

**ECE 3790 Lab 3 Report**  
*Submitted by: Richard Constantine*  
#7686561

1. Provide pseudo-code for your algorithm? Did it run as expected? What was the stopping criteria?

```
Input adjMat, size; [Adjacency Matrix and associated Size]
Algorithm simulatedAnnealing
globalStopCount  $\leftarrow$  100; [Program will stop using Metropolis criteria – 100 equilibriums in a row with no change]
localStopCount  $\leftarrow$  10000; [Number of iterations to establish 1 equilibrium]
penalty  $\leftarrow$  size/1.5; [Penalty incurred when the cardinality of the bins differs]
bins  $\leftarrow$  assignBins(adjMat, size); [Assign each component/vertex to a bin – bins are tracked in 1D array]

oldCost  $\leftarrow$  calculateCost(adjMat, bins, size, penalty); [Calculate cost of initial bin assignment]
print oldCost;
print bins;

newCost  $\leftarrow$  optimizeCost(adjMat, size, bins, localStopCount, globalStopCount, oldCost); [Optimize via SA]
print newCost;
print bins;

Input adjMat, size;
Output bins;
Algorithm assignBins
repeat for i from 0 to size - 1
    bins[i]  $\leftarrow$  random number between 0 and numBins-1; [In this lab, numBins  $\leftarrow$  2]
end for

Input adjMat, size, bins, penalty;
Output cost;
Algorithm calculateCost
repeat for i from 0 to size-2
    if bins[i] == 0
        then bin0count  $\leftarrow$  bin0count + 1; [Tracks the cardinality of each bin for the penalty]
    else
        then bin1count  $\leftarrow$  bin1count + 1;

        repeat for j from i + 1 to size - 1
            if bins[i] != bins[j]
                then cost  $\leftarrow$  cost + adjMatrix[i][j]; [Add connections between bins]
            end for
        end for

    if bins[size-1] == 0
        then bin0count  $\leftarrow$  bin0count+1;
    else
        then bin1count  $\leftarrow$  bin1count+1;

cost  $\leftarrow$  cost + (|bin0count – bin1count| x penalty); [Add the penalty due to difference in cardinality]

Input adjMat, bins, stopCount, oldCost;
Output bestCost;
Algorithm optimizeCost
globalCount  $\leftarrow$  0;
count  $\leftarrow$  0;
control  $\leftarrow$  3000;
```

```

repeat while globalCount < globalStopCount
    prevCost ← bestCost
    repeat for i from 0 to localStopCount - 1
        rand1 ← random number between 0 and size;
        rand2 ← random number between 0 and size;
        repeat while rand1 == rand2 || bin[rand1] == bin[rand2]
            rand1 ← random number between 0 and size;
            rand2 ← random number between 0 and size;
        end while

        swapBins(bins, rand1, rand2); [Swap random bins and check the new cost]
        newCost ← calculateCost(adjMat, bins, size, penalty);

        costChange ← newCost – bestCost
        rand3 ← random number between 0 and 1

        if costChange < 0 [Compare the cost, keep any better (or probabilistically better) results]
            then bestCost ← newCost;
        else if costChange > 0 && rand3 < e-(costChange/control)
            then bestCost ← newCost;
        else
            then swapBins(bins, rand1, rand2); [Swap bins back]
    end for

    if |bestCost – prevCost| == 0 [If equilibrium has no change, iterate globalCount]
        then globalCount ← globalCount + 1;
    else
        then globalCount ← 0;

    if count mod 2 == 0
        then sample1 ← globalCount;
    else
        then sample2 ← globalCount;

    if |sample2 – sample1| == 0
        then localStopCount ← 50000; [Increase inner loop iterations when solution is changing]
    else
        then localStopCount ← 10000;

    count ← count + 1;
    control ← control *.9;
end while

if (size x penalty) < bestCost [Check if all components in 1 bin yields a better result]
    then print "Penalty may be too low";
    then bestCost ← (size x penalty);
    then repeat for i from 0 to size - 1
        bins[i] ← 0;
    end for

```

**Input** bins, index1, index2;

**Output** bins;

**Algorithm** swapBins

temp ← bins[index1];

bins[index1] ← bins[index2];

bins[index2] ← temp;

Yes, the program executed as expected. The stopping criteria of the program is determined by the *globalStopCount*. When the *localCount* (of the inner loop) reaches the *localStopCount*, it compares the previous equilibrium to the currently established equilibrium and iterates *globalCount* when no changes occur. The program then exits when 100 equilibriums have been established (in a row) without any changes – i.e. when *globalCount* reaches *globalStopCount*.

2. What was your minimum score or solution. What was the percent improvement from and original or initial “solution”.

Sample outputs of the program for each of the provided adjacency matrices can be found in Appendix 1.

The minimum score achieved was a cost of 0 when processing AdjMatCC.txt. This amounts to a ratio/percent improvement of infinity.

