithms are effective for optimization tasks requiring cooperative behaviors, like network routing, and can be enhanced by combining them with global search strategies. Additionally, LS-based algorithms are effective when neighborhood structures are explicitly defined, as they systematically exploit local information to refine solutions and escape poor local optima through adaptive exploration. RL algorithms are ideal for dynamic decision-making problems, and can be integrated with EAs for adaptability in a fluctuating environment. Thus, the algorithm orchestrations depend on the problem characteristics, and an adaptive approach can significantly improve solution quality and computational efficiency.

IV. SO FOR RESOURCE ALLOCATION IN NG NETWORKS

This section examines the strategic application of SO techniques in NG networks, addressing two critical questions. First, we examine the driving forces behind the current adoption of SO, analyzing why the escalating complexity and heterogeneity of NG environments necessitate a paradigm shift toward stochastic methods (open question five). Second, we investigate the practical efficiency of these techniques in resolving intricate resource allocation challenges posed by cutting-edge NG technologies (open question six).

Open question five: *Why is now the right time for adoption of SO in the context of NG networks?*

1) *Background:* NG networks demand efficient allocation of spectrum, power, time, and computing resources under highly dynamic and non-stationary conditions [81], [92]. Fluctuating channel conditions, user mobility, time-varying traffic, and inter-node interference create a probabilistic environment that challenges traditional deterministic optimization methods [8].

Table II: Innovative strategies in metaheuristic algorithms

		Algorithm	Improvement
Metaheuristic	EAs	GA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scalarization-based transformation of multi-objective problem into single-objective formulation [120] - Constraint-aware fitness evaluation using invalid-solution filtering and parameter-free penalty mechanisms [76] - Problem-driven population initialization via conditioned random sampling [96] and cluster-aware assignment strategies [121]
		DE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adaptive mutation and crossover strategies with operator selection [75] and parameter control guided by population fitness [104] - Weighted-sum-based scalarization for handling multi-objective optimization [103]
	SI	PSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribution-aware particle initialization to improve early-stage exploration [95], - Hybrid PSO frameworks integrating evolutionary operators for enhanced global exploration and refinement [95], [109] - Constraint handling through parameter-free penalty-based fitness evaluation [109] - Scalarization-based multi-objective optimization using weighted sum vector [79] - Grouping-merging particle update mechanisms with diversity preservation and precision-aware perturbations [79]
		ACO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heterogeneous pheromone modeling with learning-assisted heuristics for adaptive solution construction and pheromone updating [87], and using a neural network heuristics [89]
	LS	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning-assisted parameter adaptation using neural network-based surrogate modeling [122] - Hybrid local search frameworks combining simulated annealing, tabu mechanisms, and cross-entropy-based neighborhood exploration [117]; - Quantum-inspired optimization via Quadratic Unconstrained Binary Optimization (QUBO) modeling with analytically derived penalty bounds and scaling strategies. [118]
		TS	Learning-assisted initialization and probability-guided neighborhood moves with early stopping criteria [119]

Table III: Innovative strategies in RL

		Algorithm	Improvement
RL	Value-based	Q-Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problem-aware state abstraction and latency-driven reward design leveraging channel correlation information [127] - Enhanced temporal-difference learning with eligibility traces, multi-objective reward formulation, and adaptive learning-rate control [128] - Q-value estimation using Long Short-term Memory (LSTM) for fast convergence [129]
		SARSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multi-step temporal-difference updates with eligibility traces and deep function approximation using Deep Neural Network (DNN)s and replay buffers for improved convergence stability [130]
		Expected SARSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Variance-reduced value updates through expectation over action distributions [94]
	Policy-based	DQN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deep value-function approximation with experience replay and target networks, including overestimation mitigation via Double DQN [131]
		PPO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clustering-based interaction reduction to improve scalability in multi-agent settings [95] - Multi-agent with centralized training and distributed execution, incorporating global rewards and state normalization for cooperative learning [128] - Stability-aware policy optimization via Lyapunov-based decomposition and hierarchical PPO [125]
		DDPG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prediction-assisted continuous control with QoS- and energy-aware reward design [132] - Predictive localization through a DNN that forecasts the future positions of vehicular users and eavesdropper [133]
		TD3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - History-aware actor modeling with LSTM and action-space regularization [134] - Trajectory-aware actor-critic optimization with delayed updates and target policy smoothing [135]
	Actor-Critic	Dyna-Q	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hybrid model-based planning and model-free RL.
		SAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entropy-regularized actor-critic learning with privacy-aware reward modeling [136]
		A3C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asynchronous parallel actor-critic learning for scalable training
		A2C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Synchronous actor-critic learning with batched gradient updates [94]

SO provides a principled framework for adaptive and data-driven decision-making by incorporating randomness, probabilistic modeling, and learning from both historical and real-time observations, thereby enhancing robustness and flexibility in resource allocation. Modern advances in computational capabilities and network intelligence have made stochastic approaches increasingly practical and scalable for NG networks. As networks evolve toward Ultra-Reliable Low-Latency Communication (URLLC), enhanced mobile broadband, and massive machine-type communications, SO emerges as a critical tool to ensure stability, efficiency, and intelligent resource management in the NG era.

2) *Key features and considerations:* As NG wireless networks scale in size, density, and service diversity, several factors make the adoption of computationally efficient SO not only timely but essential for attaining high performance and prompt adaptability. Tab. IV highlights the challenges of resource allocation in the NG networks and the benefits of SO, which includes as:

Scalability is a fundamental barrier to the adoption of SO in large-scale systems. NG networks are expected to support millions of devices in ultra-dense deployments, resulting in high-dimensional optimization problems with rapidly increasing complexity [137], [138]. The robustness of distributed SO algorithms leads to excellent convergence properties even when the network has unprecedented sizes, in contrast to centralized approaches that become computationally intractable. Advanced distributed SO frameworks leverage consensus-based mechanisms that enable network nodes to collaboratively solve global optimization problems without centralized coordination [139].

These techniques maintain robust convergence guarantees under communication delays and link failures, making them well-suited for large-scale deployments where perfect synchronization is impossible [140]. The scalability and robustness of modern SO techniques enable the decomposition of complex network-wide optimization problems into manageable subproblems. This decomposition ensures that computational complexity grows polynomially rather than exponentially with network size, while preserving performance guarantees [141].

Partial observability and learning under uncertainty pose significant challenges in NG network optimization, where complete system state information is often available due to measurement limitations, estimation errors, and communication delays [142]. SO provides inherent robustness to partial observability by explicitly incorporating uncertainty into the optimization framework, enabling effective decision making under incomplete information. These methods maintain robust performance by modeling uncertainty explicitly and providing probabilistic guarantees on optimization outcomes. This robustness ensures network performance degradation as observability decreases, rather than catastrophic failure. ML techniques integrated with SO enable radio networks to learn effective resource allocation strategies through exploration and exploitation under unknown system dynamics [143].

Non-convexity and convergence guarantees: Non-convex optimization problems are fundamental in wireless networks due to unpredictable interference patterns, discrete resource allocation constraints, and complex objective functions [144], [145]. Traditional optimization methods often become trapped in local

Table IV: Design considerations and the role of SO in NG networks

Design Consideration	NG Network Challenge	Role of SO	Example Techniques
Scalability	Massive device connectivity in ultra-dense deployments	SO supports scalable decision-making by decentralizing computation and approximating in high-dimensional spaces	GA, PSO, Deep Q-Learning, Decentralized Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning (MARL)
Partial Observability	Limited or delayed feedback due to constrained control channels	SO exploits stochastic observations to derive near-optimal decisions without full state information	Thompson Sampling, Bayesian Optimization
Non-convexity	Joint optimization of user association, power control, beamforming	SO explores non-convex landscapes to identify feasible high-quality solutions beyond deterministic methods	EA, SA, Deep RL with exploration strategies
Real-Time Constraints	Ultra-low latency requirements	SO supports fast convergence and online adaptation under strict latency budgets	Model-free RL, Online Mirror Descent, Meta-heuristics with early stopping
Multi-Objective Trade-offs	Conflicting KPIs	SO approximates Pareto frontiers to balance trade-offs among multiple objectives dynamically	NSGA-II, NSGA-III
Integration with AI Models	AI-native NG networks require runtime adaptability and resilience	SO provides a robust optimization layer for training, inference, and deployment under uncertainty	Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics, Bandit Algorithms, SO for LLM pipeline tuning
Dynamic Topologies	Non-stationary networks with mobile users, UAVs, and edge nodes	SO adapts policies and resource allocation to evolving network topologies	Adaptive RL, Online Learning with Drift Detection, Contextual Bandits
Limited Labelled Data / Prior Knowledge	Sparse measurements in emerging or under-deployed regions	SO leverages prior distributions and sample-efficient learning to operate with limited or delayed feedback.	Bayesian RL, Transfer Learning with SO priors, Gaussian Processes

optima, limiting their effectiveness in complex and time-varying wireless environments. Robust SO algorithms provide theoretical convergence guarantees even for non-convex problems by leveraging advanced techniques such as sophisticated variance reduction and momentum methods [146]. These algorithms can escape local optima and converge to globally optimal or near-optimal solutions with high probability, ensuring consistent performance across diverse operating conditions. Stochastic gradient descent with variance reduction techniques demonstrates robust convergence properties in non-convex settings. Its convergence rate remains stable even under noisy gradient estimates [147]. This robustness is crucial for NG wireless applications, where gradient computations are often corrupted by channel noise or interference.

Real-time constraints and computational efficiency: Real-time constraints require optimization algorithms that can deliver solutions within strict time limits, often on the order of milliseconds for critical applications [148]. The computational robustness of SO algorithms enables near-optimal solutions even under severe time constraints, making them well-suited for time-sensitive wireless applications. Online SO algorithms adapt to time-varying network conditions in real time while maintaining robust performance guarantees [85]. This robustness ensures stable performance even when the wireless environment deviates from design assumptions.

Multi-objective trade-offs and Pareto optimization: Again, the multi-objective optimization of wireless networks requires balancing conflicting objectives, such as energy efficiency, latency, throughput, and reliability [149]. Robust SO provides mathematical frameworks for handling multi-objective trade-offs, while ensuring that performance guarantees are maintained across all objectives. Pareto-based optimization identifies non-dominated frontiers of competing objectives while remaining robust to uncertainty in objective weights and constraints [101].

Dynamic topologies and adaptive algorithms: Dynamic topology changes in wireless networks, driven by user mobility, node failures, and time-varying connectivity, pose significant challenges for optimization algorithms [150]. As a remedy, robust SO algorithms can adapt to topology changes in real-time while maintaining convergence guarantees and exhibiting stable performance.

3) Lessons learned: Unlike deterministic methods that rely on static or average-case assumptions and are prone to local optima, SO incorporates probabilistic modeling, randomness, and data-driven adaptation to maintain stable performance under fluctuating channels, unpredictable mobility, and dynamic inter-

ference. Distributed and decomposition-based SO frameworks address scalability challenges in ultra-dense NG deployments with polynomial complexity growth and robust convergence under imperfect synchronization. SO further mitigates partial observability through explicit uncertainty modeling and learning-based approaches, enabling informed decision making with incomplete or delayed system information. For non-convex optimization problems common in wireless environments, advanced SO techniques such as variance reduction and momentum-based methods facilitate prompt escape from local optima and promote near-global solutions. Moreover, the computational efficiency of online SO algorithms supports stringent real-time constraints by delivering near-optimal solutions within millisecond-level latency budgets. Finally, SO's capability to balance multi-objective trade-offs through Pareto optimization, alongside its adaptability to dynamic network topologies, underscores its role as an essential tool for ensuring stability, efficiency, and intelligent resource management in NG systems.

Open question six: How is SO applied to address the resource allocation posed by the cutting-edge technologies of NG networks?

4) Background: Although the cutting edge technologies can significantly enhance network capacity, coverage, and flexibility, they also introduce highly dynamic and stochastic resource allocation challenges. For example, RIS-assisted systems require optimization of reflection coefficients under incomplete and time-varying channel information, resulting in highly non-convex problems. Massive and Cell-Free Massive MU-MIMO demand large-scale stochastic optimization of power control and user association to adapt to dynamic channels and user mobility. Space-air networks with UAVs and satellites face rapidly changing topologies, necessitating real-time stochastic decisions for scheduling, coverage, and handovers. In Mobile Edge Computing (MEC), uncertainty in wireless links, server capacity, and user mobility complicates task offloading decisions for latency-sensitive services. Underwater acoustic communications further challenge resource allocation due to severe channel variability, long delays, and energy constraints. These characteristics make SO essential for efficient resource management in highly dynamic and uncertain NG networks. Applications of SO in NG networks are summarized in Tab. V.

5) Key features and considerations:

RIS: SO is primarily applied to joint active-passive resource allocation problems characterized by non-convex objective functions, unit-modulus constraints, and imperfect channel state

