

# Last class

---

- Parent selection
- Survival selection
- Population diversity

# Heuristic Search and Evolutionary Algorithms

## Lecture 8: Popular Variants of Evolutionary Algorithms

Chao Qian (钱超)

Associate Professor, Nanjing University, China

Email: [qianc@nju.edu.cn](mailto:qianc@nju.edu.cn)


Homepage: <http://www.lamda.nju.edu.cn/qianc/>

# Evolutionary algorithms

---

EAs share a common routine

for  $\arg \max_x f(x)$



There have been many popular variants of EAs

# Genetic algorithms

---



## Genetic Algorithms (GA)

Typically applied to optimization in discrete domains

[J. H. Holland. *Outline for a logical theory of adaptive systems*. JACM, 1962]

J. H. Holland  
1929-2015

University of Michigan

## Simple GA (SGA)

Representation	Binary representation
Recombination	One-point crossover
Mutation	Bit-wise mutation
Parent selection	Fitness proportional selection – implemented by Roulette Wheel
Survivor selection	Generational, i.e, age-based replacement with $\lambda = \mu$


# Genetic algorithms

SGA

the probability of selecting the  $i$ -th individual is

$$P_{FPS}(i) = f_i / \sum_{j=1}^{\mu} f_j$$

$\mu$  parent solutions



binary representation:  $\{0,1\}^n$


# Genetic algorithms

SGA

$\mu$  parent solutions

for each pair of parent solutions

1. with prob.  $p_c$ , apply one-point crossover, otherwise copy them
2. for each resulting solution, apply bit-wise mutation




Generational, i.e., use the  $\mu$  offspring solutions to form the new population directly

# Genetic algorithms: Application

---

## Ensemble learning [Zhou, 2012]

- better performance than a single learner



## Selective ensemble (ensemble pruning) [Zhou, 2012]

- better performance than the complete ensemble
- reduce storage and improve efficiency

## Two goals

- maximize the generalization performance
- minimize the number of selected learners

# Genetic algorithms: Application

---

**PEP** [Qian, Yu and Zhou, AAAI'15]: apply GA with uniform parent selection, bit-wise mutation and fitness-based survivor selection to solve the selective ensemble problem

binary representation:  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$



a subset of base learners

$x_i = 1$ : the  $i$ -th base learner is selected

$x_i = 0$ : the  $i$ -th base learner is not selected



# Genetic algorithms: Application

## Pruning bagging base learners with size 100

	baseline methods	ordering-based methods						
		Test Error						
Data set	PEP	Bagging	BI	RE	Kappa	CP	MD	DREP
australian	.144±.020	<b>.143±.017</b>	.152±.023●	.144±.020	<b>.143±.021</b>	.145±.022	.148±.022	.144±.019
breast-cancer disorders	<b>.275±.041</b>	.279±.037	.298±.044●	.277±.031	.287±.037	.282±.043	.295±.044●	<b>.275±.036</b>
heart-statlog	<b>.304±.039</b>	.327±.047●	.365±.047●	.320±.044●	.326±.042●	.306±.039	.337±.035●	.316±.045
house-votes	.197±.037							
ionosphere	.045±.019							
kr-vs-kp	.088±.021							
letter-ah	<b>.010±.003</b>							
letter-br	.013±.005							
letter-oq	<b>.046±.008</b>							
optdigits	.043±.009	.049±.012●	.078±.017●	.046±.011	.042±.011	.042±.010	.046±.011	<b>.041±.010</b>
satimage-12v57	<b>.035±.006</b>	.038±.007●	.095±.008●	.036±.006	<b>.035±.005</b>	.036±.005	.037±.006●	<b>.035±.006</b>
satimage-2v5	.028±.004							
sick	.021±.007							
sonar	<b>.015±.003</b>							
spambase	.248±.056							
tic-tac-toe	<b>.065±.006</b>	.066±.007●	.095±.008●	.066±.006	.066±.006	.066±.006	.066±.007●	<b>.065±.006</b>
vehicle-bo-vs	.131±.027	.164±.028●	.212±.028●	.135±.026	.132±.023	.132±.026	.145±.022●	<b>.129±.026</b>
vehicle-b-v	<b>.224±.023</b>	.228±.026	.257±.025●	.226±.022	.233±.024●	.234±.024●	.244±.024●	.234±.026●
vote	.018±.011	.027±.014●	.024±.013●	.020±.011	.019±.012	.020±.011	.021±.011●	.019±.013
	<b>.044±.018</b>	.047±.018	.046±.016	.044±.017	<b>.041±.016</b>	.043±.016	.045±.014	.043±.019
count of the best	12	2	0	2	7	1	0	5
PEP: count of direct win		17	20	15.5	12.5	17	20	12.5

