

In The Name of God



Navid Zare

*Evolutionary Computing*

*The N-Queens Documentation*

# N-Queens Genetic Algorithm

## Technical Documentation

**Course:** Evolutionary Computing (2025)

**Institution:** Shiraz University, Department of Computer Science

**Language:** Python 3.14.0

**Last Updated:** Feb 2025

**Dependencies:** NumPy, Matplotlib, Pandas

---

## Table of Contents

1. [Introduction](#)
  2. [System Architecture](#)
  3. [Core Components](#)
  4. [Genetic Operators](#)
  5. [Experimental Framework](#)
  6. [Usage Guide](#)
  7. [Results Interpretation](#)
  8. [Performance Analysis](#)
- 

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Problem Definition

The N-Queens problem requires placing N chess queens on an  $N \times N$  chessboard such that no two queens attack each other (same row, column, or diagonal).

**Solution Representation:** Permutation encoding  $[0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1]$  where:

- Index = column position
- Value = row position
- This inherently prevents row and column conflicts

**Example (N=4):**  $[1, 3, 0, 2]$  means:

- Column 0: Queen at row 1
- Column 1: Queen at row 3
- Column 2: Queen at row 0
- Column 3: Queen at row 2

## 1.2 Fitness Function

Fitness is calculated as the **negative count of diagonal conflicts**:

fitness = 0

for each queen i at position (i, chromosome[i]):

for each subsequent queen j at position (j, chromosome[j]):

if  $|i - j| == |\text{chromosome}[i] - \text{chromosome}[j]|$ : # Diagonal check

fitness -= 1

- **Optimal fitness:** 0 (no conflicts)
- **Range:**  $[-N(N-1)/2, 0]$
- **Objective:** Maximization (higher is better)

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N^2)$  per evaluation

# 2. System Architecture

## 2.1 File Structure

project/

— main.py	# Entry point
— queens_ga.py	# Core GA engine
— individual.py	# Candidate solution class
— crossover_functions.py	# Recombination operators
— mutation_functions.py	# Mutation operators
— survival_functions.py	# Selection strategies
— utility_functions.py	# Helper functions

```

├── plotting_functions.py      # Visualization toolkit
├── all_experiments_Runner.py  # Experiment orchestration
├── Results/                  # Output directory (auto-created)
│   ├── *.png                 # Generated plots
│   └── *.csv                  # Statistical tables

```

## 2.2 Design Principles

- **Modular Design:** Operators are interchangeable via strategy pattern
  - **Lazy Evaluation:** Fitness cached to avoid redundant calculations
  - **Repair Mechanism:** Invalid chromosomes automatically fixed
  - **Comprehensive Logging:** Tracks convergence history and statistics
- 

# 3. Core Components

## 3.1 Individual Class (individual.py)

Encapsulates a candidate solution with metadata.

Key Attributes:

```

_chromosome    # NumPy array: queen positions
_fitness       # Cached fitness value
_fitness_calculated # Boolean flag for lazy evaluation
_age           # Generations survived
_generationBirth # Creation generation
_id            # Unique identifier (auto-increment)

```

Essential Methods:

- `get_chromosome() / set_chromosome(value)` - Invalidates fitness cache on update
- `get_fitness() / set_fitness(fitness)` - Manages cached evaluation
- `is_fitness_calculated()` - Checks if fitness needs recomputation

Design Rationale:

- Unique IDs enable tracking across generations

- Lazy evaluation reduces redundant  $O(N^2)$  fitness calculations
- Age tracking supports adaptive strategies (not currently used)

### 3.2 QueensGA Class (queens\_ga.py)

Main genetic algorithm engine orchestrating the evolutionary process.

Configuration Parameters:

Parameter	Default	Description
<b>n</b>	8	Board size (N×N)
<b>pop_size</b>	100	Population size
<b>mutation_prob</b>	0.5	Mutation probability per individual
<b>recombination_rate</b>	1.0	Crossover application probability
<b>max_evaluations</b>	10000	Evaluation budget (termination criterion)
<b>crossover_type</b>	'cut_and_fill'	Crossover operator selection
<b>mutation_type</b>	'swap'	Mutation operator selection
<b>survival_strategy</b>	'fitness_based'	Survivor selection method

Core Algorithm:

```
def run_ga():
    initialize_population() # Random permutations

    while not termination_criteria_met():
        # Evaluation
        evaluate_population()
        record_statistics()

        # Selection
        parent1, parent2 = select_parents() # Tournament (size=5)

        # Variation
```

```
child1, child2 = recombine(parent1, parent2)

child1 = mutate(child1)
child2 = mutate(child2)

# Replacement

population = select_survivors([child1, child2])

generation += 1
```

```
return best_individual, convergence_history
```

Termination Criteria:

1. Optimal solution found (fitness = 0), **OR**
  2. Evaluation budget exhausted (evaluations  $\geq$  max\_evaluations)
- 

## 4. Genetic Operators

### 4.1 Crossover Operators (crossover\_functions.py)

All crossover operators maintain permutation validity.

