

# CS 687 Fall'21 – Project 3 Report

Chien Wei, Hsiung  
Sai Kishore, Salaka

## Introduction:

This project contains a High-level Evolutionary Computation framework, which is later used for performing GA on boolean and floating-point vectors, and GP for Symbolic Regression and Artificial Ant problems.

## Implementation and Experimentation:

### Note:

- EM refers to “[Essentials of Metaheuristics](#)” by Dr. Sean Luke.
- Almost all the utility functions were made use of, and the code was written as short and meaningful as possible while functioning as expected.
- Almost all the runs executed in about 10-15 seconds, with the specified parameters.

### Top-level Evolutionary Computation:

The tournament-select-one(), tournament-selector(), and evolve() functions were implemented based on the contextual instructions and the respective algorithms in EM. The evolve() function runs for a specified number of generations, finding two individuals with the best fitness in the population mutating them, and creating a new population with better individuals at the end of each run. This function will be used in the later experiments.

### Boolean Vector Genetic Algorithm:

The functions boolean-uniform-crossover() and boolean-vector-modifier() were implemented from EM. In mutation-boolean(), the Boolean vector is mutated by randomly shifting the bits from 0 to 1 and vice-versa.

The testing problems were implemented from EM. The parameters chosen and results of the testing problems with those parameters is as follows:

Parameter	Value
*boolean-vector-length*	100
*tournament-size*	7
*boolean-crossover-probability*	0.2
*boolean-mutation-probability*	0.01
generations	100
pop-size	100
Result	Best of 50 runs

Problem	Results	Comments
max-ones-f()	Almost 1 in every 2 runs finds the 100% optimal solution.	As the fitness is the number of 1s in the vector, the problem easily converges to an optimal solution.
trap-f()	Rarely results in a single 1 and rest 0s vector, but mostly all 0s vector.	The function performs poorly as the probability of finding the individual with the best fitness, i.e., (n+1) is almost impossible. It is almost unaffected by the parameters.
leading-ones-f()	The best result was around 96, i.e., 96 1s in the beginning of the vector.	The higher the generations is, the better it converges to an optimal solution.
leading-ones-blocks-f()	The best result was around 28 for b=3, i.e., 28 strings with 3 1s at the beginning of the vector.	The same goes with this as previous, the higher the generations the better is the chance to find the best individual.

## Floating-point Vector Genetic Algorithm:

The functions `gaussian-random()`, `float-uniform-crossover()`, `gaussian-convolution()`, `float-vector-modifier()` were implemented from EM, and the testing problems too. A detailed analysis of the parameters chosen, and the results is below:

Parameter	Value
*tournament-size*	7
*float-vector-length*	20
*float-min*	-5.12
*float-max*	5.12
*float-crossover-probability*	0.1
*float-mutation-probability*	0.1
*float-mutation-variance*	0.02
generations	
Pop-size	100

Problem	Results	Comments
sum-f()	Almost reaches the optimal solution. All the values are near to the *float-max*	As the fitness is the sum of the floating-points in the individual, it reaches an optimal easily.
step-f()	It performs well, but not as good as the sum-f().	The values are in the range of (4.2, 5.1).
sphere-f()	Fitness almost reaches zero every time.	Considering how the function looks (in EM), it almost always results in a fitness near to 0.
rosenbrock-f()	The fitness tends to be a negative value around -90.	Considering how the function looks (in EM), most of the values lie in the negative axes.
rastrigin-f()	The fitness tends to be a negative value around -20.	Very few values reach the maximum float value. Increasing the population provides better results.
schwefel-f()	The fitness is around 8000, as the values are multiplied by 100.	Performs better than the previous two problems, and most of the values are near the max value.

## Symbolic Regression:

The functions `gp-symbolic-regression-evaluator()` was implemented as suggested, by handling any errors in the calculations. In the `gp-modifier()` when the crossed-over trees go beyond the \*size-limit\* they are replaced by random new trees.

With a pop-size=500 and generations=50, one of the runs provided a 100% optimal solution. For a value of  $x = 0.9697573$ , the individual  $(+(x)(*(-(+(x)(x))(x))(+(x)(*(x)(+(*(x)(x))(x))))))+(x)(*(-(+(x)(x))(x))(+(x)(*(x)(+(*(x)(x))(x))))))$  provided a fitness of 1.

Verification:

```
CL-USER> (defun x () 0.9697573)
WARNING: redefining COMMON-LISP-USER::X in DEFUN
X
CL-USER> (+ (* (x) (* (+ (x) (* (x) (x))) (x))) (* (+ (x) (cos (- (x) (x)))) (x)))
3.7065818
CL-USER> (+ (x) (* (- (+ (x) (x)) (x)) (+ (x) (* (x) (+ (* (x) (x)) (x)))))) (+ (x) (* (- (+ (x) (x)) (x)) (+ (x) (* (x) (+ (* (x) (x)) (x))))))
3.7065818
```

## Artificial Ant:

The functions were implemented as instructed without deviating much. In the resultant `*map*`, a 1 is placed in every location where the ant had gone. One out of 10s of runs provided the 100% optimal solution, with generations=50 and pop-size=500:

```
(PROGN3
  (IF-FOOD-AHEAD (MOVE)
    (IF-FOOD-AHEAD (IF-FOOD-AHEAD (PROGN2 (LEFT) (LEFT)) (MOVE))
      (PROGN3 (LEFT) (LEFT)
        (IF-FOOD-AHEAD (MOVE)
          (IF-FOOD-AHEAD (LEFT)
            (LEFT))))))
  (MOVE) (LEFT))
CL-USER> (print-map *map*)
```

```
ABCD.....
...E.....
...F.....ABCDEF..
...G.....Z....G..
...H.....Y....H..
...IJKLMNOPQR...TUVWX...I..
.....S.....S.....J..
.....T.....R.....K..
.....U.....Q.....L..
.....V.....P.....M..
.....W.....O.....N..
.....X.....N.....O..
.....Y.....M.....P..
.....Z.....L.....Q..
.....A.....K..XWVUTSR..
.....B...FGHIJ..Y.....
.....C...E.....Z.....
.....D...D.....A.....
.....E...C.....BCDEF..
.....F...B.....G.....
.....G...A.....H.....
.....H...Z.....I.....
.....I...Y.....NMLKJ..
.....J...X.....O.....
.VUTSRQPONMLK..W.....
.W.....V.....
.X.....U.....
.Y.....KLMNOPQRST.....
.Z.....J.....
.A.....I.....
.BCDEFGH.....
.....
```