PEP achieves the smallest error on 60% (12/20) of the data sets, while other methods perform the best on at most 35% (7/20) data

PEP is better than any other method on more than 60% (12.5/20) data sets

PEP is never significantly worse

# Genetic algorithms: Application

ordering-based methods

Data set	PEP	Ensemble Size				
		RE	Kappa	CP	MD	DREP
australian	10.6±4.2	12.5±6.0	14.7±12.6	11.0±9.7	8.5±14.8	11.7±4.7
breast-cancer disorders	8.4±3.5	8.7±3.6	26.1±21.7●	8.8±12.3	7.8±15.2	9.2±3.7
heart-statlog	14.7±4.2	13.0±4.2	24.7±16.2	15.2±10.6	17.7±10.0	13.0±5.0
house-votes	9.3±2.3	9.3±2.3	9.3±2.3	9.3±2.3	9.3±2.3	9.3±2.3
ionosphere	2.9±1.7	2.9±1.7	2.9±1.7	2.9±1.7	2.9±1.7	2.9±1.7
kr-vs-kp	5.2±2.2	5.2±2.2	5.2±2.2	5.2±2.2	5.2±2.2	5.2±2.2
letter-ah	4.2±1.8	4.2±1.8	4.2±1.8	4.2±1.8	4.2±1.8	4.2±1.8
letter-br	5.0±1.9	5.0±1.9	5.0±1.9	5.0±1.9	5.0±1.9	5.0±1.9
letter-oq	10.9±2.6	10.9±2.6	10.9±2.6	10.9±2.6	10.9±2.6	10.9±2.6
letter-oq	12.0±3.7	12.0±3.7	12.0±3.7	12.0±3.7	12.0±3.7	12.0±3.7
optdigits	22.7±3.1	25.0±9.3	25.2±8.1	21.4±7.5	46.8±23.9●	25.0±8.0
satimage-12v57	17.1±5.0	17.1±5.0	17.1±5.0	17.1±5.0	17.1±5.0	17.1±5.0
satimage-2v5	5.7±1.7	5.7±1.7	5.7±1.7	5.7±1.7	5.7±1.7	5.7±1.7
sick	6.9±2.8	6.9±2.8	6.9±2.8	6.9±2.8	6.9±2.8	6.9±2.8
sonar	11.4±4.2	11.4±4.2	11.4±4.2	11.4±4.2	11.4±4.2	11.4±4.2
spambase	17.5±4.5	18.5±5.0	20.0±8.1	19.0±9.9	28.8±17.0●	16.7±4.6
tic-tac-toe	14.5±3.8	16.1±5.4	17.4±6.5	15.4±6.3	28.0±22.6●	13.6±3.4
vehicle-bo-vs	16.5±4.5	15.7±5.7	16.5±8.2	11.2±5.7○	21.6±20.4	3.2±5.0○
vehicle-b-v	2.8±1.1	3.4±2.1	4.5±1.6●	5.3±7.4	2.8±3.8	4.0±3.9
vote	2.7±1.1	3.2±2.7	5.1±2.6●	5.4±5.2●	6.0±9.8	3.9±2.5●
count of the best	12	2	0	2	3	3
PEP: count of direct win		17	19.5	18	17.5	16

PEP achieves the smallest size on 60% (12/20) of the data sets, while other methods achieve the smallest size on at most 15% (3/20) data

PEP is better than any other method on at least 80% (16/20) data sets

PEP is never significantly worse, except two losses on vehicle-bo-vs

# Evolutionary strategies

---



## Evolutionary Strategies (ES)

Typically applied to optimization in continuous domains

[I. Rechenberg. *Cybernetic solution path of an experimental problem*. 1965]

