

Applied Computational Intelligence Project Report

David Gao Xia n^o 99907 , João Barreiros C. Rodrigues n^o 99668

Oct. 2024

Introduction

This project focuses on solving the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) using Evolutionary Computation methods. The goal is to optimize travel across 50 major European cities via collective transport (plane, train, bus), minimizing travel costs or travel time while ensuring each city is visited exactly once.

Data Collection

The cities selected for our dataset are detailed in the xy.csv file. We gathered data for the plane datasets from Google Flights. For the bus datasets, we utilized BusBud. Finally the Train dataset information was collected from Omio.

Single-Objective Genetic Algorithm (SOGA)

We tackle the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) by using Evolutionary Computation with Elitism, where we keep the best individuals on the population instead of replacing it with just the offsprings.

In cases where we need to find the minimal cost of time for a single type of transport, our population individuals are represented as lists of integers, with each number corresponding to a city in the xy.csv file. The search space has a size of $\# \text{NumberOfCities!}$. We employed ordered crossover and shuffle indexes for mutation to ensure that each city is visited exactly once. For selection, we utilized a tournament method of size 3.

In cases where all types of transport (plane, bus, train) are utilized, our population individuals are represented by two lists: one list of integers, similar to the case with a single transport type, and another list of strings [“plane”, “bus”, “train”], indicating the mode of transport between two cities. The search space has a size of $(\# \text{NumberOfCities!} * 3^{\# \text{NumberOfCities}})$. We employed ordered crossover for the list of integers and uniform crossover for the transport type list. For

mutation, we used shuffle indexing for the integer list and selected a random transport type for the other list. For selection, we utilized a tournament method of size 3.

Optional Heuristic

Results

	Plane mCost	Plane mCost	Bus mCost	Bus mCost	Train mCost	Train mCost
#Cities	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
30*	2040.03	236.85	894.3	392275.16	1864.2	629204.29

	Plane mTime	Plane mTime	Bus mTime	Bus mTime	Train mTime	Train mTime
#Cities	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
30*	2197.83	163.12	16814.06	379934.64	7997.4	627572.86

	EveryTransport		Every Transport		Every Transport		Every Transport	
#Cities	mCost	Mean	mCost	STD	mTime	Mean	mTime	STD
10	336.0		7.34		710.0		8.82	
30	833.9		180.91		2005.77		223.70	
50	2202.17		866871.54		3868.27		820750.11	

It is important to note that due to our train dataset being fairly sparse for the Train only tests, the number of cities targeted for it where 23 instead of 30, to avoid choosing invalid solutions.

Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm (MOGA)

Our MOGA, has the same foundation of our SOGA, using a eaSimple variation with Elitism, with the option to use the same heuristic described before.

To fit the multi-objective problem we had to changed some components of our algorithm most notably: - Fitness registry and calculation/evaluation - Selection - Solution extraction from result population

The Fitness functions now had to support two objectives, both to be minimized. To achieve this we simply return a tuple from the evaluation function composed of both the respective monetary cost and time taken for a solution.

The Selection is now made using the NSGA-II algorithm:

Finally for the solution extraction from the result population we first calculate two points for the final generation: the ideal point (the minima observed in the possible solutions for both objectives) and the centroid (the average of the non-dominated front solutions). By finding the solution that minimizes the vector distance to both points we extract a middle-ground solution that minimizes both monetary cost and time taken.

Results

We could not generate valid solutions for our dataset when using the MOGA, we suspect that this is once again due to the sparsity of our dataset. Therefore the results presented in this section are taken from the dataset given by Professor Horta.

#Cities	Cost for MinCost Solution	Time for MinCost Solution	Cost for MinTime Solution	Time for MinTime Solution
10	910.44	49h	1440.27	12h51m
30	2954.71	185h43m	4740.34	46h
50	3545	170h56m	5007.63	54h16m