Table V: Applications of SO in NG networks

NG-Network	Ref.	Year	Obj.	Var.	Algorithm Contribution
RIS	[75]	2022	Single	Continuous	The roulette wheel method selects one of the three mutation operators based on a weight vector, which is updated according to the fitness of the best individual
	[104]	2023	Single	Continuous	Use multiple mutation operators and the control parameters of the mutation and crossover operators are dynamically adapted to the search behavior
	[117]	2024	Single	Mixed	Hybrid metaheuristics combining modified tabu search, simulated annealing, and cross-entropy-based neighborhood exploration, applied to decoupled RIS optimization
	[103]	2024	Multiple	Discrete	Convert multi-objective optimization to single-objective using a weighted-sum vector; each individual is represented by a quantum vector, from which a binary vector is generated, and each binary string is then decoded to its corresponding decimal value
Massive MU-MIMO	[149]	2022	Multiple	Continuous	Propose a fitness function that is based on objectives, use K-means clustering to divide differential evolution population into three groups with different mutation operators
	[151]	2022	Single	Mixed	Decompose the problem into three subproblem: employ K-means clustering for UAV deployment and user pairing, PSO for hybrid beamforming to maximize hit probability, and GA for optimal power allocation
	[137]	2023	Single	Continuous	Distributed cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning framework where each user acts as a learning agent for joint resource allocation using only local information
	[152]	2023	Single	Continuous	The problem is modeled as a MDP under stochastic and time-varying channels, and the deep deterministic policy gradient algorithm is employed to optimize both the joint covariance matrix design at the base station and the passive beamforming design
	[138]	2025	Single	Continuous	Propose an enhanced genetic algorithm that employs multi-point randomized crossover combined with a forced local mutation mechanism around the current population optimum
Satellite-UAV	[153]	2023	Single	Discrete	Binary-encoded GA with single-point crossover, bit-flip mutation, and roulette-wheel selection
	[95]	2023	Single	Continuous	The initialization process adopts a normal distribution, incorporates GA's crossover operation, DE's mutation and natural selection mechanisms into PSO to escape local optima
	[109]	2024	Single	Mixed	Integrate GA to refine select particles in each PSO generation and use a parameter-free penalty function
	[87]	2024	Multiple	Discrete	Introduce heterogeneous colonies with different objective preferences, each using five pheromone matrix pairs; design feasible solution generation method for solution construction, solution division method for quality improvement, and pheromone update method for adaptive pheromone updating
	[89]	2025	Multiple	Discrete	ACO guides routing using neural network heuristics; ants explore paths via state transition, update pheromones based on cost-quality, and iteratively improve routing for Transformer-based VNF embedding
	[118]	2025	Single	Continuous	Employ Quantum Annealing (QA) on QUBO models, enhanced by deriving penalty bounds and optimizing scaling parameters with Taylor approximation and Mixed-integer linear fractional programming, avoiding heuristic tuning
Sensing & Comm.	[120]	2021	Multiple	Discrete	Convert multi-objective optimization to single-objective using a weighted-sum vector; binary-encoded GA with single-point crossover, bit-flip mutation, and invalid-individual removal
	[76]	2024	Single	Mixed	Hybrid GA-PSO, where in each PSO generation, part of the population is refined by GA. The fitness is evaluated via a parameter-free penalty function to handle constraints
	[96]	2022	Single	Discrete	Individual is represented by a two-dimensional concatenated matrix, with initialization performed using conditioned random search instead of purely random generation
	[121]	2025	Single	Discrete	Generates the initial population with a higher likelihood of assigning a provider to a requester within the same cluster, and applies a tournament selection strategy with a larger tournament size
Underwater Comm.	[154]	2022	Single	Mixed	Integrate PSO, unequal clustering and adaptive updates of cluster sizes
	[155]	2024	Multiple	Discrete	Enhance NSGA-II with a labeled tree-based encoding scheme, steering angle prior information, and a hash-based memory search mechanism
	[156]	2025	Single	Mixed	Combine model-based optimization (bisection and Lagrange dual) and DDPG for spectrum assignment
Others	[150]	2024	Multiple	Continuous	Temperature-based perturbation, domain-specific tuning
	[122]	2023	Multiple	Continuous	Neural network is trained to model geometry-S-parameter relation; SA optimizes geometric parameters via the ANN surrogate to broaden bandwidth while keeping the required center frequency
	[119]	2024	Single	Continuous	DeepEigNet initialization, probability-guided moves, and an early stopping mechanism
	[79]	2025	Multiple	Continuous	Convert multi-objective optimization to single-objective using a weighted-sum vector; integrate a grouping and merging strategy that enhances information sharing and diversity by allowing particles to learn within groups and periodically merge in a controlled manner; precision-matched perturbations are introduced to maintain search momentum

information. A representative class of studies formulates joint beamforming and phase-shift design problems under throughput- or fairness-oriented objectives. For example, Zhi *et al.* [157] considered sum-rate and max-min rate maximization in RIS-assisted massive MU-MIMO uplink systems, where a novel GA is employed to search over coupled active beamforming vectors and RIS phase configurations. Regarding high-frequency scenarios, SI-based methods have been adopted to cope with severe path loss and blockage effects. In [158], an RIS-aided Millimeter Wave (mmWave) Massive MU-MIMO uplink is considered, where PSO is employed to jointly design beamformers and RIS phase shifts. The problem is formulated as achievable-rate maximization under practical constraints on transmit power, beamforming structure, and RIS phase range, with PSO searching over the coupled active and passive beamforming variables. Specifically, the RIS phase shifts are treated as particle positions

that are iteratively updated based on both their individual best performance and on the global best performance of the swarm. The presence of an RIS optimized by PSO alleviates the deleterious disruptive effects of the wireless propagation environment.

When network dynamics and mobility are explicitly considered, learning-based SO techniques are introduced to handle complex decision spaces. Mei *et al.* [82] proposed a Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) framework for jointly optimizing UAV trajectory and RIS phase-shift in a RIS-assisted UAV communication system, aiming for minimizing the UAV's overall propulsion energy usage across all time slots. The system involves a UAV serving ground terminals with the aid of a RIS deployed on buildings to overcome blockages. The authors employ Double Deep Q-Network (DDQN) for discrete UAV actions and DDPG for continuous control, both integrating RIS phase adaptation. Reliability-oriented designs further extend

SO applications beyond rate-based objectives. Chien *et al.* [8] explored the optimization of communication reliability in RIS-assisted MU-MIMO systems as a multivariate function of both the phase shifts introduced by the RIS and the beamforming vectors of the BS. To tackle this, the authors proposed a DE algorithm and invoked LS techniques at the end of each generation, allowing effective handling of the non-convex Symbol Error Rate (SER) optimization problem, helps to avoid getting stuck in local optima.

Overall, existing SO-based studies on RIS-assisted networks can be broadly categorized into metaheuristic-driven approaches for joint active-passive beamforming under unit-modulus constraints, and learning-based frameworks for dynamic scenarios involving mobility, mixed discrete-continuous decisions, and long-term performance objectives.

Massive MU-MIMO/Cell-Free Massive MU-MIMO: SO techniques are widely adopted to address large-scale and time-varying resource allocation problems involving communication, computing, and energy management. Tilahun *et al.* [137] formulated a joint communication-and-computing optimization problem to minimize the total energy consumption of users in a Cell-Free Massive MU-MIMO-assisted MEC network under stringent latency constraints. Both task arrivals and wireless channel states are modeled as stochastic processes. To enable scalable real-time decision making, the authors proposed a MARL framework with centralized training and decentralized execution, allowing distributed agents to coordinate resource allocation decisions without excessive signaling overhead. Kurma *et al.* [152] investigated Resource Efficiency (RE) optimization in RIS-aided full-duplex MU-MIMO systems comprising a multi-antenna Base Stations (BS), uplink and downlink users, and distributed RISs. The optimization objective is to maximize RE, defined as a weighted combination of Spectral Efficiency (SE) and Energy Efficiency (EE), subject to power constraints and unit-modulus RIS phase-shift constraints. The non-convex joint optimization problem is addressed by a policy-gradient-based DRL framework with an actor-critic architecture and experience replay under dynamic channel conditions. As a further extension, Chen *et al.* [138] studied polarized hybrid beamforming in reconfigurable antenna sub-arrays for mmWave multi-user Massive MU-MIMO systems. The beamforming design is formulated as a masking matrix selection problem, where the polarization distribution, digital beamforming, and analog beamforming, implemented via phase shifters, are jointly optimized to maximize the sum rate. To solve this problem, the authors compared random mask sampling, a conventional GA, and an enhanced GA incorporating targeted perturbation strategies, highlighting the role of evolutionary search in exploring large combinatorial beamforming spaces. Finally, Chien *et al.* [159] employed augmented DE for RIS phase optimization in Cell-Free Massive MU-MIMO channel estimation. By injecting targeted perturbations into elite candidates, the method minimizes normalized mean squared error while mitigating premature convergence.

SO in Massive and Cell-Free Massive MU-MIMO systems is predominantly driven by scalability and coordination requirements. Learning-based approaches, particularly multi-agent and policy-gradient RL, are employed to enable distributed decision making across antennas, users, and edge resources, while EA and SI-based methods are leveraged to handle high-dimensional, mixed-integer, and gradient-intractable beamforming and configuration problems.

Airborne communication: Optimizing resource usage in

space-air communication involves challenging path planning problems characterized by complex 3D environments, dynamic obstacles, and energy constraints. In [85], Yu *et al.* formulated the UAV trajectory planning task as an NP-hard optimization problem to minimize a weighted path cost capturing the propagation distance, obstacle avoidance, yaw and pitch angles, and altitude constraints. To address the non-convex and multi-objective nature of this problem, the authors employed a hybrid PSO framework that integrates SA for escaping local optima and a dimensional learning strategy to improve convergence behavior. This aims for a balance between exploration versus exploitation for high-quality UAV trajectory planning. Regarding a network-layer perspective, airborne communication also face resource allocation challenges at higher protocol layers, particularly in content delivery and caching under dynamic demand and limited opportunities. The research [160] investigated a three-layer airborne communication architecture integrating satellites, terrestrial base stations, and aircraft-assisted caching. The content placement problem is formulated to minimize end-to-end delivery latency while accounting for time-varying content popularity, heterogeneous cache capacities, and constrained communication durations. To address this problem, the authors modeled content placement and delivery as a Markov decision process and employed a DRL-based approach to learn adaptive caching policies in dynamic airborne environments.

SO in airborne communication networks is mainly applied at two levels: trajectory-level optimization to handle mobility and environmental uncertainty, and network-layer resource management to adapt content delivery and caching decisions under dynamic demand and connectivity constraints.

Satellite communication: SO methods are utilized in optimizing constellation layouts of NG satellites, dynamically steering beams, and judiciously allocating both spectrum and power under uncertain link conditions to maximize coverage and throughput. Song *et al.* [161] investigated task scheduling for a group of electromagnetic exploration satellites by formulating the problem as a mixed-integer optimization task that maximizes detection profit. To solve this problem, a GA is combined with a learning-based adaptation mechanism, where a recurrent neural network dynamically adjusts crossover and mutation parameters under the guidance of a policy-gradient RL strategy. This hybrid design enables adaptive search behavior in evolving large-scale satellite scheduling scenarios. Beyond scheduling, learning-based SO frameworks have been adopted for joint resource allocation and caching in integrated terrestrial-satellite systems. In [162], Li *et al.* proposed a MARL framework based on Multi-Agent Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (MADDPG) to jointly optimize user association, power control, and cache placement in satellite-assisted Non-Orthogonal Multiple Access (NOMA) networks. The problem is formulated as a constrained EE maximization task, where different agents coordinate to manage communication and caching decisions. In addition to throughput-oriented objectives, information freshness has emerged as an important performance metric in satellite-enabled IoT networks.

SO in satellite communication primarily addresses mixed-integer scheduling and long-term resource coordination in dynamic, large-scale, and heterogeneous environments, enabling adaptive decision making under time-varying traffic demands, diverse link conditions, and complex system architectures.

Integrated Sensing and Communication (ISAC): SO is employed to manage tightly coupled sensing-communication resource allocation under mobility, uncertainty, and dynamic

traffic conditions. Typical challenges include joint bandwidth, power allocation, infrastructure activation, and latency-sensing trade-offs in highly dynamic environments. Zhang *et al.* [163] studied ISAC optimization in vehicle-to-infrastructure systems by maximizing the aggregate radar sensing rate across multiple BSs and time segments. The problem involves joint base station activation and bandwidth allocation under stochastic network conditions. The authors, then, adopted a RL approach using a double DQN, which simultaneously learns the optimal bandwidth distribution and BS selection. The approach enables adaptive decision-making across sensing and communication dimensions. In Internet of Vehicles scenarios, Liu *et al.* [164] considered ISAC-enabled multi-BS systems under spectrum scarcity. The resource allocation problem is decomposed into two stages, where a DDPG framework dynamically allocates transmission power and channels based on vehicle locations to maximize SE, followed by a DQN that assigns bandwidth to further coordinate communication performance while satisfying sensing constraints and adapting to varying traffic loads. ISAC optimization has also been investigated in high-mobility scenarios such as UAV-assisted high-speed rail systems. Qiao *et al.* [165] formulated a mixed-integer nonlinear optimization problem to maximize the fair sum rate of passengers under radar sensing constraints. Then, a hybrid PSO-GA approach is employed, combining the convergence capabilities of PSO with the strong global search capability of GA. In the PSO phase, particles navigate the search space by adjusting the positions based on their own personal bests and the swarm's global best.

Mobile edge computing: SO methods have demonstrated strong potential in efficiently managing task distribution and resource scheduling amidst erratically fluctuating unpredictable demands. Goudarzi *et al.* [80] investigated a UAV-assisted MEC architecture consisting of a cloud center, mobile edge servers mounted on UAVs, and mobile users coordinated via an Software-Defined Networking (SDN) controller. To overcome issues such as limited accessibility and high energy consumption, the authors proposed a cooperative EAs that jointly optimizes task offloading and bandwidth allocation under energy and communication constraints. Multi-objective task offloading has also been extensively studied in MEC systems. Wang *et al.* [166] proposed a comprehensive multiobjective optimization framework for task offloading, power allocation, and resource scheduling in multi-user, multi-server MEC systems. Each offloading decision must balance three conflicting objectives: minimizing response time, energy consumption, and usage cost, while operating under constraints such as limited server resources and device power budgets. To solve this, the authors developed an improved multiobjective EA based on decomposition, which encodes decisions into chromosomes and employs potent constraint-handling strategies, crossover/mutation operations, and decision-making methods for solution selection, such as simple additive weighting or multiple criteria-based decision-making. Partial computation offloading has been considered to enhance EE. Bi *et al.* [88] designed an EE partial computation offloading strategy for MEC supporting smart mobile devices, aiming for minimizing the total energy consumption by jointly optimizing offloading ratios, central processing unit speeds, bandwidth allocations, and transmission power, subject to latency, resource, and energy constraints. Then, the authors proposed a novel hybrid metaheuristic algorithm, namely Genetic Simulated-Annealing-based Particle Swarm Optimization (GSP). Specifically, the GA's crossover and mutation operations are applied for producing superior




Figure 11: Hybridization of metaheuristics and RL.

particles and for enhancing the PSO's global search capability. Additionally, the SA's Metropolis acceptance rule is used when updating particle positions, allowing the algorithm to escape local optima.

Underwater acoustic communications: SO plays a critical role in overcoming severe energy constraints, hostile time-variant channel conditions, and multi-hop routing challenges. Hou *et al.* [154] investigated energy-aware clustering and routing in three-dimensional Underwater Acoustic Sensor Networks (UASNs) by formulating a network lifetime maximization problem that balances energy consumption among sensor nodes. The optimization focuses on joint cluster-head selection, cluster size configuration, and routing path planning, with objective functions incorporating residual energy, communication distance, and load distribution. A PSO-based approach is adopted to iteratively explore feasible clustering and routing configurations under dynamic topology conditions.

Joint spectrum and power allocation problems have been addressed in underwater environments. Tang *et al.* [156] presented a comprehensive solution for resource allocation in UASNs, where sensor nodes transmit data to a central sink over harsh underwater acoustic channels. The goal is to maximize the minimum rate across all users, subject to constraints on power allocation and partial spectrum sharing. As the absence of closed-form spectrum assignment models and the presence of non-convex interference coupling, the authors combined a GA for coarse spectrum allocation with a DRL approach based on DDPG to refine power and spectrum decisions in a data-driven manner. The GA is initially applied for approximating the global optimum, while the DRL-based approach is employed to efficiently explore the entire solution space and achieve the optimal resource allocation. Energy harvesting and mobility further increase the complexity of underwater resource management. Han *et al.* [167] studied a cooperative uplink UASNs with mobile relays powered by energy harvesting. The problem of jointly optimizing relay selection and transmission power is formulated to maximize long-term uplink capacity under battery and power constraints. The main challenge lies in the coupled discrete-continuous nature of the problem, aggravated by the stochastic nature of energy harvesting, node mobility, and limited channel information. To overcome these challenges, the authors leveraged a divide-and-conquer DRL-based approach. DQN for relay selection and DDPG for power allocation, along with a reconstructed state space and an adaptive reward mechanism that balances short-term throughput with long-term energy sustainability.