I. Rechenberg  
1934-2021


Technical University of Berlin

Representation	Real-valued representation
Recombination	Discrete or arithmetic
Mutation	Gaussian perturbation
Parent selection	Uniform random
Survivor selection	Fitness-based replacement by $(\mu, \lambda)$ or $(\mu + \lambda)$
Speciality	Self-adaptation of mutation step sizes


# Evolutionary strategies

ES

the probability of selecting each individual is  $1/\mu$



Real-valued representation:  $\mathbb{R}^n$



$(x_1, \dots, x_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n(n-1)/2})$

# Evolutionary strategies

---

## Local recombination:

Select two parents  
uniformly at random



$$(x_1, \dots, x_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n(n-1)/2})$$

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n, \sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_n, \alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n(n-1)/2})$$

$$(z_1, \dots, z_n, \sigma''_1, \dots, \sigma''_n, \alpha''_1, \dots, \alpha''_{n(n-1)/2})$$



Discrete:

$z_i$  is chosen from  $x_i$  and  $y_i$   
uniformly at random

Arithmetic:

$$\sigma_i'' = \sigma_i/2 + \sigma'_i/2 \quad \alpha_i'' = \alpha_i/2 + \alpha'_i/2$$

**Global recombination:** the two parents are selected  
uniformly at random for each position

# Evolutionary strategies

---

## Local recombination:

Select two parents  
uniformly at random



$$(x_1, \dots, x_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n(n-1)/2})$$

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n, \sigma'_1, \dots, \sigma'_n, \alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n(n-1)/2})$$

$$(z_1, \dots, z_n, \sigma''_1, \dots, \sigma''_n, \alpha''_1, \dots, \alpha''_{n(n-1)/2})$$



## Correlated mutation:



$$(w_1, \dots, w_n, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n(n-1)/2})$$

**Self-adaptation**  $\delta_i = \sigma_i'' \cdot e^{\tau' \cdot N(0,1) + \tau \cdot N_i(0,1)}$      $\beta_j = \alpha_j'' + \beta \cdot N_j(0,1)$


$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{z} + N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}')$$

# Evolutionary strategies

ES

the probability of selecting each individual is  $1/\mu$

local/global recombination + correlated mutation



Real-valued representation:  $\mathbb{R}^n$




$(x_1, \dots, x_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n(n-1)/2})$

# Evolutionary strategies: Application



Rastrigin function

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = 10d + \sum_{i=1}^d [x_i^2 - 10 \cos(2\pi x_i)]$$

$d = 2$



**CMA-ES** [Hansen et al., ECJ'03] CMA-ES Rastrigin function trial=1





# Evolutionary strategies: Application


---

## Reinforcement learning

- learn how to take actions in an environment in order to maximize the cumulative reward

Example: double pole with velocities problem

**Goal:** Learn an optimal policy to keep the angles of the poles in the range  $[-36^\circ, 36^\circ]$  for  $10^5$  time steps, where each step corresponds to 0.02s



**State:** vector  $(x, \dot{x}, \theta_1, \dot{\theta}_1, \theta_2, \dot{\theta}_2)$  velocity

**Action:** exert forces either left or right on the cart

**Reward:**  $-1$  when balancing fails (any of the poles out of range  $[-36^\circ, 36^\circ]$ )

Finite length track

# Evolutionary strategies: Application

---

[Igel, CEC'03] uses **CMA-ES** with average arithmetic recombination, Gaussian perturbation with self-adaptation, and  $(\mu + \lambda)$  survivor selection to solve the double pole with velocities problem

real-valued representation:  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$



neural network weights



a policy  $\pi$

# Evolutionary strategies: Application

CMA-ES	$n_{\text{hidden}}$	bias	$n_{\text{weights}}$	evaluations	failures
(3/3, 13)	4	no	28	<b>884</b> / 3142	0 / 1
(3/3, 13)	4	yes	33	2929 / 25853	0 / 12
(3/3, 13)	6	no	42	<b>895</b>	0
(3/3, 13)	6	yes	49	2672 / 13464	0 / 5
(4/4, 16)	8	no	56	1119	0
(4/4, 16)	8	yes	65	2493	0
(4/4, 16)	10	no	70	1003	0
(4/4, 16)	10	yes	81	2494	0
(4/4, 16)	12	no	84	1143	0
(4/4, 16)	12	yes	97	2216	0
(4/4, 16)	14	no	98	1021	0
(4/4, 16)	14	yes	113	2391	0
(4/4, 16)	16	no	112	967	0
(4/4, 16)	16	yes	129	2146	0

