**Laboratory 4.1 Neagu Mihnea**

**NLP problem using the sum of different functions problem**

The sum of different powers problem involves finding the minimum value of a function that is defined as the sum of absolute values raised to different powers. Specifically, the function evaluates to:

***f*(*x*)=∣*x*1​∣^2+∣*x*2​∣^3+…+∣*xn*​∣^(*n*+1)**

Where ***x*1​,*x*2​,…,*xn*​** are the components of the input vector ***x***. This problem is often used as a benchmark in optimization algorithms, particularly evolutionary algorithms, to test their effectiveness in finding the global minimum of a non-linear and multimodal function. It serves as a challenging problem due to its complex landscape with many local minima and sharp ridges. The sum of different powers problem helps researchers and practitioners evaluate the performance of optimization algorithms in handling various types of optimization challenges, including those found in real-world applications such as engineering design, finance, and machine learning.

**Evolutive Algorithm for solving NLP:**

**Step 1:**
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We define a class **EvolutionaryAlgorithm** encapsulating the core mechanics of an evolutionary algorithm. It initializes parameters, generates populations, and evaluates fitness using a predefined function. This groundwork sets the stage for evolving solutions across generations.

**Step 2:**
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We implement a strategy for parent selection by randomly sampling individuals from the population and sorting them based on fitness. This ensures that fitter individuals are more likely to be selected as parents. For crossover, we randomly select a crossover point and exchange genetic material between parents to create offspring. Mutation occurs probabilistically for each individual gene, introducing variation in the population. Survivor selection is based on fitness, where individuals are sorted and the fittest are retained. Additionally, population renewal introduces diversity by replacing random individuals with new ones. These strategies collectively drive the evolution of solutions toward optimal fitness, but also because of the strategy used for parent and survivor selection which are highly exploitative we use the renewal population in order to inject diversification into the algorithm.

**Step 3:**
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The **adjust\_probabilities** method dynamically adjusts the mutation probability based on the current generation. If the generation is a multiple of **generations\_until\_renewal** and greater than 0, the mutation probability is doubled. This strategy aims to increase exploration in early generations and exploitation in later generations.

In the evolve method, the execution time is measured using the time module. It initializes the population, tracks the best fitness and individual per generation, and evolves the population over a specified number of generations. Within each generation, parents are selected, crossover and mutation are applied to generate offspring, and survivors are chosen based on fitness. The mutation probability is adjusted, and population renewal occurs periodically. The best fitness, generation, and individual are updated if a new best fitness is found. Finally, the total execution time is printed, and the best fitness and individual per generation are returned. This method encapsulates the entire evolutionary process, from initialization to termination.

**Step 4:**
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The **plot\_evolution\_fitness** function visualizes the evolution of the best fitness over generations. It takes **best\_fitness\_per\_generation** as input, which contains the best fitness values recorded for each generation. Using Matplotlib, it plots the best fitness values against the generations, with the x-axis representing generations and the y-axis representing fitness. The title, x-label, and y-label are set accordingly, and the plot is displayed using plt.show().

In the main function, the user is prompted to input the problem size. Other parameters such as **population\_size, num\_generations, crossover\_prob, mutation\_prob, renewal\_rate, and generations\_until\_renewal** are predefined. An instance of EvolutionaryAlgorithm is created with these parameters, and the evolve method is called to execute the evolutionary process. After evolution, the average fitness is calculated from **best\_fitness\_per\_generation.** The evolutionary process's results are then displayed: the absolute best fitness found, along with the generation where it occurred, and the average fitness across all generations. Finally, the evolution plot is shown using **plot\_evolution\_fitness**, and the results are printed.