Performance results: In Fig. 13, we consider a Massive MU-MIMO system in which a BS having up to 100 antennas serves




Figure 12: Cutting-edge technologies integrated in NG wireless networks classified into four layers consisting of space, air, terrestrial, and underwater communications.




Figure 13: Pareto front obtained by NSGA-II for the joint design of RIS elements and the number of antennas at the BS, considering the three different objectives.

50 users uniformly distributed within an area of $0.5 \times 0.5 \text{ km}^2$. To enhance communication performance, a RIS having 256 elements is installed in the coverage area and the channel information is modeled according to [8]. A multi-objective optimization problem jointly designs the number of active BS antennas and the configuration of RIS elements for simultaneously maximizing three objectives: sum rate, minimum rate, and EE. Fig. 13a demonstrates the convergence performance of the NSGA-II algorithm, configured with a population size of 100 and 100 generations. The Pareto front obtained closely approximates the true front after approximately 10,000 fitness evaluations. The 2D Pareto front between EE and minimum rate illustrates the robustness and diversity preservation capability of NSGA-II in capturing trade-offs among the objectives.

In Fig. 14, we consider a network where a ground BS communicates with UAVs equipped with backscatter devices that relay information to end users. We formulate a novel optimization problem for jointly determining the dynamic time-splitting ratio and flight trajectory of the UAVs under imperfect channel state information, while considering key factors such as UAV flight duration, altitude, and transmission power. The performance comparison between a deterministic BCD-based algorithm and various SO algorithms, including GA, DE, PSO, SA, Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO), and ABC, under different transmit power levels of the GBS. Quantitatively, the achievable rate consistently increases with the GBS transmit power for




Figure 14: Stochastic versus deterministic optimization for joint trajectory and dynamic time-splitting ratio in a two-UAV-assisted system.

all methods, where the SO algorithms substantially outperform the BCD benchmark. Specifically, the SO techniques achieve rate improvements ranging from 73.79% to 95.89%, while the computational time is reduced by as much as 15.78% to 95.47%. Additionally, GA exhibits the highest achievable rate. SA and GWO require longer execution times compared to other SO methods. In contrast, DE and PSO present a favorable trade-off between solution quality and computation cost.

6) *Lessons learned:* Since cutting-edge technologies like Massive/Cell-Free MU-MIMO, joint communication and sensing, and RIS might introduce complex SE expressions under dynamic and uncertain environments, SO proves valuable by offering flexibility in adapting to real-time changes. It is capable of outperforming static or deterministic methods in handling unpredictable channel conditions, mobility, and interference. In a nutshell, while SO is attractive for complex and uncertain environments introduced by NG technologies, its continued development must focus on scalability, adaptability, and real-world applicability. These insights are crucial for designing high-performance NG wireless systems that are resilient and efficient.

V. INTEGRATION OF SO WITH FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES

Open question seven: How can SO collaborate with emerging technologies, e.g. generative AI, in resource allocation for NG networks?

1) *Background:* The transition to 6G is underpinned by the convergence of Distributed Systems [138], Generative AI [168],




Figure 15: SO combining with the emerging technologies in NG wireless networks.

[169], and Automation frameworks [170]. While distributed architectures enhance scalability [171], their efficacy is compromised by inherent network stochasticity, rendering centralized deterministic controls inadequate. Concurrently, Generative AI models, encompassing LLMs [172], diffusion models [173], and Generative Adversarial Network (GANs) [168], drive intelligent operations [169], [174] but face severe integration challenges at the edge, including energy constraints and non-stationary data distributions. Meanwhile, network automation is critical for managing complexity via frameworks like intent-based networking and zero-touch management [175]. By translating high-level user intents (e.g., maximizing Quality of Experience (QoE)) into autonomous decisions, these systems enhance scalability across multi-service environments. However, their efficacy is challenged by the stochastic, partially observable nature of NG networks, where ambiguous intents and delayed feedback complicate real-time control. Across these technological domains, the dominance of stochasticity renders deterministic optimization fundamentally inadequate. Conversely, SO provides the essential mathematical scaffolding to navigate uncertainty (see Fig. 15). By enabling robust decision-making under noisy, partial information and facilitating model-free learning in non-stationary environments, SO acts as a foundational enabler for distributed systems, LLM-driven intelligence, and autonomous orchestration in NG networks.

2) Key features and considerations:

Distributed implementation: Distributed systems are exemplified by technologies such as MEC, Federated Learning (FL), cell-free massive MU-MIMO, and RIS clusters, just to name a few. Operating in inherently decentralized architectures, these systems must handle dynamic constraints, which often break convexity assumptions and limit the feasibility of centralized optimization approaches. Therefore, decision-making is typically based on asynchronous, partial, and non-stationary feedback, which is reliably managed by population-based SO methods.

- *SI* represented by, for example, PSO and ACO is inherently decentralized, making them well-suited for distributed optimization. These algorithms rely on local interactions and limited information exchange, allowing agents (e.g., edge devices, UAVs, RIS elements) to independently adapt based on their own local observations and shared best-known solutions. This results in low communication overhead and high scalability, critical for large-scale dynamic networks.
- *EAs* as gradient-free and population-based methods inherently

support parallel computation by evolving candidate solutions locally on distributed nodes (e.g., island models). This architecture accommodates heterogeneous environments with varying node capabilities and link qualities. For instance, Li *et al.* [176] introduced a fully distributed DE framework utilizing a three-layer architecture for parallel fitness evaluation and adaptive migration, significantly accelerating convergence in resource allocation tasks.

- *RL* facilitates autonomous, asynchronous decision-making in distributed systems by optimizing long-term objectives via localized environmental interactions. This capability is critical for tasks constrained by partial observability, such as distributed caching [177] or federated learning [41]. Furthermore, RL enables model-free adaptation to stochastic dynamics [178], while advanced techniques like mean-field approximation and parameter sharing support scalable cooperation in continuous action spaces [179].

- *Other SO Frameworks:* Stochastic frameworks, such as gradient descent and dual decomposition, align with distributed architectures by partitioning global objectives into decoupled local subproblems governed by message passing or shared dual variables. Their robust convergence properties under noisy gradients render them indispensable for managing computation-latency trade-offs in MEC and federated learning, thereby facilitating real-time adaptive control.

SO with generative AI: Integrating Generative AI models, encompassing LLMs, diffusion models, and GANs, into network optimization pipelines requires scalable, uncertainty-resilient decision-making mechanisms. Therein, SO provides a natural framework for enabling sample-efficient search, robust adaptation, and multi-objective trade-off handling. The interplay between SO and Generative AI-based intelligence unfolds along the following key dimensions:

- *SI* in the convergence with generative AI establishes a dual-functional framework. Classical algorithms, such as PSO, function as external optimizers that refine generative outputs to satisfy stringent QoS constraints like latency and energy [180]. Conversely, Generative AI agents (most notably LLMs) can themselves be employed within a swarm-like architecture, forming distributed decision-making entities capable of interpreting local context and coordinating via prompt-driven protocols. In this paradigm, SI principles provide a coordination scaffold for distributed LLM agents, enabling decentralized negotiation and emergent policy synthesis within complex multi-agent environments [181].
- *EAs* combining with generative AI results in a powerful synergy between generative capability (e.g., distribution modeling in GANs [169]) and global search [182]. Meanwhile, EAs-enhanced Generative AI utilizes EAs for optimizing the inputs (prompts/noise vectors), parameters, or inference trajectories of models, particularly when model internals are inaccessible (black-box) or when optimizing over multiple objectives. For example, Liu *et al.* [183] introduced an LLM-driven Evolutionary Algorithm (LMEA), utilizing LLMs to execute crossover and mutation operations via prompt engineering. Reciprocally, Generative AI-enhanced EAs refers to using models to assist the evolutionary search process. While GANs could generate high-quality initial populations or surrogate models to accelerate convergence [168], [169], LLMs offer a semantic advantage by interpreting challenging problem contexts [184]. These bidirectional synergies facilitate a more adaptive approach to SO, leveraging both structured search

and generative reasoning.

- *RL* integrating with generative AI constitutes a robust closed-loop framework. Generative models augment RL agents by synthesizing training trajectories or distilling unstructured states, exemplified by LLM-guided policy updates in O-Radio Access Network (RAN) slicing [185]. Conversely, RL optimizes the deployment of generative models. For instance, RL is used for determining split points in edge hierarchies to minimize latency and energy consumption [186]. Overall, this combination unifies structured policy learning with flexible generative capabilities, paving the way for autonomous NG network control.
- *Other SO frameworks*: Beyond LLMs, diffusion models and Variational Autoencoder (VAE)s [173], [187] synergize with zero-order optimization and Bayesian Optimization (BO) to address black-box uncertainty. Specifically, deep generative simulators provide robust modeling of temporal-spatial channel randomness [188]. For instance, robust optimization frameworks utilizing deep generative simulators (e.g., diffusion models) provide a principled way of modeling and handling temporal-spatial randomness in wireless channels [189]. Meanwhile, BO ensures sample-efficient hyperparameter tuning, exemplified by prompt-guided LLM placement in edge environments [190].

SO in automation: As NG networks evolve toward full autonomy, SO provides the essential algorithmic scaffolding for self-configuration, self-optimization, and self-healing amidst high-dimensional uncertainty. By facilitating both reactive adaptation and proactive intent management under stochastic traffic and topology changes, SO empowers the multi-layer automation stack.

- *SI* algorithms, such as PSO and ACO, enable adaptive behavior through local interactions, facilitating scalable decision-making under dynamically fluctuating and uncertain conditions. Conforth and Meng [191] proposed a SI-based RL framework for training Artificial Neural Network (ANN), combining ACO and PSO for determining an ANN topology and the associated connection weights. The method is validated on a robot localization task, demonstrating the effectiveness of the SI-RL synergy for distributed control applications.
- *EAs* support automation in NG networks by evolving adaptive policies and configurations without gradient dependence through population-based search and adaptive operators. Through mechanisms like island-model evolution, they facilitate automated intent-to-policy translation and distributed decision-making. These capabilities make EAs natural fit for zero-touch management, allowing self-optimize and adapt to dynamic, uncertain environments. For example, Li *et al.* [176] present an automated distributed differential evolution framework. Therein, evolutionary search is performed by multiple DE populations, while automation is introduced through performance-driven fitness evaluation allocation. This allows the system to autonomously manage computational resources and accelerate convergence.
- *RL* has emerged as a key pillar for closed-loop automation, enabling systems to learn optimal policies via interaction with the network environment. In NG networks, RL supports autonomous decision-making for routing, spectrum allocation, energy management, and more. MARL further enables coordination across heterogeneous nodes, while online RL techniques allow continuous adaptation in real deployments where

conditions shift frequently. Farzanullah *et al.* in [192] employ MARL for resource allocation in factory automation networks to meet URLLC requirements, for enabling decentralized decision-making, enhancing communication reliability, and supporting real-time industrial automation.

- *Other SO frameworks*: Complementary techniques such as Bayesian optimization, zero-order optimization, and generative models are vital for black-box automation where gradients are unavailable. BO excels in sample-efficient hyperparameter tuning, exemplified by its role in guiding multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for automated, energy-efficient UAV coordination [193]. Similarly, zero-order optimization facilitates online configuration in noisy, model-free environments, proving particularly effective for gradient-independent tasks as adaptive load balancing and real-time sensor management [194].

Table VI provides an overview of how various SO approaches are applied across distributed systems, Generative AI models, and automation in NG networks, highlighting their key features, tasks, and real-world applications.

- 3) *Lessons learned*: The integration of SO with distributed architecture, Generative AI, and automation offers critical insights into the design of self-evolving NG networks. SO enhances distributed systems by enabling decentralized decision-making, robust adaptation to dynamic conditions via SI and EAs. Furthermore, a bidirectional synergy characterizes the interplay between SO and Generative AI. While models encompassing LLMs, diffusion models, and GANs enhance SO through semantic reasoning, latent state abstraction, and synthetic data augmentation. Reciprocally, SO grounds these generative outputs, acting as a rigorous feedback mechanism to optimize prompts, refine black-box inference trajectories, and enforce physical constraints. For network automation, SO and RL enable self-optimization and self-healing in response to changing conditions, enhancing efficiency and service quality. However, challenges remain, such as computational and energy constraints at the edge and partial observability in dynamic environments. Real-time adaptation and scalability are difficult with the limited resources of distributed systems. Addressing these necessitates a pivot toward lightweight, model-free optimization and federated learning paradigms to reconcile algorithmic complexity with distributed resource limitations.

Open question eight. How can QC boost the capabilities of SO in NG networks?

- 1) *Background*: As NG network problems grow in complexity, driven by multi-agent coordination, large-scale device populations, and multi-objective trade-offs, classical SO algorithms increasingly suffer from four major limitations including *i) exponential computational complexity*: The combinatorial nature of problems like RIS configuration, task off-loading, or trajectory control leads to search spaces that grow exponentially with the number of variables, making global optimization intractable for classical Central Processing Unit (CPU)/Graphics Processing Unit (GPU); *ii) convergence inefficiency*: Population-based algorithms and deep reinforcement learning require large iteration counts and extensive sampling to reach acceptable performance, often violating latency constraints in practice; *iii) sample inefficiency under uncertainty*: In partially observed, non-stationary environments, classical SO suffers from limited exploration capability and difficulty in adapting to unseen conditions or environmental shifts; and *iv) energy and hardware inefficiency*:

Table VI: Integration of SO with distributed systems, generative AI, and automation tasks: Summary of key approaches, their features, and applications.

Technology	Approach	Key Features	Synergies & Applications
Distributed systems and edge intelligence	SI	Decentralized coordination; local feedback adaptation; scalable and robust to noise.	Distributed resource allocation [195].
	EAs	Parallelizable; robust to mobility and fading; mixed-variable optimization.	Distributed DE resource allocation [176].
	RL	Asynchronous local decision-making; handles non-stationary dynamics.	Cooperative edge caching [177], FL [41], UAV pathing [196].
	Other SO	SGD, dual decomposition, stochastic approximation.	MEC/FL adaptation under energy and latency.
Generative AI	SI	Optimizing generative outputs (e.g., LLM/diffusion) or coordinating agents.	Reasoning enhancement [180], swarm LLMs [181].
	EAs	Generative population initialization (GANs); LLM-enhanced operators.	GAN-assisted optimization [168], [169], LMEA [182], EAs-guided slicing [184].
	RL	GenAI-based state abstraction/augmentation; RL for model deployment.	Prompt-augmented RL policy [185], LLM split computing [186].
	Other SO	Generative simulators (Diffusion/VAE); robust zero-order solvers.	Diffusion-based channel modeling [173], [188], VAE-based design [187], LLM-enhanced BO [190].
Automation	SI	Agent coordination; dynamic adaptive behavior.	SI-enhanced model training [191].
	EAs	Long-term planning and policy evolution.	Adaptive resource allocation [176].
	RL	Closed-loop control, MARL, online learning.	MARL in URLLC factory settings [192].
	Other SO	BO, zero-order tuning, generative models.	UAV offloading w/ BO [193], sensor management [194].




