**Effects of Combining Particle Swarm Optimization with Genetic Algorithms to Minimize Deceptive Cases**

**Daniel N. Khalil**

*Computer Science*

*Artificial Intelligence Club*

Daytona Beach, Florida

600 South Clyde Morris Blvd.

**Luke R. Crump**

*Software Engineering*

*Artificial Intelligence Club*

Daytona Beach, Florida

600 South Clyde Morris Blvd.

**Abstract**

This paper set out to find whether hybridizing Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) and Genetic Algorithms (GA) together would allow convergence to an optimal solution on a solution space with many local minimums to simulate solving a deceptive case. After experimentation, it was found that the algorithm proposed performed slightly better than PSO and GA when executed on solution spaces with many local minimums.

**Introduction**

Heuristic optimization techniques have become a widespread technique within the field of machine learning **[1]**. Whether it be training Neural Networks approximating solutions to NP-Complete problems, or pattern recognition, Heuristic evolutionary optimization algorithms, like genetic algorithms and particle swarm optimization, are handy. Although in machine learning, as the solution space becomes larger or more complex with multiple viable solutions. The disadvantage becomes accidentally converging upon an un-optimal solution when there is a solution within the set of viable solutions that is much more favorable. It is acceptable if the difference in fitness of the resulted solutions is not too different. The accuracy would be close enough to justify the solution. However, it is not acceptable when that difference between given solutions is significant; this means that the solution is nowhere near the optimal solution to the problem.

A close up of a lamp

Description automatically generated

**Figure 1: Deceptive Problems Visualized**

Most solution space's deception do not pose much of a problem to current population based meta-heuristic algorithms; most of these algorithms have mechanisms in place to explore a solution space more extensively. Although if there is too much noise applied to solution spaces, or the solution space itself is exceptionally deceptive, then these mechanisms may be rendered ineffective. In worst cases, if the solution space has too much deception, it could be understood that a heuristic algorithm is not useful for the given problem.

The goal of this research is to test whether hybridizing the population based meta-heuristic optimization algorithm’s GA and PSO together may have a positive effect on efficiency, and quality of result.

**Definitions**

**Solution** **Space**: The set of all possible solutions to a specific problem.

**Optimization**: The process of finding the best solution or solutions out of a range of possible solutions.

**Machine Learning:** a subset of Artificial Intelligence that allows an algorithm to learn and improve performance from experiences in an environment.

**Heuristic:** A problem dependent algorithm that is supposedly faster and more efficient than traditional methods by sacrificing accuracy, or completeness.

**Metaheuristic**: A high-level problem independent algorithm that uses heuristic methods to allow application to a broad variety of problems.

**Genetic Algorithm (GA)**: a metaheuristic technique that utilizes evolution of solutions based off of survival of the fittest.

**Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO):** a metaheuristic technique that utilizes the movement of solutions based off of communication of other solutions within a solution space.

**Genetic Algorithm**

Genetic Algorithm (GA) are an evolutionary metaheuristic optimization algorithm based on Darwin's theory of evolution and survival of the fittest. The algorithm initially constructs a population **p** of random solutions in the given solution space, encodes them, then will run through the following steps:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | For each generation of **p** |
| 1 | Evaluation(eval) of each **pi** within**p** |
| 2 | Selection of two suitable individuals within **p**  In this research the *Tournament* method will be used:  Image result for ga tournament method   1. Pick two (**pi, pj**) solutions from **p** 2. If: eval(pi) > eval(pj) then: return pi else: return pj |
| 3 | Breed the solutions together using one of an assortment of crossover methods. |
| 4 | Mutating each solution based on a defined mutation rate. |

Repeating these steps until an optimal solution has been found, Genetic Algorithms eventually converges the entire population to a solution inside the solution space.

The critical aspects of how GAs find a solution is in how they explore and converge. Exploration is affected by the selection and mutation methods of GA and is essential to help the population not get stuck in deceptive cases. Convergence is affected by the selection and crossover methods of GA and is essential to moving the entire population towards a specific solution.