**Experiments and parameter optimization:**

In this next section we will showcase the best and average values of individuals over the course of all the generations, as well as the execution time of the program and the plotting of the fitness evolution over generations. Also, the data tables and plots presented below are calculated for a user input of 3 dimensions(we will be using a 3D space for the function) and a number of 10 runs for the evolution algorithm.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INPUTS** | | | | | | | **OUTPUTS** | | |
| **Exp**  **nr** | **Number**  **gens** | **Population size** | **Crossover prob** | **Mutation prob** | **Renew rate** | **Renew**  **after gen** | Best  Solution | Average solution | Exec  time |
| **1** | 100 | 20 | 0.9 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 50 | 0.00000654(gen93) | 0.00112 | 0.028 |
| **2** | 100 | 30 | 0.85 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 50 | 0.00000070(gen70) | 0.00057 | 0.038 |
| **3** | 100 | 40 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 80 | 0.00000026(gen67) | 0.00040 | 0.050 |
| **4** | 1000 | 100 | 0.7 | 0.25 | 0.05 | 500 | 0.00000000059(gen462) | 0.00038 | 1.25 |
| **5** | 10000 | 50 | 0.9 | 0.09999 | 0.00001 | 15000 | 0.00000000006(gen8051) | 0.0000013 | 6.17 |
| **6** | 10000 | 100 | 0.9 | 0.09999 | 0.00001 | 15000 | 0.000000000002(gen8564) | 0.0000015 | 12.38 |
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In the **first three experiments**, each with **100** generations, I adjusted the evolutionary algorithm's parameters. By **increasing population size**, **decreasing crossover probability, and boosting mutation and renewal rates**, I explored their impact on performance. Results consistently showed performance improvement. Larger populations enhanced both exploration and exploitation. Lower crossover and higher mutation favored exploitation, refining solutions. Elevated renewal rates fostered diversity, aiding exploration. The approach led to faster convergence to lower fitness values, signaling improved solutions. Notably, best fitness values improved, highlighting the algorithm's efficacy. Experiments revealed a balance between exploitation and exploration. Reduced crossover and increased mutation and renewal rates favored exploitation, while higher renewal rates maintained diversity, preventing premature convergence.

In summary, parameter adjustments showcased the algorithm's adaptability, enhancing convergence while preserving diversity.
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In Experiment 4, a notable observation in the fitness evolution plot is a significant spike occurring precisely at the 500th generation. This spike indicates a sudden increase in fitness levels, which is not desirable since the objective is to minimize fitness values. This abrupt change coincides with the population restart triggered by the parameter generations\_until\_renewal, set to exactly 500.

This observation suggests that while the population restart mechanism was effective in the initial experiments (Experiments 1-3), it led to suboptimal outcomes in Experiment 4. To address this issue, a strategic adjustment was made to the generations\_until\_renewal parameter. Instead of matching it precisely to the number of generations, it was increased beyond the number of generations. Consequently, population restarts would occur only based on the probabilistic chance defined by the renewal probability.

Interestingly, despite the spike in fitness at the 500th generation, Experiment 4 still outperformed the initial three experiments. The algorithm achieved superior results, notably reaching a promising fitness level at generation 462, just before the population restart. This observation underscores the importance of fine-tuning parameters to optimize algorithm performance and highlights the efficacy of strategic parameter adjustments in enhancing evolutionary algorithm outcomes.
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In Experiments 5 and 6, we extended the number of generations to 10,000, aiming to explore the impact of population size on algorithm performance. The key distinction between the two experiments lies in the population size, with Experiment 5 utilizing a population of 50 and Experiment 6 employing a population of 100.

To induce premature convergence and highlight the effect of population size, deliberate parameter settings were applied. Specifically, the generation at which population renewal occurs was set beyond the total number of generations, and the renewal probability was kept exceptionally low at 0.000001. These adjustments were intended to encourage premature convergence, where the algorithm settles on suboptimal solutions prematurely.

Notably, Experiment 6, featuring a larger population size of 100, outperformed Experiment 5. Despite the deliberate inducement of premature convergence, Experiment 6 achieved a lower fitness value for the objective function. This outcome suggests that a larger population size facilitates more effective exploration of the solution space, enabling the algorithm to reach superior solutions even under conditions conducive to premature convergence.