Cut-and-Fill Crossover (Default)

**Algorithm:**

1. Select random cut point
2. Copy prefix [0:cut\_point] from parent to child
3. Fill remaining positions from other parent, skipping duplicates
4. Wrap around if necessary

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N^2)$

**Pros:** Preserves large contiguous segments; good exploitation

**Cons:** Sequential fill may introduce bias

**Best For:** N-Queens (preserves diagonal-free segments)

### Partially Mapped Crossover (PMX)

**Algorithm:**

1. Select two random cut points
2. Copy segment [point1:point2] from parent1 to child1
3. Map conflicting values from parent2 using position relationships
4. Fill remaining positions from parent2

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N^2)$

**Pros:** Preserves relative ordering from both parents

**Cons:** More complex; higher computational overhead

### N-Cut Crossover (2-cut, 3-cut)

**Algorithm:**

1. Generate N random cut points
2. Alternate between direct copy and fill-from-other-parent
3. Maintain permutation validity during fill

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N^2 \times n\_cuts)$

**Observation:** Increasing cuts (2→3) shows **diminishing returns** (see Task 3 results)

### 4.2 Mutation Operators (mutation\_functions.py)

#### Swap Mutation (Recommended)

**Algorithm:**

if random() < mutation\_prob:

    i, j = select\_two\_random\_indices()

    chromosome[i], chromosome[j] = chromosome[j], chromosome[i]

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N)$

**Properties:**

- Naturally preserves permutation validity
- Low disruption (single transposition)
- Ideal for exploitation phase

**Best For:** N-Queens (no repair needed)

## Bitwise Mutation

### Algorithm:

for each gene in chromosome:

if random() < mutation\_prob:

gene = random\_value(0, N-1)

**Time Complexity:**  $O(N)$

**Critical Issue: Violates permutation constraint**

- Introduces duplicate values
- Requires costly repair operation
- Adds significant computational overhead
- Disrupts evolutionary process

**Recommendation: Not suitable for N-Queens** (see Task 2 analysis)

## 4.3 Survival Strategies (survival\_functions.py)

### Fitness-Based Replacement (Default)

Replaces worst individuals only if offspring are better.

### Algorithm:

1. Sort population by fitness (descending)
2. If child1 > worst\_individual: replace
3. If child2 > next\_worst\_individual: replace

**Selection Pressure:** Moderate

**Diversity:** High (weak individuals persist longer)

**Convergence Speed:** Slow (~94 generations for N=8)

### Generational Replacement

Replaces entire population each generation.

### Algorithm:

1. Generate pop\_size/2 offspring pairs
2. Replace all parents with offspring

**Selection Pressure:** Low

**Diversity:** Maximum (complete turnover)



**Convergence Speed:** Fast (~3 generations for N=8)  
**Best For:** Early exploration; avoiding premature convergence

Elitism Replacement

Preserves top N individuals, replaces rest.

**Algorithm:**

1. Identify top `n_elite` individuals (default: 2)
2. Generate offspring to fill remaining slots
3. Keep elite + best offspring

**Selection Pressure:** High

**Diversity:** Moderate (elite preserved)

**Convergence Speed:** Fastest (~2.3 generations for N=8)

**Best For:** Exploitation; maintaining best solutions

---

## 5. Experimental Framework

### 5.1 Task 2: Parameter Sensitivity Analysis

Tests impact of key parameters on algorithm performance.

Experiments:

Parameter	Values Tested	Runs	Key Finding
<b>Mutation Probability</b>	0.2, 0.5, 1.0	30	<b>Higher is better:</b> 1.0 achieves ~59 gen ( $\pm 65$ )
<b>Recombination Rate</b>	0.5, 1.0	30	<b>1.0 recommended:</b> ~85 gen vs 145 gen at 0.5
<b>Mutation Type</b>	swap, bitwise	30	<b>Swap only:</b> Bitwise breaks permutations

Output Files:

- `parameter_sensitivity_mutation_probability.png`
- `parameter_sensitivity_recombination_rate.png`
- `mutation_probability_comparison.csv`

## 5.2 Task 3: Crossover Strategy Exploration

Compares effectiveness of different recombination operators.