Figure 16: Conceptual comparison between classical hardware-based parallelism (top) and quantum-inspired intrinsic parallelism via superposition mapping (bottom).

Classical processors consume significant energy when scaling SO across large network scenarios, raising concerns about sustainability, especially at the edge.

These limitations necessitate a paradigm shift toward QC [197], [198]. By leveraging superposition, entanglement, and tunneling, QC facilitates intrinsic parallel exploration, thereby reducing the computational complexity of SO beyond the reach of classical hardware acceleration.

2) *Key features and considerations:* We now examine how QC augments each class of SO techniques, from population-based metaheuristics and RL to black-box and sampling-based frameworks, and discuss implementation trade-offs at the hardware and algorithmic level.

Quantum-inspired Metaheuristic (QIM): Quantum-inspired metaheuristics integrate quantum principles into classical algorithms such as GA, PSO, or ACO. As illustrated in Fig. 17, the QIM-based stochastic optimization employs probabilistic qubit representations during initialization, thereby maximizing diversity. Subsequently, quantum-inspired operators, such as rotation gates or phase shifts, dynamically update these states, enabling interference-like behavior and escape from local optima. Therefore, this integration accelerates convergence and improves performance in high-dimensional, multi-objective wireless optimization tasks. To justify the intrinsic amalgamation of quantum principles within our framework, Fig. 16 illustrates

the fundamental operational distinction. Classical algorithms (top panel) rely on serial processing or hardware-based parallelism. In contrast, the low panel demonstrates the proposed quantum-inspired mechanism acting as a quantum coprocessor. Specifically, a superposition mapping operator (e.g., Hadamard) transforms classical information into a single superimposed state ($|\Psi\rangle$) [199]. This exploits intrinsic state-space parallelism, evaluating the entire solution space via a quantum oracle (U_f) in a single step, thereby accelerating the search for high-dimensional NG network configurations [199]. The detailed features are

- *Quantum encoding for richer search representation:* In classical metaheuristics (e.g., GA, PSO), solution representations are fixed and explicit, limiting each candidate to a single deterministic point in the search space devoid of probabilistic superposition. Conversely, quantum-inspired metaheuristics utilize qubit encodings to represent decision variables as state superpositions. This facilitates a probabilistic mapping of the entire search space, enabling the simultaneous exploration of multiple potential solutions. For instance, quantum-behaved PSO [200] utilizes phase angle encoding and quantum attractor-based stochastic sampling to represent particle positions, thereby facilitating broader probabilistic exploration.
- *Quantum-inspired operators:* While classical operators (e.g., crossover) rely on static heuristics, quantum-inspired frameworks employ adaptive mechanisms like rotation gates and phase shifts. These operators update probability amplitudes via success-driven adjustments, leveraging quantum interference to dynamically guide the search. Quantum-inspired Genetic Algorithms (QIGA), for instance, apply quantum operators such as rotation gates, Hadamard transformations, and quantum mutation (e.g., Pauli-X gates) to evolve qubit-based solutions in a probabilistic manner. This enables gradient-free, adaptive search across complex, high-dimensional spaces. Saad *et al.* [201] demonstrated that QIGA leverages superposition and gate-based updates to optimize resource-constrained scheduling efficiently. This approach is particularly suited for NG network tasks like offloading and routing, coping effectively with non-differentiable or simulation-dependent objectives.
- *Interference and quantum tunneling for escaping local optima:* A major challenge in classical metaheuristics is premature convergence to local optima, especially in non-convex optimization landscapes. Quantum-inspired metaheuristics integrate quantum tunneling and wave interference principles




Figure 17: SO based on quantum computation.

to enable escape from local traps. In practice, this can be implemented via probabilistic reinitialization schemes or non-local update operators that allow solutions to “jump” between regions of the search space. Notably, QA frameworks, such as those realized by D-Wave systems [202], use quantum tunneling to traverse energy barriers between local and global optima in a potential landscape, which can be emulated by quantum-inspired algorithms through probabilistic perturbations or hybrid annealing schedules.

- *Parallel evaluation via quantum coprocessor paradigm:* Unlike classical optimizers that evaluate solutions sequentially or rely on hardware duplication, QC leverages superposition to encode and process a large set of candidate states simultaneously. This reflects a hybrid quantum-classical workflow suitable for the Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum (NISQ) era, where the quantum module acts as a quantum coprocessor. As demonstrated in recent frameworks [202], this collaboration is bidirectional: classical algorithms are employed to fine-tune the parameters (e.g., rotation angles θ) of the quantum circuit, while the quantum coprocessor executes the computationally intensive evaluation of multiple configurations in parallel via superposition. For instance, quantum annealers (e.g., D-Wave) exploit this property to evaluate global energy states for QUBO problems, achieving near-optimal sum-rate performance with significantly reduced running time.

Quantum Reinforcement Learning (QRL): RL is frequently used for dynamic spectrum access, mobility management, energy-efficient control, and intent-based orchestration. However, classical RL suffers from slow convergence, poor sample efficiency, and local policy entrapment under highly stochastic and multi-objective environments. In NG networks, QRL offers meaningful improvements:

- *Quantum encoding for richer policy and state representation:* Quantum encoding fundamentally enhances environmental representation in reinforcement learning by utilizing qubits, which, unlike binary bits, exist in superposition to capture continuous probabilistic configurations [203]. This capacity enables the efficient encoding of exponentially larger state-action spaces using fewer physical units. Furthermore, entangled qubit configurations efficiently model complex dependencies, such as spatial-temporal correlations. This provides a compact, information-rich representation for high-dimensional NG network states, enabling agents to evaluate diverse policies with greater nuance [204].
- *Quantum-inspired operators for adaptive learning:* Quantum reinforcement learning replaces neural networks with param-

eterized gates and Variational Quantum Circuits (VQCs) as function approximators [203], [205]. By leveraging trainable rotation and entanglement, these operators achieve high expressivity with significantly fewer parameters, yielding compact models robust to high-dimensional control tasks. In practical NG network scenarios, such as MEC [205] or joint sensing and communication systems [206], these quantum-enhanced update mechanisms allow agents to rapidly adjust their strategies in response with improved stability and convergence behavior.

- *Quantum superposition for parallel policy evaluation:* Quantum superposition enables the simultaneous evaluation of multiple policy trajectories within a single state [207], [208]. This intrinsic parallelism significantly enhances search efficiency, allowing broader exploration per iteration without additional computational overhead. In scenarios like dense IoT coordination, this parallelism significantly accelerates learning and sample efficiency. Consequently, QRL converges to optimal strategies faster than classical counterparts, satisfying the critical temporal constraints of NG networks.
- *Reduction in training parameters and model complexity:* QRL exploits the exponential expressiveness of Hilbert spaces to approximate complex policies via compact parameterized gates [204]. This drastic reduction in parameterization minimizes memory and computational overhead, thereby accelerating policy optimization [208]. Such efficiency is particularly advantageous in resource-constrained settings [203], [205], [209], where classical deep RL models may be impractical due to hardware limitations. By aligning learning performance with stringent resource constraints, QRL offers a promising framework for scalable deployment in NG network environments.

To fully leverage the potential of quantum reinforcement learning, several architectural variants, each with distinct strengths, have been proposed, as summarized in Table VII.

Hardware and algorithmic considerations: To employ quantum-enhanced SO in practice, both hardware feasibility and algorithmic robustness must be considered. These considerations determine whether a technique is realistic in near-term hybrid systems or requires fault-tolerant QC.

- *Encoding constraints and embedding overheads:* Quantum hardware imposes strict constraints on how problems must be encoded. For example, quantum annealers (e.g., D-Wave) require problems to be formulated as QUBO or Ising models. By contrast, gate-based quantum computers necessitate variational formulations with Parameterized Quantum Circuits (PQCs). Additionally, embedding overhead arises when logical variables must be mapped onto physical qubits with limited connectivity. Complex problems such as user association, joint power-bandwidth allocation, or RIS phase control often require thousands of variables, far exceeding current hardware capabilities unless aggressive dimensionality reduction or clustering is applied. For instance, Dinh *et al.* [210] applied QA to satellite beam placement, employing Hamiltonian reduction to decompose the problem into sub-instances compatible with D-Wave hardware limits.
- *Hybrid quantum-classical integration:* Given the NISQ nature of today’s quantum processors, most real-world applications require hybrid workflows where quantum routines augment classical optimization components. A common structure involves using quantum modules, such as QA for search, sampling, or policy generation, while the objective function

Table VII: Comparison of quantum-specific architectures driving performance in NG networks

Architecture	Structure	Strength	Representative Application
Hybrid quantum-classical non-sequential architecture	Classical feedforward layers for input/output, with multiple non-sequential VQCs in the middle layer.	Enables finer control over qubits, reduces entanglement overhead, improves generalization and scalability in quantum-classical systems.	Joint task offloading and resource allocation in MEC environments [205], [207], LEO satellite routing [209].
Layerwise quantum deep reinforcement learning	Deep quantum network with RX/RY/CZ gates per layer and local loss calculation at each quantum layer instead of a single global loss.	Avoids barren plateaus, supports deeper quantum networks, enables faster convergence and stable training with less memory overhead.	UAV trajectory and power allocation optimization under energy-efficiency constraints [203].
Multi-agent quantum reinforcement learning	Decentralized agents each with independent quantum policy networks using VQCs, trained from local observations and rewards.	Scalable multi-agent coordination; lowers communication overhead; resilient to partial observability; suitable for large-scale systems.	Irregular repetition slotted ALOHA-NOMA adaptive transmission [204].
Quantum actor-critic with quantum policy circuits	Actor and/or critic networks modeled with parameterized quantum circuits; can use shared encoders and hybrid classical output layers.	Effective for continuous action control; enables expressive policy approximation with fewer parameters and enhanced convergence speed.	Joint Direction of Arrival (DoA) estimation and task offloading in ISAC-based 6G systems [206].

evaluation and reward feedback occur in classical simulators or digital twins [211].

- *Noise, decoherence, and error tolerance:* Quantum algorithms for SO must tackle hardware-induced quantity noise [212], [213], such as decoherence, crosstalk, and gate infidelity, which can degrade performance, particularly in feedback-intensive wireless applications. To mitigate these effects, error-aware strategies, including noisy gradient training and measurement error mitigation, enhance robustness. Additionally, redundant circuit encodings can average out stochastic failures. Minimizing quantum-classical communication latency is also critical for meeting the real-time demands of NG network controls.
- *Quantum acceleration benchmarks:* Justifying QC integration necessitates rigorous benchmarking against classical baselines (e.g., DE, PSO) across algorithmic and hardware dimensions. Critical metrics include convergence rates, multi-objective Pareto coverage, and robustness to dynamic network conditions, while hardware evaluations must quantify the wall-clock latency and power efficiency of QPUs relative to CPUs/GPUs. In UAV scheduling, Jeong *et al.* [202] demonstrated that QA surpasses classical clustering in convergence and throughput across diverse user densities, thereby providing essential empirical validation of quantum advantage in wireless scenarios.

3) *Lessons learned:* QC holds transformative potential for SO in NG networks, yet realizing its full potential requires careful alignment between algorithm design, hardware limitations, and network-specific requirements, with the key lessons:

- Quantum-inspired algorithms are immediately valuable even without access to fault-tolerant quantum hardware (e.g., quantum-inspired genetic algorithm, quantum-behaved PSO). This provides measurable gains in search diversity, convergence, and scalability across high-dimensional NG network problems. These methods offer a practical bridge between classical and QC paradigms.
- QRL offers compact and expressive control models via exploiting quantum encoding and variational circuits to reduce the number of training parameters and improve policy adaptability, which are keys for dynamic and constrained wireless environments. Their strength lies not only in expressivity but also in sample efficiency and robustness to partial observability.
- The convenient hybrid quantum-classical workflow concept emerges as the most feasible approach in the NISQ era. Embedding quantum subroutines into classical optimization pipelines, regardless whether for initialization, sampling, or policy approximation, because it can offer speedups without

full quantum stack deployment.

- Effective quantum-enhanced SO mandates QUBO, Ising, or PQC encodings, yet embedding overhead and limited connectivity necessitate dimensionality reduction or structured decomposition to ensure hardware compatibility.
- For evaluation, demonstrating quantum advantage involves more than improved solution quality. Realistic benchmarking must include energy efficiency, wall-clock latency, adaptability under uncertainty, and Pareto front coverage. Early deployments should leverage quantum simulators, bespoke hybrid components, and integration with LLMs and/or digital twins to support explainable and intent-driven network automation.
- Given the susceptibility of quantum processors to impairments, error-aware circuit design, e.g., low-depth PQCs, redundant encoding, and quantum error mitigation with or without error correction, are essential for reliable performance, especially in feedback-driven applications like real-time beamforming or resource slicing.

These insights indicate that QC, even in the current NISQ era, can meaningfully enhance SO for NG networks, especially when leveraged through hybrid, modular, and error-tolerant strategies tailored to wireless-domain constraints.

VI. DESIGN GUIDELINES, FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This section provides the design guidelines of ultra-dense deployments, multi-layer heterogeneous NG networks spanning deeply from space to underwater communications. They are expected to support massive connectivity, extreme service demands, and integration of sensing, communications, and computing functions. Then, we present a suite of potential research directions and draw tangible conclusions.

A. Generic Design Guidelines

- **Scalable System Design & Problem Formulation:** Effective formulation constitutes the mathematical foundation for scalability in NG networks. It requires defining variables across continuous (e.g., beamforming [8]), discrete (e.g., user association [95]), and mixed domains [214]. However, to tackle the curse of dimensionality in ultra-dense deployments, formulation must move beyond monolithic models by adopting *decomposition strategies* that partition large-scale problems into parallelizable subtasks [215]. Furthermore, efficient problem representation is critical; mapping multi-modal data (e.g., channel states, vision) into compact embeddings ensures tractability. Crucially, where exact global optimality is computationally infeasible, formulations should prioritize robust

feasibility via risk-aware approaches (e.g., chance-constrained optimization [216]), providing reliability bounds within the strict energy budgets of edge hardware.

- **Resource-Efficient Algorithmic Design:** Designing algorithms for NG networks mandates balancing the exploration-exploitation trade-off with stringent hardware and latency constraints.

(i) *Initialization and Representation:* As problem instances scale, naive random sampling risks premature convergence. Design must leverage domain-specific heuristics—such as using SA or PSO to generate robust initial populations [217], to guide optimization toward feasible regions rapidly.

(ii) *Hardware-Aware Execution:* Given that super-linear complexity growth taxes battery-powered devices, algorithms must incorporate **Green AI principles** (e.g., model compression) to minimize thermal stress and processing overhead [218]. Large-scale designs should further utilize decentralized multi-agent coordination with lightweight consensus to mitigate central bottlenecks [219].