CMA-ES can find an optimal policy even with a small population size

method	evaluations	population size
NE (Wieland, 1991)	$\approx 307200$	2048
EP (Saravanan and Fogel, 1995)	$\approx 80000$	100
SANE (Moriarty and Miikulainen, 1996)	12600	200
ESP (Gomez and Miikulainen, 1999)	3800	200
NEAT (Stanley and Miikkulainen, 2002)	3600	150

CMA-ES is almost four times faster than the best previous algorithm

# Evolutionary programming

---



L. J. Fogel  
1928-2007

## Evolutionary Programming (EP)

Originally for optimizing finite state machines (agents)

[L. J. Fogel, A. J. Owens, M. J. Walsh. *Artificial Intelligence through Simulated Evolution*. 1966]

University of California, Los Angeles

Now typically applied to optimization in continuous domains,  
and almost merged with ES

Representation	Real-valued representation	difference
Recombination	None	
Mutation	Gaussian perturbation	
Parent selection	Deterministic (each parent generates one offspring)	
Survivor selection	Round-robin tournament	
Speciality	Self-adaptation of mutation step sizes	

# Genetic programming



J. R. Koza  
1944-

## Genetic Programming (GP)


Typically for optimizing computer programs

[J. R. Koza. *Genetic Programming*.1992]

Stanford University


Arithmetic formula:

$$2 \cdot \pi + \left( (x + 3) - \frac{y}{5 + 1} \right)$$



Representation	Tree representation
Recombination	Exchange of subtrees
Mutation	Random change in trees
Parent selection	Fitness proportional
Survivor selection	Generational replacement


# Genetic programming




- Initial tree construction (maximum initial depth  $d_{max}$ )
  - Full method (each branch has depth =  $d_{max}$ ):
    - nodes at depth  $< d_{max}$  are randomly chosen from  $F$
    - nodes at depth  $d_{max}$  are randomly chosen from  $T$
  - Grow method (each branch has depth  $\leq d_{max}$ ):
    - nodes at depth  $< d_{max}$  are randomly chosen from  $F \cup T$
    - nodes at depth  $d_{max}$  are randomly chosen from  $T$

# Genetic programming

GA uses  
recombination  
AND mutation  
sequentially  
(each performed  
probabilistically)



GA flowchart




GP flowchart

GP uses  
recombination  
OR mutation  
(chosen  
probabilistically)

# Genetic programming

---


- **Bloat:** average tree sizes tend to grow over time
    - Prohibiting variation operators that would generate “too big” offspring
    - Parsimony pressure: penalty for being oversized
  - **Parent selection**
    - Typically fitness proportional selection
    - Over-selection for very large population sizes
      - rank population by fitness and divide it into two groups:  
group 1: best  $x\%$  of population, group 2: other  $(100 - x)\%$
      - 80% of selection chooses from group 1, 20% from group 2
      - for pop. size = 1000, 2000, 4000, 8000,  $x = 32, 16, 8, 4$
- Selection pressure increases with the population size
- 



# Genetic programming: Application

**Task:** learn a rule to distinguish good from bad loan applicants

ID	No of children	Salary	Marital status	Good?
ID-1	2	45000	Married	0
ID-2	0	30000	Single	1
ID-3	1	40000	Divorced	1
...				



represent

IF (NOC = 2) AND (S > 80000)  
THEN good ELSE bad


**Fitness:** percentage of correctly  
classified cases

# Genetic programming: Application

---

**Task:** find a function  $f(x)$  to fit the observed data

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$$




**Fitness:** the error

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - y_i)^2$$


# Genetic programming: Application

---

**Task:** antenna design in NASA's Space Technology 5 (ST5) mission



Two antennas centered on the top and bottom of each spacecraft



Quadrifilar helical antenna designed by human experts

# Genetic programming: Application

## Computer-Automated Evolution of an X-Band Antenna for NASA's Space Technology 5 Mission

**Gregory S. Hornby** Gregory.S.Hornby@nasa.gov  
Mail Stop 269-3, University Affiliated Research Center, UC Santa Cruz, Moffett Field, CA, 94035, USA