Tested Operators:

- Cut-and-Fill: ~81 gen ( $\pm 93$ ) - **Best balance**
- PMX: ~57 gen ( $\pm 78$ ) - High variance (inconsistent)
- 2-Cut: ~86 gen ( $\pm 107$ )
- 3-Cut: ~82 gen ( $\pm 76$ ) - **No improvement over 2-cut**

**Key Insight:** Cut-and-Fill provides reliable performance for N-Queens by preserving large conflict-free segments.

Output Files:

- crossover\_comparison.png
- crossover\_type\_comparison.csv

## 5.3 Task 4: Survival Strategy Comparison

Evaluates impact of selection pressure on convergence.

Results:

Strategy	Avg Generations	Variance	Selection Pressure
<b>Elitism</b>	~2.3	$\pm 2.0$	<b>High</b> (fastest)
<b>Generational</b>	~3.0	$\pm 1.9$	Low (diverse)
<b>Fitness-based</b>	~94	$\pm 136$	Moderate (slow)

Recommendation:

- Use **Elitism** for fast convergence on well-defined problems
- Use **Generational** for exploration/early phases
- Avoid Fitness-based for simple problems (too slow)

Output Files:

- survival\_strategy\_comparison.png
- survival\_strategy\_comparison.csv

## 5.4 Task 5: Scalability Study

Analyzes algorithm behavior across problem sizes.

Results:

N	Success Rate	Avg Generations	Avg Evaluations	Complexity
8	100%	113 ( $\pm 161$ )	325 ( $\pm 322$ )	Low
10	100%	394 ( $\pm 505$ )	888 ( $\pm 1010$ )	Moderate
12	83.3%	592 ( $\pm 458$ )	1283 ( $\pm 916$ )	<b>Transition point</b>
20	86.7%	2625 ( $\pm 1915$ )	5449 ( $\pm 3830$ )	High

Degradation Factors:

1. **Search Space Explosion:**  $N!$  permutations ( $8! = 40,320 \rightarrow 20! = 2.4 \times 10^{18}$ )
2. **Complexity Growth:** Near-quadratic (Generations/ $N^2$ )
3. **Fixed Resources:** pop\_size=100-200 insufficient for large N
4. **Fitness Landscape:** Exponentially more potential conflicts

Observations:

- $N \leq 10$ : Reliable solutions with standard settings
- $N=12$ : Success rate drops (transition point)
- $N=20$ : Requires  $5\times$  evaluation budget, still 13% failure rate

Output Files:

- scalability\_study.png
- n\_value\_comparison.csv

---

## 6. Usage Guide

### 6.1 Quick Start

Single Run:

```
from queens_ga import QueensGA

from utility_functions import visualize_chessboard


# Initialize and run

ga = QueensGA(n=8, pop_size=100, mutation_prob=0.5)
```

```

ga.initialize_population()

best_ind, fitness, gens, history, _ = ga.run_ga()

# Display result
print(f'Fitness: {fitness}, Generations: {gens}')

visualize_chessboard(best_ind)

```

Output Example:

Fitness: 0, Generations: 73

Chessboard:

```

Q . . . . . . .
. . . . Q . . .
. Q . . . . . .
...

```

## 6.2 Running Experiments

All Experiments (Complete Suite):

```

from all_experiments_Runner import run_all_experiments

```

```

run_all_experiments() # ~30-60 minutes for 540 total runs

```

Individual Tasks:

```

from all_experiments_Runner import (
    run_task_2_only, # Parameter sensitivity
    run_task_3_only, # Crossover comparison
    run_task_4_only, # Survival strategies
    run_task_5_only # Scalability study
)

```

```

run_task_2_only() # Run only Task 2

```

### 6.3 Custom Configuration

```
from all_experiments_Runner import run_experiment  
from plotting_functions import plot_single_experiment
```

```
# Custom experiment
```

```
results = run_experiment(  
    num_runs=30,  
    n=12,  
    pop_size=150,  
    mutation_prob=0.7,  
    recombination_rate=1.0,  
    max_evaluations=15000,  
    crossover_type='cut_and_fill',  
    mutation_type='swap',  
    survival_strategy='elitism'  
)
```

```
# Visualize
```

```
plot_single_experiment(results, "Custom 12-Queens")
```