(iii) *Adaptation:* Exploitation refines candidates via local search or gradient fine-tuning, while self-adaptive mechanisms (e.g., BO) dynamically calibrate parameters to handle non-stationary dynamics without exhaustive manual tuning [220].

- **Multi-dimensional Performance Evaluation:** Evaluating SO in ultra-dense networks requires going beyond simple sum-rate maximization to assess practical scalability. The evaluation framework must capture the tension between solution quality and computational cost: (i) *Optimality-Latency Trade-off:* In URLLC contexts, algorithms should be evaluated on their ability to rapidly converge to robust, near-optimal operating points rather than solely penalized for missing elusive global optima [221], [222]. (ii) *Computational Efficiency:* Metrics must explicitly quantify the runtime, memory footprint, and energy cost of the optimization process itself, ensuring the overhead does not negate system gains [223]. (iii) *Stability and Robustness:* Consistency under stochastic disturbances is vital for risk-aware designs. Finally, for multi-objective tasks, Pareto front visualization and specialized metrics (Table VIII) are necessary to analyze how well the algorithm navigates conflicting goals under high-dimensional pressure.

- **Performance evaluation:** Selecting an evaluation framework is critical for assessing SO efficacy in NG networks. Performance analysis must leverage realistic scenarios and metrics that capture solution quality, efficiency, stability, and scalability. The primary evaluation dimensions include: (i) Solution quality representing how close the result obtained is to the optimal or reference solution, typically measured through metrics such as achievable sum-rate, system utility, or energy efficiency; (ii) Convergence speed, quantified by the number of iterations or total runtime required to reach a near-optimal solution; (iii) Stability and robustness, which evaluate the consistency of results under varying initializations, stochastic disturbances, or environmental dynamics; and (iv) Computational complexity, reflecting algorithmic scalability in terms of runtime, memory, and communication overhead. Because SO is inherently non-deterministic, both the average performance and variance across multiple runs should be evaluated. Many NG network optimization tasks involve multiple conflicting goals. Evaluating algorithmic performance in such contexts requires specialized metrics that assess both convergence to the Pareto-optimal front and the diversity of solutions. Table VIII presents some common multi-objective metrics. Additionally,

the visualization of Pareto fronts can further assist in analyzing trade-offs, allowing for the intuitive comparison of algorithmic performance under different optimization priorities.

B. Future Research Directions

Drawing on the insights gained from each of the above open questions, we distill the key lessons learned and outline promising avenues for future research aimed at advancing the seamless integration of SO with NG networks.

- **Uncertainty-aware and ergodic optimization:** A fundamental challenge is that the inherent stochasticity of the NG networks erodes the reliability of deterministic allocation schemes. Hence, future research should develop SO frameworks that explicitly account for uncertainty, either by leveraging robust risk-aware formulations such as chance-constrained or distributionally robust optimization, or by employing ergodic evaluations over multiple coherence intervals. By incorporating probabilistic models and sample-based methods, resource allocation can be designed to provide reliability guarantees even in the face of highly variable hostile environments. This capability positions SO as a key enabler for robust resource management in large-scale deployments.

- **Multi-objective designs for stochastic environments:** The second critical challenge arises from the need to simultaneously optimize conflicting objectives such as spectral efficiency, energy consumption, latency, and fairness. In practice, striking compelling trade-offs becomes even more of a challenge when channel dynamics and device mobility shift the optimal balance over time, causing static single-objective solutions to degrade rapidly. Multi-objective SO offers a promising framework, yet the identification of robust Pareto-optimal solutions remains difficult in these non-stationary conditions. Future research should thus focus on algorithms capable of tracking evolving Pareto fronts, learning operator preferences on the fly, and adapting priorities across multiple time scales. Such methods will facilitate the creation of NG networks to deliver differentiated service guarantees, while maintaining efficiency and fairness that static or single-metric optimization cannot provide.

- **Gradient-free and black-box optimization:** Another pressing limitation in NG networks is the prevalence of non-convex, noisy, and simulator-only optimization problems, where no gradients are available, or they are unreliable. Resource allocation tasks such as scheduling, beam selection, or hardware-in-the-loop optimization fall directly into this category. SO provides a natural solution by offering gradient-free methods that rely on population-based search, probabilistic sampling, or reinforcement-based exploration to discover near-optimal policies without requiring analytical tractability. Future research should refine these methods to improve sample efficiency, reduce computational overhead, and enable online adaptation. By doing so, black-box SO will become indispensable for optimizing real-world systems, where no closed-form models exist, allowing deployment-ready algorithms to operate directly in noisy, incomplete, and non-differentiable environments.

- **Scalability and real-time feasibility:** As networks evolve toward ultra-dense scenarios, scalability emerges as both an algorithmic and architectural bottleneck. The dimensionality of optimization problems escalates rapidly, while real-time constraints require millisecond-level decision making under strict energy budgets. Centralized solvers, even when theoretically optimal, are impractical in such settings. Future research

Table VIII: Multi-objective performance metrics

Metric	Description	Feature
Hypervolume [97], [106], [155]	Volume dominated by Pareto set	Indicates convergence and diversity
Inverted Generational Distance [97], [100]	Average distance from reference Pareto front to obtained front	Evaluates both convergence and coverage of solutions
Generational Distance [87], [224]	Mean distance from obtained front to reference front	Measures closeness to Pareto-optimal front
Spacing [225]	Standard deviation of distances between neighboring solutions	Assesses uniform distribution of Pareto points
Spread [87]	Diversity ratio across extremes and intermediate solutions	Quantifies how solutions are distributed along Pareto front
Epsilon indicator [226]	Minimum shift to dominate another front	Provides pairwise comparison between Pareto fronts
Scalarization [79], [103], [120]	Linear combination of objectives	Simplifies comparison via single-objective equivalence

should focus on decomposition-based SO, decentralized multi-agent coordination, and adaptive learning strategies that can break large-scale problems into smaller components, while maintaining global coordination. Furthermore, lightweight communication protocols and hardware-aware algorithm design are needed for ensuring tractability even on resource-constrained devices. Achieving scalable and energy-efficient stochastic optimization will unlock the ability to deliver near-optimal solutions in real time, thereby enabling NG networks to support city-scale deployments without sacrificing services.

- **Integration with distributed systems, generative AI, and automation:** The paradigm shift toward distributed, automated and intelligence-oriented networks lead to complex optimization problems. On one hand, distributed environments are characterized by non-IID data, partial observability, and limited computational capacity at the edge. Simultaneously, Generative AI models (e.g., LLMs) and intent-based automation offer novel interfaces for translating high-level service-oriented specifications into executable policies. Future work should investigate federated and model-free SO methods that enhance decentralized decision-making while preserving privacy, as well as hybrid pipelines where Generative AI carries out the parsing of ambiguous intents into broad optimization constraints. The family of SO algorithms is capable of refining these outputs into feasible solutions. When synergized with digital twins and closed-loop automation, these techniques will lead to self-optimizing and self-healing networks that operate reliably in the face of uncertainty. This integration opens the path toward zero-touch network management, where human intervention is minimized, efficiency is maximized, and service quality is maintained across heterogeneous environments.
- **Quantum-enhanced SO:** Finally, QC presents a transformative yet hitherto underexplored opportunity for SO in next-generation networks. While NISQ hardware remains limited in qubit count and connectivity, quantum-inspired algorithms already demonstrate tangible benefits in diversity, convergence, and scalability. In parallel, hybrid quantum-classical workflows allow the embedding of quantum subroutines into classical pipelines, enabling SO to leverage potent tunneling and superposition effects without requiring fully fault-tolerant devices. Future research should focus on overcoming embedding overhead, reducing circuit depth, and integrating quantum error-mitigation and error-correction coded techniques, while also establishing realistic benchmarking metrics that include latency, energy efficiency, and robustness to uncertainty. The pursuit of quantum-enhanced SO promises not only faster exploration of large combinatorial spaces but also new performance frontiers that classical methods cannot readily reach, thereby positioning it as a long-term strategic direction for NG network optimization.

C. Summary and Conclusions

This tutorial & survey provided a comprehensive exploration of SO as a unifying methodology for resource allocation in

Figure 18: Common objective functions in NG networks.



Figure 19: Family of SO algorithms.

NG networks. We commenced by revisiting the fundamental models and algorithmic frameworks that differentiate SO from classical deterministic optimization, emphasizing their suitability for high-dimensional, dynamic, and uncertainty-prone environments. Building on this foundation, we examined how SO supports both single and multi-objective trade-offs across diverse NG systems, spanning key technologies such as massive MU-MIMO, RIS, THz communications, satellite-aerial-terrestrial integration, and mobile edge computing. In Section V, we further highlighted the integration of SO with distributed network architectures, enabling adaptive and scalable decision-making under partial or delayed information. The discussion also extended to hybrid designs that combine SO with emerging tools like large language models and automation, providing novel avenues for tackling unstructured and complex decision spaces. Finally, we also explored the role of QC as a natural extension of SO, underscoring its potential to accelerate convergence, enhance solution diversity, and address otherwise intractable optimization tasks. Taken together, these insights position SO not merely as a convenient mathematical framework, but as a foundational enabler for the design, deployment, and evolution of intelligent, resilient, and trustworthy NG networks.

We have critically appraised the whole suite of objective functions seen in Fig. 18, which are often relied upon in the SO of NG wireless networks, while the family of SO algorithms considered was portrayed in Fig. 19. The parting message

gleaned is that the choice of the objective function - such as for example the sum-rate or min-max objective function - is more influential in determining the overall system performance than that of the SO algorithms. However, not all the SO algorithms lend themselves to conveniently determining the optimum of the objective function.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Wang, C. Jiang, H. Zhang, Y. Ren, K.-C. Chen, and L. Hanzo, "Thirty years of machine learning: The road to Pareto-optimal wireless networks," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1472–1514, 2020.
- [2] K. B. Letaief, Y. Shi, J. Lu, and J. Lu, "Edge artificial intelligence for 6G: Vision, enabling technologies, and applications," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 5–36, 2021.
- [3] W. Chen, X. Lin, J. Lee, A. Toskala, S. Sun, C. F. Chiasserini, and L. Liu, "5G-advanced toward 6G: Past, present, and future," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1592–1619, 2023.
- [4] M. M. Kiasaraei, K. Nikitopoulos, and R. Tafazolli, "Towards ultra-power-efficient, tbps wireless systems via analogue processing: Existing approaches, challenges and way forward," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2023.
- [5] Z. Zhang, Y. Xiao, Z. Ma, M. Xiao, Z. Ding, X. Lei, G. K. Karagiannidis, and P. Fan, "6G wireless networks: Vision, requirements, architecture, and key technologies," *IEEE Veh. Tech. Mag.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 28–41, 2019.
- [6] S. Chen, Y.-C. Liang, S. Sun, S. Kang, W. Cheng, and M. Peng, "Vision, requirements, and technology trend of 6G: How to tackle the challenges of system coverage, capacity, user data-rate and movement speed," *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 218–228, 2020.
- [7] Q. Guo, F. Tang, T. K. Rodrigues, and N. Kato, "Five disruptive technologies in 6G to support digital twin networks," *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 149–155, 2023.
- [8] T. Van Chien, B. T. Duc, H. V. D. Luong, H. T. T. Binh, H. Q. Ngo, and S. Chatzinotas, "Active and passive beamforming designs for SER minimization in RIS-assisted MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wirel. Commun.*, 2024.
- [9] J. He, Y. Mao, Y. Zhou, T. Wang, and Y. Shi, "Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces empowered green wireless networks with user admission control," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 71, no. 7, pp. 4062–4078, 2023.
- [10] L. T. Wedage, B. Butler, S. Balasubramaniam, Y. Koucheryavy, J. M. Jornet, and M. C. Vuran, "Climate change sensing through terahertz communication infrastructure: A disruptive application of 6G networks," *IEEE Network*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 261–268, 2023.
- [11] Y. Shi, L. Lian, Y. Shi, Z. Wang, Y. Zhou, L. Fu, L. Bai, J. Zhang, and W. Zhang, "Machine learning for large-scale optimization in 6G wireless networks," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 2088 – 2132, 2023.
- [12] H. Jiang, Z. Xiao, Z. Li, J. Xu, F. Zeng, and D. Wang, "An energy-efficient framework for internet of things underlaying heterogeneous small cell networks," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 31–43, 2020.
- [13] M. Asim, Y. Wang, K. Wang, and P.-Q. Huang, "A review on computational intelligence techniques in cloud and edge computing," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 742–763, 2020.
- [14] B. Ji, Y. Wang, K. Song, C. Li, H. Wen, V. G. Menon, and S. Mumtaz, "A survey of computational intelligence for 6G: Key technologies, applications and trends," *IEEE Trans. Industr. Inform.*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 7145–7154, 2021.
- [15] Q.-V. Pham, D. C. Nguyen, S. Mirjalili, D. T. Hoang, D. N. Nguyen, P. N. Pathirana, and W.-J. Hwang, "Swarm intelligence for next-generation networks: Recent advances and applications," *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 191, p. 103141, 2021.
- [16] S. Zeb, A. Mahmood, S. A. Hassan, M. J. Piran, M. Gidlund, and M. Guizani, "Industrial digital twins at the nexus of NextG wireless networks and computational intelligence: A survey," *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 200, p. 103309, 2022.
- [17] H. Zhou, M. Erol-Kantarci, Y. Liu, and H. V. Poor, "A survey on model-based, heuristic, and machine learning optimization approaches in rsi-aided wireless networks," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 781–823, 2023.
- [18] A. K. Abasi, M. Aloqaily, B. Ouni, M. Guizani, M. Debbah, and F. Karray, "A survey on securing 6G wireless communications based optimization techniques," in *Proc. IWCNC*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 216–223.
- [19] S. P. Singh, N. Kumar, G. Kumar, B. Balasamy, A. K. Bashir, and Y. D. Al-Otaibi, "A hybrid multi-objective optimisation for 6G-enabled Internet of Things (IoT)," *IEEE Trans. Consum. Electron.*, 2024.
- [20] A. K. Abasi, M. Aloqaily, M. Guizani, and B. Ouni, "Metaheuristic algorithms for 6G wireless communications: Recent advances and applications," *Ad Hoc Netw.*, p. 103474, 2024.
- [21] M. O. Butt, N. Waheed, T. Q. Duong, and W. Ejaz, "Quantum-inspired resource optimization for 6G networks: A survey," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2024.
- [22] S. S. Hassan, L. U. Khan, Y. M. Park, M. Guizani, Z. Han, T. Ratnarajah, and C. S. Hong, "Quantum machine learning for 6G space-air-ground integrated networks: a comprehensive tutorial and survey," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2025.
- [23] R. Sun, N. Cheng, C. Li, W. Quan, H. Zhou, Y. Wang, W. Zhang, and X. Shen, "A comprehensive survey of knowledge-driven deep learning for intelligent wireless network optimization in 6G," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2025.
- [24] Y. Wang, C. Yang, T. Li, Y. Ouyang, X. Mi, and Y. Song, "A survey on intent-driven end-to-end 6G mobile communication system," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2025.
- [25] W. U. Khan, A. Mahmood, M. A. Jamshed, E. Lagunas, M. Ahmed, and S. Chatzinotas, "Beyond diagonal RIS for 6G non-terrestrial networks: Potentials and challenges," *IEEE Network*, 2024.
- [26] A. A. Khan and R. S. Adve, "Percentile optimization in wireless networks—part I: Power control for max-min-rate to sum-rate maximization (and everything in between)," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 72, pp. 1518–1532, 2024.
- [27] Y. Wang, C. Yang, and M. Peng, "Terahertz hybrid precoding with low-resolution PSs under frequency selective channel: A partial decoupling method," *IEEE Trans. Broadcast.*, 2025.
- [28] J. Zhang, H. Miao, P. Tang, L. Tian, and G. Liu, "New mid-band for 6G: Several considerations from the channel propagation characteristics perspective," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 175–180, 2024.
- [29] Y. Fan, C. Yang, R. Yuan, and M. Peng, "Dynamic delay-Doppler-angle domain channel tracking for THz massive MIMO-OTFS communication systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2025.
- [30] M. Biagi, A. Petroni, F. Campagnaro, and M. Zorzi, "Invisible light communications: ultraviolet enabling robust high-rate underwater communications," *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, 2025.
- [31] S. Willhammar, H. Iimori, J. Vieira, L. Sundström, F. Tufvesson, and E. G. Larsson, "Achieving distributed MIMO performance with repeater-assisted cellular massive MIMO," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 114–119, 2025.
- [32] L. X. Nguyen, S. S. Hassan, Y. K. Tun, K. Kim, Z. Han, and C. S. Hong, "Semantic communication enabled 6G-NTN framework: A novel denoising and gateway hop integration mechanism," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2025.
- [33] S. Wang, J. Ye, C. Chen, G. Pan, and J. An, "Safeguarding inter-satellite transmissions: A viewpoint from covertness," *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 221 – 228, 2025.
- [34] M. Gu, Y. Liu, B. He, W. Huangfu, and K. Long, "RIS-assisted joint waveform design for PAPR-aware UAV-enabled integrated sensing and communication," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 10480 – 10494, 2025.
- [35] W. Jiang, Q. Zhou, J. He, M. A. Habibi, S. Melnyk, M. El-Absi, B. Han, M. Di Renzo, H. D. Schotten, F.-L. Luo *et al.*, "Terahertz communications and sensing for 6G and beyond: A comprehensive review," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 2326–2381, 2024.
- [36] V. Petrov, H. Guerboukha, A. Singh, and J. M. Jornet, "Wavefront hopping for physical layer security in 6G and beyond near-field THz communications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 73, no. 5, pp. 2996–3012, 2025.
- [37] A. Trucco, "Predicting underwater noise spectra dominated by wind turbine contributions," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 1675–1694, 2024.
- [38] L. Mendes, J. Silva, N. Lourenço, J. C. Vaz, R. Martins, and F. Pasos, "Fully automatically synthesized mm-wave low-noise amplifiers for 5G/6G applications," *IEEE Trans. Microw. Theory Tech.*, 2025.
- [39] Z. Xiao, X. Liu, Y. Zeng, J. A. Zhang, S. Jin, and R. Zhang, "Rethinking waveform for 6G: Harnessing delay-doppler alignment modulation," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, 2024.
- [40] S. Ju and T. S. Rappaport, "Statistical channel model of wideband sub-THz radio propagation in indoor factories at 142 GHz: Towards 6G industrial wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 16 316 – 16 331, 2024.
- [41] A. M. Seid, A. Erbad, H. N. Abishu, A. Albaseer, M. Abdallah, and M. Guizani, "Multiagent federated reinforcement learning for resource allocation in UAV-enabled internet of medical things networks," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 22, pp. 19 695–19 711, 2023.
- [42] X. Ke and K. Ho, "Localization by doppler derivatives and doppler-shifted frequencies," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 72, pp. 2890–2904, 2024.
- [43] K. Zhang, Y. Zhang, C.-X. Wang, X. Wu, and C. Du, "A non-reciprocal channel model for THz asymmetric massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 7787–7801, 2024.
- [44] I. Ghareeb and O. Al-Shalabi, "Statistical analysis of cascaded Nakagami-m fading channels with generalized correlation," *J. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2024.
- [45] S. Chakraborty, T. K. Rana, and S. Das, "Tropospheric scintillation at Ka-band over a hilly tropical region," *IEEE Antennas Wirel. Propag. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 1288–1291, 2021.