**Particle Swarm Optimization**

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) is a metaheuristic optimization algorithm based off the social behavior of birds. PSO instead of using the practice of selection and crossover, uses a mathematical vector equation that uses the position of the specific particle, the position of the best particle, and randomness to explore and converge on a solution

The algorithm initially constructs a population of particles that contain a random solution between the upper and lower bounds of the solution space, assigns each particle a random velocity vector **vi** within the bounds of the solution space. Then runs through these steps.

ω – inertia parameter (normally between 0.6-0.9)

φp – social component parameter (normally 2)

φg – cognitive component parameter (normally = φp = 2)

r – random number between 0-1

1. Evaluates the particle’s solution: **x**i
2. If the particle’s solution is better, then it’s personal best it updates that particles personal best: **p**i
3. If the particle’s solution is the best solution out of the entire swarm then the global best solution is updated **g**d
4. Updates the particle’s velocity using  
   **v**i,d ← ω **v**i,d + φp *r*p (**p**i,d-**x**i,d) + φg *r*g (**g**d-**x**i,d)
5. Updates the particle’s position

**p**i ← **p**i+ **v**i,d

These steps repeat for each particle for each epoch. To promote convergence the velocity vector equation uses the social component to move each of the particles towards the global best solution, to promote exploration of the solution space the random parameter **r** is multiplied to each component of the equation, as well as the inertia parameter ω.


**Hybridization**

To test whether the hybridization of PSO and GA is viable. GA, and PSO will be tested against 3 different hybrid algorithms. If these algorithms are awarded a higher fitness, in a shorter amount of iterations it will be accepted that these algorithms perform better than the nonhybrid versions of GA or PSO.

**Hybrid: Tandem GAPSO**

The Tandem GAPSO Algorithm will first construct a population of random solutions within the bounds of a solution space. Then encapsulate 1/2 of those individual solutions within a particle object that contains a personal best and global best as well as a velocity vector.

1. Personal best updates based on the current particles position.
2. Global best updates based off the entire population’s global best solution.
3. Particles update velocities of the first ½ of the population
4. Particles update position the first ½ of the population
5. GA will select parents from the entire population
6. GA performs crossover and mutation to fill up the other ½ of the population with children.
7. These steps will repeat to converge to a solution.



**Figure 1**

The idea behind this hybridization of Particle Swarm Optimization and Genetic Algorithm, is to increase the exploration of the population through the solution space. As the population will utilize the exploration components of Particle Swarm Optimization (Inertia, and random aspects of the velocity calculation), as well as the exploration aspects of Genetic Algorithm, (mutation rate, and selection).

Adding this extra exploration aspect will hopefully allow convergence to a more optimal solution within solution spaces that contain either extra noise, or more local minimums / local maximums.

**Benchmark Functions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Function** |
| Ackley's function | https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/BqTjKqIMEd396aoe5C1_L_AbNxLn7vJy5yKveZ3EsGGeq3tVPISHxY4t0LiNK2lC1JkqAGFG-qfjN42HCWWL8mZtKmgsTFX_vjYY3SbiEf4FIF4iIT7Is5AXi_ZR5JUgZS9rFART |
| Eggholder function | https://lh5.googleusercontent.com/NM91deT3uvWQUZCOpxAm9_M_Ra8np7lmzRjGmD_FuYtWyivUAGFaoo8oIdwxbI8uUJwAcBRefXI8owKAlqRnmF7g90oAKyu2yjo5qfekMEz14i9B0wBV-SLSFsA1odsF-apxDkPK |
| Holder Table function | https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/UCpwYhyOEodTYbvAxVMwyNpvLyopHwOrGYZLE7Uss6Ay2CrCIR1y3IJyb-g1JE6-Ojw43wEld7XC_qQlh-kOsMXe40Yqg7kZnzOPtWzHxsXTW8baIOV1h16HhIpt5QLomDNozfop |
| Levy function | https://lh6.googleusercontent.com/Iqcsi0XIdMhVH0718VE5VnL2_kQie1Pyu0MncpzraLUl1PWc1ve48-U0-CjvDRKUqxe8esuBjr4dVPBb6nu6BnlpgLvSDuu07t6imgJXh5atXZjjNsGqgMWqYY5KGTSQecNFZb61 |
| Rastrigin function | https://lh3.googleusercontent.com/3gz3IboUxAliZ-PnxYXLZRBQ3U5hRiMqE9596sJ6JCvkKnnLx49tUmzLfpvuINc_N5eLLYsiyzn3CxXekP4igfDJ5xzPDbNH6ZRmwR9uufOLXcwj-7CWwow7S_Dy9uss0dzRNGN9 |
| Sphere function | **https://lh5.googleusercontent.com/1btHiIHr48djQPAA4uEhc1uWguqVAQboDbnQ30qF1QC0JXAANU1-8EdscIzdIDXty_Xz7jTJGqvWNjeVSGFjY6tdX8ljFKMm8qkV2rrRDB8N00QQzfHPwFTRQBSoK9_ClpNXq79p** |