<u>Adjacency Matrix</u>	<u>Percent Improvement (Greedy)</u>	<u>Percent Improvement (SA)</u>
AdjMatAsym.txt	190%	185%
AdjMatCC.txt	336%	Infinity
AdjMatRand.txt	128%	143%

3. How long did the algorithm take to run? If you doubled the size of your problem did the running time scale linearly, quadratically or by some other means?

Random adjacency matrices were generated using the matrixGenerator.java code (from as lab 1) and are all provided within the lab package. They were created using 50% sparsity (same test matrices used from lab 2). Sample outputs of the program executing on the adjacency matrices of size 100 and 200 are provided in Appendix 2 (the matrices used are also provided as attachment).

<u>Size</u>	<u>Run-Time (Greedy)</u>	<u>Run-Time (SA)</u>
100 components	1.09 seconds	32.8 seconds
200 components	2.63 seconds	99.5 seconds

The run time appears to scale almost quadratically (i.e. double problem size, 4 times longer run time). This is because the algorithm uses 2 nested loops in order to calculate cost, therefore, the run-time should scale by about  $O(n^2)$  with the problem size ( $n$ ).

4. Vary the component population size. How did this affect the running time?

Continuing using the previous data and the same matrixGenerator.java (with a sparsity of 50%), the problem size can be varied to observe average run-time (the matrices used are also provided – same used in lab 2). Note, large variance due to many random influences.

<b>Size</b>	<b>Run-Time (Greedy)</b>	<b>Run-Time (SA)</b>
100 components	1.09 seconds	32.8 seconds
110 components	1.20 seconds	33.9 seconds
120 components	1.27 seconds	48.6 seconds
130 components	1.40 seconds	51.0 seconds
140 components	1.60 seconds	55.8 seconds

150 components	1.86 seconds	65.7 seconds
160 components	2.05 seconds	69.7 seconds
170 components	2.25 seconds	75.9 seconds
180 components	2.37 seconds	86.0 seconds
190 components	2.57 seconds	95.7 seconds
200 components	2.63 seconds	99.5 seconds

A plot/graph of the results is provided in Appendix 3.

5. How might your basic algorithm be improved?

Some improvements that could be implemented:

- Better *localStopCount* response relative to how quickly the solution is changing
  - Sample more when change is large and less when change is small
  - More intuitive way of detecting how quickly the solutions are changing
- More efficient method of calculating cost (instead of loops both spanning almost the entire adjacency matrix – instead only calculate necessary connections)
- Visualization aid

## Appendix 1

What is the size of the matrix?

100

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program.

AdjMatAsym.txt

Old Cost = 4238

Bins:

```
010000111001000100101100011111101010001010111001111110001011000100111111111011111001010001010
000011
```

New Cost = 2294

Bins:

[illegible]

Run-Time: 30202138797 nanoseconds

or 30.202 seconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.8474280732345247

Program Ends

\*\*\*\*\*

What is the size of the matrix?

100

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program.

AdjMatCC.txt

Old Cost = 1897

Bins:

1010111000101010011001100101100010111110001001001010000110101010101000101101101010011111110011  
100001

New Cost = 0

Bins:

[illegible]

Run-Time: 25608439097 nanoseconds

or 25.608 seconds

Ratio (ie improvement): Infinity

Program Ends

\*\*\*\*\*

What is the size of the matrix?

100

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program.

AdjMatRand.txt

Old Cost = 4038

Bins:

0110000011110011001100101110100000101101100111101010010001011000111010001001010111110100100011  
000111

New Cost = 2833

Bins:

0011010000001011010110000000100101000100011010111111010010000101010101101111101110110111110100  
100110

Run-Time: 37093944203 nanoseconds  
or 37.094 seconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.4253441581362514

Program Ends

## **Appendix 2**

What is the size of the matrix?

100

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program.

Q3\_1.txt

Old Cost = 7296

Bins:

10110011011011101011101111010111010110101000110010011010100011101010011101010101100110011101  
111110

New Cost = 6093

Bins:

1010110001110101101100100010111111000000011101011001111011001101100101101101011110111011101011  
010111

Run-Time: 32825689794 nanoseconds  
or 32.826 seconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.1974396848842934

Program Ends

\*\*\*\*\*

What is the size of the matrix?

200

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program.

Q3\_2.txt

Old Cost = 27748

Bins:

011111111000101000101001110101010011110101101111000010111001101000010010111111110101000011101

001000011100010100100111101100011111110010011110111111111111000011000101001010101010000100111  
010110100101

New Cost = 24448

Bins:

0111000110010011101011011001110101110100101111001011000010001011001111111111110011110110100010  
001000000001111110011011010101101010010011100101111001011110001010111101101000001001001101101  
110111111000

Run-Time: 93851563131 nanoseconds  
or 93.852 seconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.1349803664921465

Program Ends

### Appendix 3