[46] R. He, X. Zhang, Q. Cui, and X. Tao, "Doppler interference analysis for OTFS-based LEO satellite system," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 75 – 89, 2025.

[47] S. Kissleff, V. M. Baeza, H. Al-Hraishawi, K. Ntontin, W. A. Martins, and S. Chatzinotas, "Massive RF inter-satellite links for massive non-terrestrial networks," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 48 – 53, 2025.

[48] X. Yi, Y. Li, X. Tao, A. M. Vegni *et al.*, "A unified channel model for IRS-aided underwater OWC with combined attenuation losses," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1552 – 1567, 2025.

[49] Y. Zhang, Q. Hu, M. Peng, Y. Liu, G. Zhang, and T. Jiang, "Interdependent cell-free and cellular networks: Thinking the role of cell-free architecture for 6G," *IEEE Network*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 247–254, 2023.

[50] W. Mao, Y. Lu, C.-Y. Chi, B. Ai, Z. Zhong, and Z. Ding, "Communication-sensing region for cell-free massive MIMO ISAC systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 12 396–12 411, 2024.

[51] A. R. Pawar, S. Kashyap, and S. Chouhan, "Impact of channel aging and pilot contamination on decoding and power control strategies for uplink massive MIMO-NOMA systems," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 103 – 116, 2025.

[52] T. Van Chien, H. Q. Ngo, S. Chatzinotas, M. Di Renzo, and B. Ottersten, "Reconfigurable intelligent surface-assisted cell-free massive MIMO systems over spatially-correlated channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 5106–5128, 2022.

[53] W. Deng, M. Li, M.-M. Zhao, M.-J. Zhao, and O. Simeone, "CSI transfer from sub-6G to mmwave: Reduced-overhead multi-user hybrid beamforming," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 973–987, 2025.

[54] S. C. Prabhushana, D. Van Huynh, K. Singh, H.-J. Zepernick, O. A. Dobre, H. Shin, and T. Q. Duong, "Machine learning-based resource allocation in 6G integrated space and terrestrial networks-aided intelligent autonomous transportation," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, 2025.

[55] Y.-F. Liu, T.-H. Chang, M. Hong, Z. Wu, A. M.-C. So, E. A. Jorswieck, and W. Yu, "A survey of recent advances in optimization methods for wireless communications," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 2992–3031, 2024.

[56] W. Yu and J. Zhao, "Optimization for 6G wireless communications with heterogeneous VR and non-VR 360-degree videos: A differentiated reinforcement learning approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2025.

[57] P. M. Pereira, T. A. de Bairros, R. A. de Souza, and M. D. Yacoub, "Mobility, path loss, and composite fading: Performance of a conventional and of a non-conventional system with a robust autoencoder," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 12, pp. 16 725–16 730, 2023.

[58] A. Liu, V. K. Lau, and B. Kananian, "Stochastic successive convex approximation for non-convex constrained stochastic optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 67, no. 16, pp. 4189–4203, 2019.

[59] T. Van Chien, E. Björnson, and E. G. Larsson, "Joint power allocation and load balancing optimization for energy-efficient cell-free massive MIMO networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 6798–6812, 2020.

[60] Z. Tang, X. Zhu, H. Zhu, and H. Xu, "Energy-efficient optimization algorithm based on reconfigurable intelligent surface and rate splitting multiple access for 6G multicell communication system," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2097–2108, 2023.

[61] G. Eichfelder, O. Stein, and L. Warnow, "A solver for multiobjective mixed-integer convex and nonconvex optimization," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 203, no. 2, pp. 1736–1766, 2024.

[62] M. Ahmed, S. Raza, A. A. Soofi, F. Khan, W. U. Khan, S. Z. U. Abideen, F. Xu, and Z. Han, "Active reconfigurable intelligent surfaces: Expanding the frontiers of wireless communication-a survey," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 839–869, 2024.

[63] D. Han, J. Park, S.-H. Park, and N. Lee, "Sparse joint transmission for cloud radio access networks with limited fronthaul capacity," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 3395–3408, 2021.

[64] Y. Xiu, Y. Zhao, S. Yang, Y. Zhang, D. Niyato, H. Du, and N. Wei, "Robust beamforming design for near-field DMA-NOMA mmwave communications with imperfect position information," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1678 – 1692, 2025.

[65] A. Azarbahram, O. L. López, and M. Latva-Aho, "Waveform optimization and beam focusing for near-field wireless power transfer with dynamic metasurface antennas and non-linear energy harvesters," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 1031 – 1045, 2025.

[66] D. H. Nguyen, X. T. Nguyen, S.-G. Jeong, T. Van Chien, L. Hanzo, and W. J. Hwang, "Hybrid quantum convolutional neural network-aided pilot assignment in cell-free Massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1 – 6, 2025.

[67] Z. Zhu, J. Li, J. Yang, and B. Ai, "Robust beamforming design for STAR-RIS-aided secure SWIPT system with bounded CSI error," *IEEE Trans. Green Commun. Netw.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 968–977, 2024.

[68] H. Byeon, J. V. N. Ramesh, S. Gupta, M. K. Sahu, S. K. Nallamala, R. Regulagadda, and A. Vidyarthi, "Next-generation optimized video coding mechanism for 6G wireless communication network," *IEEE Commun. Stand. Mag.*, 2025.

[69] Z. Jia, M. Sheng, J. Li, D. Niyato, and Z. Han, "LEO-satellite-assisted UAV: Joint trajectory and data collection for internet of remote things in 6G aerial access networks," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 9814–9826, 2021.

[70] F. Kavehmadavani, V.-D. Nguyen, T. X. Vu, and S. Chatzinotas, "Empowering traffic steering in 6G open RAN with deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 12 782–12 798, 2024.

[71] B. Li, L.-L. Yang, R. G. Maunder, S. Sun, and P. Xiao, "Heterogeneous graph neural network for power allocation in multicarrier-division duplex cell-free massive MIMO systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 962–977, 2023.

[72] D. Tagliaferri, M. Mizmizi, S. Mura, F. Linsalata, D. Scazzoli, D. Badini, M. Magarini, and U. Spagnolini, "Integrated sensing and communication system via dual-domain waveform superposition," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 4284–4299, 2024.

[73] V.-D. Nguyen, T. X. Vu, N. T. Nguyen, D. C. Nguyen, M. Juntti, N. C. Luong, D. T. Hoang, D. N. Nguyen, and S. Chatzinotas, "Network-aided intelligent traffic steering in 6G O-RAN: A multi-layer optimization framework," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, 2023.

[74] F. E. Curtis and K. Scheinberg, "Adaptive stochastic optimization: A framework for analyzing stochastic optimization algorithms," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 32–42, 2020.

[75] P.-Q. Huang, Y. Zhou, K. Wang, and B.-C. Wang, "Placement optimization for multi-IRS-aided wireless communications: An adaptive differential evolution algorithm," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 942–946, 2022.

[76] Y. Qiao, Y. Niu, Z. Han, L. Xiong, N. Wang, T. Q. Quek, and B. Ai, "Resource allocation for ISAC and HRLLC in UAV-assisted HSR system with a hybrid PSO-genetic algorithm," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, 2024.

[77] X. Wang, S. Wang, X. Liang, D. Zhao, J. Huang, X. Xu, B. Dai, and Q. Miao, "Deep reinforcement learning: A survey," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 5064–5078, 2022.

[78] T. V. Chien, B. T. Duc, M. Mohammadi, H. Ngo, and M. Matthaiou, "Differential evolution for infeasible circumstances in network-assisted full-duplex cell-free massive MIMO," in *Proc. GECCO*, 2025, pp. 1497–1505.

[79] D. Zhu, J. Shen, J. Hu, Z. Ouyang, G. Hu, C. Zhou, J. Zhang, and S. Cheng, "Group merging particle swarm optimization algorithm for rural base station deployment," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.*, 2025.

[80] S. Goudarzi, S. A. Soleimani, W. Wang, and P. Xiao, "UAV-enabled mobile edge computing for resource allocation using cooperative evolutionary computation," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 5134–5147, 2023.

[81] W. Qi, N. Zhang, G. Zong, S.-F. Su, H. Yan, and R.-H. Yeh, "Event-triggered SMC for networked Markov jumping systems with channel fading and applications: Genetic algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 6503–6515, 2023.

[82] H. Mei, K. Yang, Q. Liu, and K. Wang, "3D-trajectory and phase-shift design for RIS-assisted UAV systems using deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 3020–3029, 2022.

[83] D. Liu and O. Simeone, "Wireless federated langevin monte carlo: Repurposing channel noise for Bayesian sampling and privacy," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 2946–2961, 2022.

[84] Y. He, J. Huang, W. Li, L. Zhang, S.-W. Wong, and Z. N. Chen, "Hybrid method of artificial neural network and simulated annealing algorithm for optimizing wideband patch antennas," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 944–949, 2023.

[85] Z. Yu, Z. Si, X. Li, D. Wang, and H. Song, "A novel hybrid particle swarm optimization algorithm for path planning of UAVs," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 22, pp. 22 547–22 558, 2022.

[86] Q. Zhang, H. Wen, Y. Liu, S. Chang, and Z. Han, "Federated-reinforcement-learning-enabled joint communication, sensing, and computing resources allocation in connected automated vehicles networks," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 22, pp. 23 224–23 240, 2022.

[87] Y. Wang, J. Zhu, H. Huang, and F. Xiao, "Bi-objective ant colony optimization for trajectory planning and task offloading in UAV-assisted mEC systems," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 12 360–12 377, 2024.

[88] J. Bi, H. Yuan, S. Duanmu, M. Zhou, and A. Abusorrah, "Energy-optimized partial computation offloading in mobile-edge computing with genetic simulated-annealing-based particle swarm optimization," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 3774–3785, 2020.

[89] Y. Li, Q. Zhang, H. Yao, X. Xin, Y. Zhao, and R. Gao, "Optimizing cost-efficient SFC routing in NTNs: a novel transformer-ant colony optimization framework," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2025.

[90] M. Dehghani, Z. Montazeri, E. Trojovská, and P. Trojovský, "Coati optimization algorithm: A new bio-inspired metaheuristic algorithm for solving optimization problems," *KBS*, vol. 259, p. 110011, 2023.

[91] M. Yildirim, "Joint parallel tabu search algorithm-based look-up table design and deep learning-based signal detection for OFDM-aim," *IEEE Wirel. Commun. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 575–579, 2023.