**Jason D. Lohn** Jason.Lohn@west.cmu.edu  
Carnegie Mellon University, Mail Stop 23-11, Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA

**Derek S. Linden** dlinden@jemengineering.com  
JEM Engineering, 8683 Cherry Lane, Laurel, MD 20707, USA Moffett Field, CA 94035, USA



use **GP** to design antenna automatically

## tree representation



- forward(length, radius)
- rotate-x(angle)
- rotate-y(angle)
- rotate-z(angle)

**Fitness:** efficiency and gain evaluated by simulation

Execute the operators



by preorder traversal


an antenna







# Genetic programming: Application


Quadrifilar helical antenna designed by human experts




Re-evolved antenna ST5-33.142.7



38% efficiency




80% efficiency



93% efficiency

# Genetic programming: Application

---



Re-evolved antenna ST5-33.142.7



February 25, 2005

Delivered to Goddard Space Flight Center to undergo tests



April 8, 2005

Complete the tests

March 22, 2006

Launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, California on a Pegasus XL rocket





# Genetic programming: Application


---



Three ST5 spacecraft with the black radomes on top containing an evolved antenna, ST5-33.142.7

Three ST5 spacecraft mounted for launch on a Pegasus XL rocket

The first computer-evolved hardware in space



# Genetic programming: Application


[J. R. Koza, et al. What's AI Done for Me Lately? Genetic Programming's Human-Competitive Results. IEEE Intelligent Systems, 18(3): 25-31, 2003.]

Table 1. Human-competitive results produced by genetic programming.

Claimed instance	Basis for claim (criteria number)
1. Creating a better-than-classical quantum algorithm for the Deutsch-Jozsa "early promise" problem <sup>2</sup>	2, 5
2. Creating a better-than-classical quantum algorithm for Grover's database search problem <sup>3</sup>	2, 5
3. Creating a quantum algorithm for the depth-two AND/OR query problem that is better than any previously published result <sup>4,5</sup>	4
4. Creating a quantum algorithm for the depth-one OR query problem that is better than any previously published result <sup>5</sup>	4
5. Creating a protocol for communicating information through a quantum gate that was previously thought not to permit such communication <sup>6</sup>	4
6. Creating a novel variant of quantum dense coding <sup>5</sup>	4
7. Creating soccer-playing program that ranked in the middle of the field of 34 human-written programs in the Robo Cup 1998 competition <sup>7</sup>	8
8. Creating four different algorithms for the transmembrane segment identification problem for proteins <sup>8,9</sup>	2, 5
9. Creating a sorting network for seven items using only 16 steps <sup>9</sup>	1, 4
10. Rediscovering the Campbell ladder topology for lowpass and highpass filters <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
11. Rediscovering the Zobel "M-derived half section" and "constant K" filter sections <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
12. Rediscovering the Cauer (elliptic) topology for filters <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
13. Automatic decomposition of the problem of synthesizing a crossover filter <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
14. Rediscovering a recognizable voltage gain stage and a Darlington emitter-follower section of an amplifier and other circuits <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
15. Synthesizing 60 and 96 decibel amplifiers <sup>9</sup>	1, 6
16. Synthesizing analog computational circuits for squaring, cubing, square root, cube root, logarithm, and Gaussian functions <sup>9</sup>	1, 4, 7
17. Synthesizing a real-time analog circuit for time-optimal control of a robot <sup>9</sup>	7
18. Synthesizing an electronic thermometer <sup>9</sup>	1, 7
19. Synthesizing a voltage reference circuit <sup>9</sup>	1, 7
20. Creating a cellular automata rule for the majority classification problem that is better than the Gacs-Kurdyumov-Levin (GKL) rule and all other known rules written by humans <sup>9</sup>	4, 5
21. Creating motifs that detect the D-E-A-D box family of proteins and the manganese superoxide dismutase family <sup>8</sup>	3
22. Synthesizing topology for a PID-D2 (proportional, integrative, derivative, and second derivative) controller <sup>10</sup>	1, 6
23. Synthesizing topology for a PID (proportional, integrative, and derivative) controller <sup>10</sup>	1, 6
24. Synthesizing analog circuit equivalent to Philbrick circuit <sup>10</sup>	1, 6
25. Synthesizing NAND circuit <sup>10</sup>	1, 6
26. Simultaneously synthesizing topology, sizing, placement, and routing of analog electrical circuits <sup>10</sup>	7
27. Rediscovering Yagi-Uda antenna <sup>10</sup>	2, 6, 7
28. Creating PID tuning rules that outperform a PID controller using the Ziegler-Nichols and Astrom-Hagglund tuning rules <sup>10</sup>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
29. Creating three non-PID controllers that outperform PID controllers using the Ziegler-Nichols and Astrom-Hagglund tuning rules <sup>10</sup>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
30. Rediscovering negative feedback <sup>10</sup>	1, 6
31. Synthesizing a low-voltage balun circuit <sup>10</sup>	1
32. Synthesizing a mixed analog-digital variable capacitor circuit <sup>10</sup>	1
33. Synthesizing a high-current load circuit <sup>10</sup>	1
34. Synthesizing a voltage-current conversion circuit <sup>10</sup>	1
35. Synthesizing a cubic signal generator <sup>10</sup>	1
36. Synthesizing a tunable integrated active filter <sup>10</sup>	1