**Experimental Design**

Plotting the fitness over 20 iterations on each the 6 different optimization benchmark functions, all three algorithms are executed to understand efficiency. In this test the algorithms will be optimizing for the global minimum, so the favorable fitness of each algorithm will be the smallest value.


|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Algorithm | Parameters |
| GA | Mutation rate: 0.1  Population: 25 |
| PSO | Cognitive Component: 2  Social Component: 2  Inertia: 0.9  Population |
| Hybrid Algorithm | Cognitive Component: 2  Social Component: 2  Inertia: 0.9  Mutation rate: 0.1  Population: 25 |


(Each Algorithm executed 100 times then averaged to find the data points that go inside the test cases)  
The test cases will go as follows:


For each algorithm

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Iteration | GA | PSO | Hybrid |
| 0 |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |



**Results**


****The pattern found was that the hybrid algorithm did not outperform in benchmark functions with less prominent local minimums.

****

****Although in functions that had many local minimums the hybrid algorithm performed slightly better than both Genetic Algorithm and Particle Swarm Optimization. For example, the Rastrigin function was a function that the hybrid algorithm would outperform GA and PSO for every dimension.

To check how the hybrid algorithm would perform on solution spaces that contained plateaus; the GA, PSO and the hybrid algorithm were executed using the Easom function which has a large area containing a plateau.

****

****

The Easom function’s hybrid algorithm execution had a slightly quicker convergence speed then particle swarm optimization, although the difference was within 1-2 iterations.

**Conclusion**

The proposed Genetic Algorithm and Particle Swarm Optimization hybridization outperformed GA and PSO only slightly in situations that contained many local minimums / local maximums. Although, the act of changing the algorithm to expand on exploration affected the convergence speed of the algorithm on solution spaces with no/few local minimums or maximums.

Particle Swarm Optimization is an excellent algorithm when paired with real number problems. In the experiment, we executed with the parameters we utilized Particle Swarm Optimization had a faster convergence speed than the Genetic Algorithm; inversely, Genetic Algorithms performed better when it came to the exploration of the solution space. Thankfully when it came to optimizing solution spaces with many local minima and maxima, the hybrid GAPSO Algorithm used both of those strengths and converged on the optimal solution in fewer iterations because of it.

Particle Swarm Optimization and Genetic Algorithms, if executed with the right parameters, always finds the global minimum of the Sphere Function, and Ackley’s function, although when these algorithms are put up against solution spaces with noise, or fluctuation, they stop becoming viable solutions to problems. The GAPSO hybrid created during this paper set out to push that boundary slightly further and succeeded. Although the improvement to the exploration to aid metaheuristic optimization algorithms to get over deceptive problems continues to hinder convergence speeds.

**References**

**[1]** Heuristic and Meta-Heuristic Algorithms and Their Relevance to the Real World: A Survey

<https://ijcert.org/ems/ijcert_papers/V2I55.pdf>

PSO-GSA (Particle Swarm Optimization, Gravitational Search Algorithm Hybrid

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/6141614>

Gene selection in cancer classification using PSO/SVM and GA/SVM hybrid algorithms

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/4424483>

GA and a novel PSO-GA-based hybrid algorithm

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020019004003254>

Variable-Length Particle Swarm Optimization for Feature Selection on High-Dimensional Classification

<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8458226>

How efficient are genetic algorithms to solve high epistasis deceptive problems?  
<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/4630806>

# Development and validation of different hybridization strategies between GA and PSO <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4424823>