[92] J. Qi, H. Zhang, X. Qi, and M. Peng, "Deep reinforcement learning based hopping strategy for wideband anti-jamming wireless communications," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 3568–3579, 2023.

[93] M. Sohaib, S.-W. Jeon, and W. Yu, "Hybrid online–offline learning for task offloading in mobile edge computing systems," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 6873–6888, 2023.

[94] D. G. S. Pivoto, F. A. de Figueiredo, C. Cavdar, G. R. de Lima Tejerina, and L. L. Mendes, "A comprehensive survey of machine learning applied to resource allocation in wireless communications," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 2025.

[95] H. Pan, Y. Liu, G. Sun, J. Fan, S. Liang, and C. Yuen, "Joint power and 3D trajectory optimization for UAV-enabled wireless powered communication networks with obstacles," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 2364–2380, 2023.

[96] H. Song, B. Gu, K. Son, and W. Choi, "Joint optimization of edge computing server deployment and user offloading associations in wireless edge network via a genetic algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 2535–2548, 2022.

[97] H.-A. Tran, C.-S. Duong, T.-D. Bui, V. Tong, and H. T. T. Binh, "Gamr: Revolutionizing multi-objective routing in sdn networks with dynamic genetic algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Top. Comput. Intell.*, 2025.

[98] T. Van Chien, N. T. A. Thu, L. Nguyen, N. Binh, and H. Binh, "On the performance of user association in space-ground communications with integer-coded genetic algorithms," in *Proc. Genet. Evol. Comput. Conf. (GECCO)*, 2024, pp. 1373–1380.

[99] M. N. Omidvar, X. Li, and X. Yao, "A review of population-based metaheuristics for large-scale black-box global optimization—part I," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 802–822, 2021.

[100] N. T. Tam, T. H. K. Ly, B. T. Duc, T. H. Hung, and H. T. T. Binh, "Multi-objective virtual network functions placement and traffic routing problem," in *Proc. 2024 IEEE Congr. Evol. Comput. (CEC)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 01–08.

[101] W. Zheng and B. Doerr, "Approximation guarantees for the non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II)," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 2024.

[102] W. Zheng, Y. Yang, T.-X. Feng, and H. Li, "Systematic inverse design of miniaturized frequency selective surfaces based on microwave network theory and NSGA-III," *IEEE Trans. Microw. Theory Techn.*, 2025.

[103] B. Bandyopadhyay, P. Kuila, M. Bey, and M. C. Govil, "Quantum-inspired differential evolution for freshness-aware caching-aided offloading in digital twin-enabled internet of vehicles," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Veh.*, 2024.

[104] T. Van Chien, C. V. Le, H. T. T. Binh, H. Q. Ngo, and S. Chatzinotas, "Phase shift design for RIS-aided cell-free massive MIMO with improved differential evolution," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 9, pp. 1499–1503, 2023.

[105] M. B. Taha, C. Talhi, H. Ould-Slimane, S. Alrabaei, and K.-K. R. Choo, "A multi-objective approach based on differential evolution and deep learning algorithms for VANETs," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 3035–3050, 2022.

[106] B. T. Duc, T. V. Chien, H. Q. Ngo, and H. T. T. Binh, "Multi-objective signal optimization to balance multiple conflicting metrics in ris-assisted mimo systems," in *Proc. GECCO*, 2025, pp. 915–918.

[107] Z. Liao, X. Mi, Q. Pang, and Y. Sun, "History archive assisted niching differential evolution with variable neighborhood for multimodal optimization," *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 76, p. 101206, 2023.

[108] K. Zhang, C. Shen, G. G. Yen, Z. Xu, and J. He, "Two-stage double niched evolution strategy for multimodal multiobjective optimization," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 754–768, 2021.

[109] Y. Qiao, Y. Niu, Z. Han, L. Xiong, N. Wang, T. Q. Quek, and B. Ai, "Resource allocation for ISAC and HRLLC in UAV-assisted HSR system with a hybrid PSO-genetic algorithm," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, 2024.

[110] S. Yang, B. Wei, L. Deng, X. Jin, M. Jiang, Y. Huang, and F. Wang, "A leader-adaptive particle swarm optimization with dimensionality reduction strategy for feature selection," *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 91, p. 101743, 2024.

[111] G. Yuan, B. Wang, B. Xue, and M. Zhang, "Particle swarm optimization for efficiently evolving deep convolutional neural networks using an autoencoder-based encoding strategy," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 2023.

[112] T. Qian, X.-F. Liu, and Y. Fang, "A cooperative ant colony system for multiobjective multirobot task allocation with precedence constraints," *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 2024.

[113] B. Wu, X. Zuo, M. Zhou, X. Wan, X. Zhao, and S. Yang, "A multi-objective ant colony system-based approach to transit route network adjustment," *IEEE Trans. Intel. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 7878–7892, 2024.

[114] F. Zhu, Z. Shuai, Y. Lu, H. Su, R. Yu, X. Li, Q. Zhao, and J. Shuai, "oBABC: a one-dimensional binary artificial bee colony algorithm for binary optimization," *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 87, p. 101567, 2024.

[115] F. Zhao, Z. Xu, L. Wang, N. Zhu, T. Xu, and J. Jonrinaldi, "A population-based iterated greedy algorithm for distributed assembly no-wait flowshop scheduling problem," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 6692–6705, 2022.

[116] P. V. T. Dat, L. Doan, and H. T. T. Binh, "Hsevo: Elevating automatic heuristic design with diversity-driven harmony search and genetic algorithm using LLMs," in *Proc. AAAI*, vol. 39, no. 25, 2025, pp. 26931–26938.

[117] S. A. EL-Meadawy, P. Zhu, and H. S. Khallaf, "Multi-layer irregular RIS assisted wireless communication systems performance optimization," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, 2024.

[118] S.-G. Jeong, P. D. A. Duc, Q. V. Do, D.-I. Noh, N. X. Tung, T. Van Chien, Q.-V. Pham, M. Hasegawa, H. Sekiya, and W.-J. Hwang, "Quantum annealing-based sum rate maximization for multi-UAV-aided wireless networks," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, 2025.

[119] H.-Y. Lu, S. P. Azizi, and S.-C. Cheng, "DeepEigen-Tabu: Deep eigen network assisted probabilistic Tabu search for Massive MIMO detection," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 9, pp. 13292–13308, 2024.

[120] A. S. Nandan, S. Singh, R. Kumar, and N. Kumar, "An optimized genetic algorithm for cluster head election based on movable sinks and adjustable sensing ranges in IoT-based HWSNs," *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 5027–5039, 2021.

[121] F. J. Kaleibar, M. St-Hilaire, and M. Barati, "A customized genetic algorithm for SLA-aware service provisioning in infrastructure-less vehicular cloud networks," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, 2025.

[122] Y. He, J. Huang, W. Li, L. Zhang, S.-W. Wong, and Z. N. Chen, "Hybrid method of artificial neural network and simulated annealing algorithm for optimizing wideband patch antennas," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 944–949, 2023.

[123] N. Naderializadeh, J. J. Sydir, M. Simsek, and H. Nikopour, "Resource management in wireless networks via multi-agent deep reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 3507–3523, 2021.

[124] C. Wang, Z. Cao, Y. Wu, L. Teng, and G. Wu, "Deep reinforcement learning for solving vehicle routing problems with backhauls," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 4779–4793, 2024.

[125] Y. Long, S. Gong, S. Sun, G. C. Lee, L. Li, and D. Niyato, "Lyapunov-guided deep reinforcement learning for semantic-aware AoI minimization in UAV-assisted wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2025.

[126] Y. Guo, J. Fan, R. Zhang, B. Chang, D. W. K. Ng, D. Niyato, and D. I. Kim, "Secrecy energy efficiency maximization in IRS-assisted VLC MISO networks with RSMA: A DS-PPO approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, 2025.

[127] S. Tripathi, O. J. Pandey, and R. M. Hegde, "An optimal reflective elements grouping model for RIS-assisted IoT networks using Q-learning," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. II, Exp. Briefs*, vol. 70, no. 8, pp. 3214–3218, 2023.

[128] N. Sharvari, D. Das, J. Bapat, and D. Das, "Improved Q-learning based multi-hop routing for UAV-assisted communication," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manag.*, 2024.

[129] S. Wang, X.-L. Huang, F. Hu, and S. Yu, "A fast-convergence, induced dynamic spectrum access based on accelerated Q-learning for cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2025.

[130] W. Ahsan, W. Yi, Y. Liu, and A. Nallanathan, "A reliable reinforcement learning for resource allocation in uplink NOMA-URLLC networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 5989–6002, 2022.

[131] F. Khorramnejad and M. Erol-Kantarci, "On joint offloading and resource allocation: A double deep Q-network approach," *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1126–1141, 2021.

[132] H. Zhao, W. Sun, Y. Ni, W. Xia, G. Gui, and C. Zhu, "Deep deterministic policy gradient-based rate maximization for RIS-UAV-assisted vehicular communication networks," *IEEE Trans. Intel. Transp. Syst.*, 2024.

[133] I. Ahmad, R. Narmeen, H. Tabassum, and Z. Becvar, "Intelligent localization-based DDPG for UAV-borne RIS in vehicular communication," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2025.

[134] X. Han, Z. Li, and Z. Xie, "Two-step random access optimization for 5G-and-beyond LEO satellite communication system: a TD3-based MsgA channel allocation strategy," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1570–1574, 2023.

[135] A. A. Puspitasari and B. M. Lee, "TD3 algorithm-based SWIPT with UAV-RIS assistance for MIMO communication," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2024.

[136] S. Shen, X. Hao, Z. Gao, G. Wu, Y. Shen, H. Zhang, Q. Cao, and S. Yu, "SAC-PP: Jointly optimizing privacy protection and computation offloading for mobile edge computing," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manag.*, 2024.

[137] F. D. Tilahun, A. T. Abebe, and C. G. Kang, "Multi-agent reinforcement learning for distributed resource allocation in cell-free massive MIMO-enabled mobile edge computing network," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 12, pp. 16454–16468, 2023.

[138] Z. Chen, W. Wang, W. Zhang, T. Wan, and L. Liu, "Hybrid polarized beamforming optimization of millimeter wave multi-user massive MIMO

communication systems,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 11055–11 065, 2025.

[139] W. Li and M. Assaad, “Distributed stochastic optimization in networks with low informational exchange,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2989–3008, 2021.

[140] A. Ghasemi and H. De Meer, “Robustness of interdependent power grid and communication networks to cascading failures,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1919–1930, 2023.

[141] Y. Zhou, L. Lei, X. Zhao, L. You, Y. Sun, and S. Chatzinotas, “Decomposition and meta-DRL based multi-objective optimization for asynchronous federated learning in 6g-satellite systems,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1115–1129, 2024.

[142] T. Bozkus and U. Mitra, “Leveraging digital cousins for ensemble Q-learning in large-scale wireless networks,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 72, pp. 1114–1129, 2024.

[143] H. Q. Ali, A. B. Darabi, and S. Coleri, “Optimization theory-based deep reinforcement learning for resource allocation in ultra-reliable wireless networked control systems,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 72, no. 8, pp. 4774–4787, 2024.

[144] W. Wang and A. Lesshem, “Non-convex generalized nash games for energy efficient power allocation and beamforming in mmwave networks,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 3193–3205, 2022.

[145] M. Chen, A. Liu, N. N. Xiong, Y. Ren, and H. H. Song, “Anns: An intelligent advanced non-convex non-smooth scheme for IRS-aided next generation mobile communication networks,” *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, 2025.

[146] J. B. Perazzone, S. Wang, M. Ji, and K. Chan, “Communication-efficient device scheduling for federated learning using Lyapunov optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Network.*, 2025.

[147] L. Lei, Y. Yuan, Y. Zhou, Y. Yang, Y. Luo, L. Pu, and S. Chatzinotas, “Energy optimization and lightweight design for efficient federated learning in wireless edge systems,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 9, pp. 13 542–13 557, 2024.

[148] Y. Zhou, L. Feng, X. Jiang, W. Li, and F. Zhou, “Predictable wireless networked scheduling for bridging hybrid time-sensitive and real-time services,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 72, no. 6, pp. 3664–3680, 2024.

[149] Z. Zhang, H. Chen, F. Jiang, Y. Yang, and Q. S. Cheng, “K-means-based multigroup differential evolution optimization framework for design of MIMO antenna with decoupling elements,” *IEEE Antennas Wireless Propag. Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1980–1984, 2022.

[150] X. Yuan, F. Tang, M. Zhao, and N. Kato, “Joint rate and coverage optimization for the THz/RF multi-band communications of space-air-ground integrated network in 6G,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 6669–6682, 2023.

[151] Y. Yin, M. Liu, G. Gui, H. Gacanin, and H. Sari, “Minimizing delay for MIMO-NOMA resource allocation in UAV-assisted caching networks,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 4728–4732, 2023.

[152] S. Kurma, M. Katwe, K. Singh, T. Q. Duong, and C.-P. Li, “Spectral-energy efficient resource allocation in RIS-aided FD-MIMO systems,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 5125–5141, 2024.

[153] M.-H. T. Nguyen, T. T. Bui, L. D. Nguyen, E. Garcia-Palacios, H.-J. Zepernick, H. Shin, and T. Q. Duong, “Real-time optimized clustering and caching for 6G satellite-UAV-terrestrial networks,” *IEEE Trans. Intel. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 3009–3019, 2023.

[154] R. Hou, J. Fu, M. Dong, K. Ota, and D. Zeng, “An unequal clustering method based on particle swarm optimization in underwater acoustic sensor networks,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 24, pp. 25 027–25 036, 2022.

[155] Z. Li, W. Ge, J. Yin, L. Wei, and Q. Liu, “A multiobjective optimization algorithm based directional reception TDMA protocol for underwater acoustic networks,” *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 24, no. 16, pp. 26 755 – 26 769, 2024.

[156] R. Tang, R. Zhang, Y. Xu, C. Liu, C. Huang, and C. Yuen, “Resource allocation for underwater acoustic sensor networks with partial spectrum sharing: When optimization meets deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manag.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 2715–2730, 2025.

[157] K. Zhi, C. Pan, H. Ren, and K. Wang, “Power scaling law analysis and phase shift optimization of RIS-aided massive MIMO systems with statistical CSI,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 5, pp. 3558–3574, 2022.

[158] I. Yildirim, A. Koc, E. Basar, and T. Le-Ngoc, “RIS-aided angular-based hybrid beamforming design in mmwave massive MIMO systems,” in *Proc. GLOBECOM*, 2022.

[159] T. V. Chien, N. H. Viet, S. Chatzinotas, and L. Hanzo, “Improved differential evolution for enhancing the aggregated channel estimation of RIS-aided cell-free massive MIMO,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, pp. 1–6, 2025.

[160] Z. Guo, F. Tang, X. Chen, L. Luo, and M. Zhao, “Deep-reinforcement-learning-based content caching in satellite-terrestrial assisted airborne communications,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 22 779–22 789, 2024.