e.g.: design low-voltage balun circuit

*"The best-of-run evolved circuit (see Figure 1) is roughly a fourfold improvement over the patented circuit in terms of our fitness measure. The evolved circuit is superior both in terms of its frequency response and harmonic distortion."*



# Differential evolution

---

## Differential Evolution (DE)

Typically applied to nonlinear and nondifferentiable continuous optimization

[R. Storn, K. Price. *Differential Evolution – A Simple and Efficient Adaptive Scheme for Global Optimization over Continuous Spaces*. 1995]


International Computer Science Institute in Berkeley, USA



R. Storn

Representation	Real-valued representation
Recombination	Uniform crossover
Mutation	<b>Differential mutation</b>
Parent selection	Uniform random selection
Survivor selection	Deterministic elitist replacement (parent vs. offspring)



# Differential evolution



Randomly select three parent solutions  $x, y, z$



Differential mutation

$$v = x + F \cdot (y - z)$$




Select the value from  $v_i$  with prob.  $p$  for each position

Uniform crossover



# Differential evolution

---



Randomly select three parent solutions  $x, y, z$

Differential mutation

$$v = x + F \cdot (y - z)$$

base vector  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{random} \\ \text{best} \end{array} \right.$


perturbation vector  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} y - z \quad \text{randomly} \\ \quad \quad \text{select two} \\ (y - z) + (y' - z') \\ \text{randomly select four} \end{array} \right.$

Variants of DE: DE/a/b/c

- a is the base vector (rand or best)
- b is the number of different vectors to define perturbation vector
- c denotes the crossover scheme ("bin" is uniform crossover)

# Particle swarm optimization

---



## Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)

Typically applied to nonlinear optimization

[J. Kennedy, R. Eberhart. *Particle Swarm Optimization*. 1995]

J. Kennedy R. Eberhart

fish school




bird flock



Representation	Real-valued representation
Recombination	None
Mutation	Adding velocity vector
Parent selection	Deterministic (each parent creates one offspring via mutation)
Survivor selection	Generational (offspring replaces parents)

# Particle swarm optimization

Each member in the population (a list):



learning rate for the personal influence      learning rate for the social influence      random matrices

inertia weight


$$\mathbf{v}' = \underbrace{w}_{\text{inertia weight}} \cdot \mathbf{v} + \underbrace{\phi_1}_{\text{learning rate for the personal influence}} \underbrace{U_1}_{\text{random matrix}} \cdot \underbrace{(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})}_{\text{the best position the member ever had}} + \underbrace{\phi_2}_{\text{learning rate for the social influence}} \underbrace{U_2}_{\text{random matrix}} \cdot \underbrace{(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})}_{\text{the best position the population ever had}}$$

**Mutation**  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}' \end{array} \right.$

# Particle swarm optimization

---

The  $i$ -th member in the population (a list):



**Mutation**  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{v}'_i = w \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + \phi_1 \mathbf{U}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i) + \phi_2 \mathbf{U}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}_i) \\ \mathbf{x}'_i = \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{v}'_i \end{array} \right.$

$$\mathbf{y}'_i = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}'_i & \text{if } f(\mathbf{x}'_i) < f(\mathbf{y}_i) \\ \mathbf{y}_i & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The global best  $\mathbf{z}$  is updated  
if  $\min\{f(\mathbf{x}'_1), \dots, f(\mathbf{x}'_\mu)\} < f(\mathbf{z})$



# Ant colony optimization



M. Dorigo

## Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)

Typically applied to find good paths through graphs

[M. Dorigo. *Optimization, Learning and Natural Algorithms*. 1992]

Ants find the shortest path between their nest and a good source using **pheromone trails**



Solution representation

path on a graph

### Solution construction

An ant moves on the graph according to the pheromone and length of each edge

### Pheromone update

The pheromone of each edge is updated according to the number of ants traversing it and the lengths of constructed paths



# Ant colony optimization

## Solution construction

An ant moves on the graph according to the pheromone and length of each edge

For an ant  $k$ , if the current vertex is  $i$ , the probability of selecting  $j$  as the next vertex is

$$p_k(i, j) = \begin{cases} \frac{(\tau(i, j))^\alpha (\eta(i, j))^\beta}{\sum_{u \in J_k(i)} (\tau(i, u))^\alpha (\eta(i, u))^\beta}, \\ 0, \end{cases}$$

pheromone

usually  $1/d(i, j)$ , where  $d(i, j)$  is the distance between  $i$  and  $j$

if  $j \in J_k(i)$

otherwise

vertices which are connected to  $i$  and unvisited by the ant  $k$

# Ant colony optimization

## Pheromone update

The pheromone of each edge is updated according to the number of ants traversing it and the lengths of constructed paths

After the ants construct the paths, the pheromone is updated by

$$\tau(i, j) = (1 - \rho) \cdot \tau(i, j) + \sum_{k=1}^m \Delta\tau_k(i, j)$$

number of ants, i.e., population size

evaporation factor

$$\Delta\tau_k(i, j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{C_k}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in R^k \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

length of the path constructed by the ant  $k$

pheromone density laid on edge  $(i, j)$  by the ant  $k$

edge set traversed by the ant  $k$

# Estimation of distribution algorithms

---



S. Baluja

## Estimation of Distribution Algorithms (EDA)


### Applied to diverse optimization

[S. Baluja. *Population-Based Incremental Learning: A Method for Integrating Genetic Search Based Function Optimization and Competitive Learning*. 1994]

Carnegie Mellon University

EDA guide the search for the optimum by **building and sampling explicit probabilistic models of promising candidate solutions**

Select the fittest subset of sampled solutions




# Estimation of distribution algorithms

---

Model building

Model sampling





Probabilistic model


$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$$

Univariate:  $P(x_1) \cdot P(x_2) \cdot \dots \cdot P(x_n)$

Bivariate:  $\prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i | pa_i)$



Multivariate: Bayesian network



# Summary

---

- Genetic algorithms
  - Evolutionary strategies
  - Evolutionary programming
  - Genetic programming
  - Differential evolution
  - Particle swarm optimization
  - Ant colony optimization
  - Estimation of distribution algorithms
- Historical EA variants
- Recent EA variants
-

# References

---

- A. E. Eiben and J. E. Smith. Introduction to Evolutionary Computing. Chapter 6.
- J. R. Koza, M. A. Keane and M. J. Streeter. What's AI done for me lately? Genetic programming's human-competitive results. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 2003, 18(3): 25-31.
- C. Igel. Neuroevolution for reinforcement learning using evolution strategies. In: *Proceedings of the 2003 Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC'03)*, 2003, pages 2588-2595, Canberra, Australia.
- M. Dorigo and T. Stützle. Ant Colony Optimization. 2004, MIT Press.
- G. S. Hornby, J. D. Lohn and D. S. Linden. Computer-automated evolution of an X-band antenna for NASA's space technology 5 mission. *Evolutionary Computation*, 2011, 19(1): 1-23.
- C. Qian, Y. Yu and Z.-H. Zhou. Pareto ensemble pruning. In: *Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'15)*, 2015, pages 2935-2941, Austin, TX.