[161] Y. Song, J. Ou, P. N. Suganthan, W. Pedrycz, Q. Yang, and L. Xing, “Learning adaptive genetic algorithm for earth electromagnetic satellite scheduling,” *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 9010–9025, 2023.

[162] X. Li, H. Zhang, H. Zhou, N. Wang, K. Long, S. Al-Rubaye, and G. K. Karagiannidis, “Multi-agent drl for resource allocation and cache design in terrestrial-satellite networks,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 5031–5042, 2023.

[163] Z. Zhang, Q. Chang, S. Yang, and J. Xing, “Sensing-communication bandwidth allocation in vehicular links based on reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 11–15, 2023.

[164] C. Liu, M. Xia, J. Zhao, H. Li, and Y. Gong, “Optimal resource allocation for integrated sensing and communications in internet of vehicles: A deep reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 74, no. 2, pp. 3028–3038, 2025.

[165] Y. Qiao, Y. Niu, Z. Han, L. Xiong, N. Wang, T. Q. S. Quek, and B. Ai, “Resource allocation for ISAC and HRLLC in UAV-assisted HSR system with a hybrid PSO-genetic algorithm,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 6790–6804, 2025.

[166] P. Wang, K. Li, B. Xiao, and K. Li, “Multiobjective optimization for joint task offloading, power assignment, and resource allocation in mobile edge computing,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 11 737–11 748, 2021.

[167] S. Han, L. Li, X. Li, Z. Liu, L. Yan, and T. Zhang, “Joint relay selection and power allocation for time-varying energy harvesting-driven uasns: A stratified reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE Sens. J.*, vol. 22, no. 20, pp. 20 063–20 072, 2022.

[168] F. Khoramejad and E. Hossain, “Generative ai for the optimization of next-generation wireless networks: Basics, state-of-the-art, and open challenges,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 3483–3525, 2025.

[169] T.-H. Vu, S. Kumar Jagatheeaperumal, M.-D. Nguyen, N. Van Huynh, S. Kim, and Q.-V. Pham, “Applications of generative ai (gai) for mobile and wireless networking: A survey,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 1266–1290, 2025.

[170] F. Hamidi-Sepehr, M. Sajadieh, S. Panteleev, T. Islam, I. Karls, D. Chatterjee, and J. Ansari, “5G URLLC: Evolution of high-performance wireless networking for industrial automation,” *IEEE Commun. Stand. Mag.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 132–140, 2021.

[171] S. Duan, D. Wang, J. Ren, F. Lyu, Y. Zhang, H. Wu, and X. Shen, “Distributed artificial intelligence empowered by end-edge-cloud computing: A survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 591–624, 2022.

[172] X. Liu, S. Gao, B. Liu, X. Cheng, and L. Yang, “LLM4WM: adapting LLM for wireless multi-tasking,” *IEEE Trans. Mach. Learn. Commun. Netw.*, pp. 1–1, 2025.

[173] J. Wen, J. Kang, D. Niyato, Y. Zhang, J. Wang, B. Sikdar, and P. Zhang, “Generative AI for data augmentation in wireless networks: Analysis, applications, and case study,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, pp. 1–10, 2025.

[174] H. Zhou, C. Hu, Y. Yuan, Y. Cui, Y. Jin, C. Chen, H. Wu, D. Yuan, L. Jiang, D. Wu *et al.*, “Large language model (LLM) for telecommunications: A comprehensive survey on principles, key techniques, and opportunities,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1955 – 2005, 2024.

[175] E. Coronado, R. Behravesh, T. Subramanya, A. Fernández-Fernández, M. S. Siddiqui, X. Costa-Pérez, and R. Riggio, “Zero touch management: A survey of network automation solutions for 5G and 6G networks,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 2535–2578, 2022.

[176] J.-Y. Li, K.-J. Du, Z.-H. Zhan, H. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Distributed differential evolution with adaptive resource allocation,” *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 2791–2804, 2023.

[177] H. Zhou, K. Jiang, S. He, G. Min, and J. Wu, “Distributed deep multi-agent reinforcement learning for cooperative edge caching in internet-of-vehicles,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 9595–9609, 2023.

[178] O. Urmonov, H. Aliev, and H. Kim, “Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for enhancement of distributed resource allocation in vehicular network,” *IEEE Syst. J.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 491–502, 2023.

[179] Y. Xu, L. Zheng, X. Wu, Y. Tang, W. Liu, and D. Sun, “Joint resource allocation for UAV-assisted V2X communication with mean field multi-agent reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2024.

[180] Y. Zhu, H. Zhou, R. Su, P. Zhuang, and L. Bai, “Swarm intelligence enhanced reasoning: A density-driven framework for LLM-based multi-agent optimization,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.17115>

[181] C. Jimenez-Romero, A. Yegenoglu, and C. Blum, “Multi-agent systems powered by large language models: applications in swarm intelligence,” *Front. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 8, pp. 1–23, 2025.

[182] X. Wu, S.-H. Wu, J. Wu, L. Feng, and K. C. Tan, “Evolutionary computation in the era of large language model: Survey and roadmap,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 534–554, 2025.

[183] S. Liu, C. Chen, X. Qu, K. Tang, and Y.-S. Ong, “Large language models as evolutionary optimizers,” in *Proc. 2024 IEEE Congr. Evol. Comput. (CEC)*, 2024, pp. 1–8.

[184] H. Tian, X. Han, G. Wu, A. Guo, Y. Zhou, J. Zhang, S. Li, J. Wei, and T. Zhang, “An LLM-empowered adaptive evolutionary algorithm for

multi-component deep learning systems,” in *Proc. AAAI*, vol. 39, no. 19, Apr. 2025, pp. 20 894–20 902.

[185] F. Lotfi, H. Rajoli, and F. Afghah, “Prompt-tuned LLM-augmented DRL for dynamic O-RAN network slicing,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.00574>

[186] Y. Chen, R. Li, X. Yu, Z. Zhao, and H. Zhang, “Adaptive layer splitting for wireless LLM inference in edge computing: A model-based reinforcement learning approach,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.02616>

[187] N. Van Huynh, J. Wang, H. Du, D. T. Hoang, D. Niyato, D. N. Nguyen, D. I. Kim, and K. B. Letaief, “Generative ai for physical layer communications: A survey,” *IEEE Trans. Cogn. Commun. Netw.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 706–728, 2024.

[188] Y. Liu, H. Du, D. Niyato, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, D. I. Kim, and A. Jamalipour, “Deep generative model and its applications in efficient wireless network management: A tutorial and case study,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 199–207, 2024.

[189] S. Zhang, Y. Xue, Z. Tang, H. Wang, C. Shen, Q. Shi, and T.-H. Chang, “Robust network optimization by deep generative models and stochastic optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 6069–6084, 2025.

[190] T. Liu, N. Astorga, N. Seedat, and M. van der Schaar, “Large language models to enhance Bayesian optimization,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=O0xotBmGol>

[191] M. Conforth and Y. Meng, “Reinforcement learning for neural networks using swarm intelligence,” in *2008 IEEE Swarm Intelligence Symposium*, 2008, pp. 1–7.

[192] M. Farzanullah, H. V. Vu, and T. Le-Ngoc, “Deep reinforcement learning for joint user association and resource allocation in factory automation,” in *Proc. IEEE WCNC 2022*, 2022, pp. 2059–2064.

[193] S. Gong, M. Wang, B. Gu, W. Zhang, D. T. Hoang, and D. Niyato, “Bayesian optimization enhanced deep reinforcement learning for trajectory planning and network formation in Multi-UAV networks,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 72, no. 8, pp. 10 933–10 948, 2023.

[194] S. Liu, P.-Y. Chen, B. Kailkhura, G. Zhang, A. O. Hero III, and P. K. Varshney, “A primer on zeroth-order optimization in signal processing and machine learning: Principals, recent advances, and applications,” *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 43–54, 2020.

[195] A. Mukherjee, P. Goswami, Z. Yan, L. Yang, and J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, “ADAII and adaptive PSO-based resource allocation for wireless sensor networks,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 131 163–131 171, 2019.

[196] Y. Nie, J. Zhao, F. Gao, and F. R. Yu, “Semi-distributed resource management in UAV-aided MEC systems: A multi-agent federated reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 12, pp. 13 162–13 173, 2021.

[197] M. Coccia, S. Roshani, and M. Mosleh, “Evolution of quantum computing: Theoretical and innovation management implications for emerging quantum industry,” *IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag.*, vol. 71, pp. 2270–2280, 2024.

[198] T. Q. Duong, L. D. Nguyen, B. Narottama, J. A. Ansere, D. V. Huynh, and H. Shin, “Quantum-inspired real-time optimization for 6G networks: Opportunities, challenges, and the road ahead,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 3, pp. 1347–1359, 2022.

[199] K. Bharti, A. Cervera-Lierta, T. H. Kyaw, T. Haug, S. Alperin-Lea, A. Anand, M. Degroote, H. Heimonen, J. S. Kottmann, T. Menke, W.-K. Mok, S. Sim, L.-C. Kwek, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, “Noisy intermediate-scale quantum algorithms,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 94, p. 015004, Feb 2022.

[200] Y. Fu, M. Ding, and C. Zhou, “Phase angle-encoded and quantum-behaved particle swarm optimization applied to three-dimensional route planning for UAV,” *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern. A Syst. Hum.*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 511–526, 2012.

[201] H. M. H. Saad, R. K. Chakrabortty, S. Elsayed, and M. J. Ryan, “Quantum-inspired genetic algorithm for resource-constrained project-scheduling,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 38 488–38 502, 2021.

[202] S.-G. Jeong, P. D. A. Duc, Q. V. Do, D.-I. Noh, N. X. Tung, T. V. Chien, Q.-V. Pham, M. Hasegawa, H. Sekiya, and W.-J. Hwang, “Quantum-annealing-based sum rate maximization for multi-UAV-aided wireless networks,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 12, no. 12, pp. 21 225–21 239, 2025.

[203] Silvianti, B. Narottama, and S. Y. Shin, “Layerwise quantum deep reinforcement learning for joint optimization of UAV trajectory and resource allocation,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 430–443, 2024.

[204] W. J. Ryu, J.-M. Lee, and D.-S. Kim, “Multi-agent quantum reinforcement learning for adaptive transmission in NOMA-based irregular repetition slotted ALOHA,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 6, pp. 4405–4420, 2025.

[205] X. Wei, X. Gao, K. Ye, C.-Z. Xu, and Y. Wang, “A quantum reinforcement learning approach for joint resource allocation and task offloading in mobile edge computing,” *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 2580–2593, 2025.

[206] A. Paul, K. Singh, A. Kaushik, C.-P. Li, O. A. Dobre, M. Di Renzo, and T. Q. Duong, “Quantum-enhanced DRL optimization for DoA estimation and task offloading in ISAC systems,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 364–381, 2025.

[207] J. A. Ansere, E. Gyamfi, V. Sharma, H. Shin, O. A. Dobre, and T. Q. Duong, “Quantum deep reinforcement learning for dynamic resource allocation in mobile edge computing-based IoT systems,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 6221–6233, 2024.

[208] G. S. Kim, J. Chung, and S. Park, “Realizing stabilized landing for computation-limited reusable rockets: A quantum reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 8, pp. 12 252–12 257, 2024.

[209] G. Seon Kim, S. Lee, I.-S. Cho, S. Park, and J. Kim, “Quantum reinforcement learning for lightweight LEO satellite routing,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 12, no. 14, pp. 28 986–29 004, 2025.

[210] T. Q. Dinh, S. H. Dau, E. Lagunas, S. Chatzinotas, D. N. Nguyen, and D. T. Hoang, “Quantum annealing for complex optimization in satellite communication systems,” *IEEE Internet of Things J.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3771–3784, 2025.

[211] L. Fan and Z. Han, “Hybrid quantum-classical computing for future network optimization,” *IEEE Network*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 72–76, 2022.

[212] S. Kanno, J. Soda, and J. Tokuda, “Noise and decoherence induced by gravitons,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 103, no. 4, p. 044017, 2021.

[213] A. Kandala, A. Mezzacapo, K. Temme, M. Takita, M. Brink, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, “Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets,” *Nature*, vol. 549, no. 7671, p. 242–246, Sep. 2017.

[214] N. T. Nguyen, V.-D. Nguyen, H. Van Nguyen, Q. Wu, A. Tölli, S. Chatzinotas, and M. Juntti, “Fairness enhancement of UAV systems with hybrid active-passive RIS,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 4379–4396, 2023.

[215] Y. Liu, W. Huangfu, H. Zhou, H. Zhang, J. Liu, and K. Long, “Fair and energy-efficient coverage optimization for UAV placement problem in the cellular network,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 4222–4235, 2022.

[216] W. Huang and W. B. Haskell, “Stochastic approximation for risk-aware Markov decision processes,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1314–1320, 2020.

[217] U. Sadana, A. Chreddy, E. Delage, A. Forel, E. Frejinger, and T. Vidal, “A survey of contextual optimization methods for decision-making under uncertainty,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 320, no. 2, pp. 271–289, 2025.

[218] S. Pasricha, R. Ayoub, M. Kishinevsky, S. K. Mandal, and U. Y. Ogras, “A survey on energy management for mobile and IoT devices,” *IEEE Design & Test*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 7–24, 2020.

[219] C. Tang, Y. Chen, G. Chen, L. Du, and H. Liu, “A dynamic and collaborative spectrum sharing strategy based on multi-agent DRL in satellite-terrestrial converged networks,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 7969 – 7984, 2025.

[220] J. Sun, X. Liu, T. Bäck, and Z. Xu, “Learning adaptive differential evolution algorithm from optimization experiences by policy gradient,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 666–680, 2021.

[221] Z. Fei, B. Li, S. Yang, C. Xing, H. Chen, and L. Hanzo, “A survey of multi-objective optimization in wireless sensor networks: Metrics, algorithms, and open problems,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 550–586, 2016.

[222] Y. Teng, M. Liu, F. R. Yu, V. C. Leung, M. Song, and Y. Zhang, “Resource allocation for ultra-dense networks: A survey, some research issues and challenges,” *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2134–2168, 2018.

[223] M. M. H. Shuvo, S. K. Islam, J. Cheng, and B. I. Morshed, “Efficient acceleration of deep learning inference on resource-constrained edge devices: A review,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 42–91, 2023.

[224] Y.-X. Xing, J.-S. Wang, S.-H. Zhang, S.-W. Zhang, Y.-H. Zhang, and X.-F. Sui, “Multi-objective transit algorithm based on density sorting and cylindrical grid mechanism for layout optimization of wireless sensor networks,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, p. 104217, 2025.

[225] R. Chaudhry and N. Kumar, “A multi-objective meta-heuristic solution for green computing in software-defined wireless sensor networks,” *IEEE Trans. Green Commun. Netw.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1231–1241, 2021.

[226] S. K. Goudos, P. D. Diamantoulakis, and G. K. Karagiannidis, “Multi-objective optimization in 5G wireless networks with massive MIMO,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 2346–2349, 2018.