### 6.4 Recommended Configurations

For Quick Testing (N=8):

```
n=8, pop_size=50, max_evaluations=5000  
mutation_prob=0.5, recombination_rate=1.0  
crossover_type='cut_and_fill', survival_strategy='elitism'
```

For Standard Performance (N=8-12):

```
n=8-12, pop_size=100, max_evaluations=10000  
mutation_prob=1.0, recombination_rate=1.0  
crossover_type='cut_and_fill', survival_strategy='elitism'
```

For Large-Scale Problems ( $N \geq 20$ ):

`n=20, pop_size=200, max_evaluations=50000`

`mutation_prob=0.3, recombination_rate=1.0`

`crossover_type='cut_and_fill', survival_strategy='elitism'`

---

## 7. Results Interpretation

### 7.1 Output Files

All results saved in Results/ directory.

Plots:

- Parameter sensitivity analysis (3 files)
- Crossover comparison
- Survival strategy comparison
- Scalability study
- Baseline experiment results

Data Tables (CSV):

- Statistical summaries for each experiment
- Columns: Success Rate, Avg Generations, Avg Evaluations, Fitness

### 7.2 Visualization Components

Convergence Curves:

- X-axis: Generation number
- Y-axis: Best fitness (higher is better)
- Red dashed line: Optimal fitness ( $y=0$ )
- Shaded regions: Standard deviation bands
- Interpretation: Steeper descent = faster convergence

Success Rate Charts:

- Percentage of runs achieving fitness=0
- Higher is better

- Indicates algorithm reliability

Box Plots:

- Center line: Median
- Box: 25th-75th percentile (interquartile range)
- Whiskers: Min/Max (excluding outliers)
- Outliers: Individual points beyond whiskers
- Interpretation: Narrower box = more consistent performance

Scalability Analysis:

- Log-scale plots: Show exponential growth
- Normalized complexity: Reveals algorithmic scaling behavior

### 7.3 Key Metrics

Success Rate:

- **Definition:** Percentage achieving fitness=0
- **Good:** >90%
- **Acceptable:** 70-90%
- **Poor:** <70%

Average Generations (Successful Runs Only):

- **Fast:** <100 generations (N=8)
- **Moderate:** 100-500 generations
- **Slow:** >500 generations
- **Note:** Lower variance indicates reliability

Average Evaluations (All Runs):

- Measures computational cost
- Compare across configurations with similar success rates
- Lower is better (efficiency)

Final Fitness Distribution:

- Tight distribution around 0 = consistent
- Wide spread = unreliable

- Median closer to 0 = better average case
- 

## 8. Performance Analysis

### 8.1 Optimal Configuration (N=8)

Based on experimental results:

`n = 8`

`pop_size = 100`

`mutation_prob = 1.0`      # Task 2.1: Best convergence

`recombination_rate = 1.0`    # Task 2.2: Lower variance

`crossover_type = 'cut_and_fill'` # Task 3: Most reliable

`mutation_type = 'swap'`      # Task 2.3: Only viable option

`survival_strategy = 'elitism'` # Task 4: Fastest (2.3 gen)

`max_evaluations = 10000`

#### **Expected Performance:**

- Success Rate: 100%
- Generations: ~50-80
- Evaluations: ~200-300

### 8.2 Complexity Analysis

Time Complexity per Generation:

Population evaluation:  $O(N \times \text{pop\_size})$       # Dominant factor

Parent selection:  $O(1)$       # Fixed tournament size

Crossover:  $O(N^2)$       # Worst case

Mutation:  $O(N)$       # Single pass

Survivor selection:  $O(\text{pop\_size} \times \log \text{pop\_size})$  # Sorting

**Total per generation:**  $O(N \times \text{pop\_size} + N^2)$

**Space Complexity:**



Population storage:  $O(N \times \text{pop\_size})$

Fitness history:  $O(\text{generations})$

**Total:**  $O(N \times \text{pop\_size})$

### 8.3 Scalability Limits

Practical Limits with Standard Settings:

- **$N \leq 10$ :** Excellent (100% success, fast convergence)
- **$N = 12$ :** Good (83% success, moderate speed)
- **$N \leq 16$ :** Feasible (requires increased resources)
- **$N \geq 20$ :** Challenging (high variance, 85-90% success)

For  $N \geq 20$ , consider:

- Increasing population size (200-500)
- Higher evaluation budgets (50000-100000)
- Hybrid approaches (GA + local search)
- Parallel island models

### 8.4 Common Issues & Solutions

Issue	Cause	Solution
Low success rate	Insufficient exploration	Increase pop_size or max_evaluations
Premature convergence	Too much exploitation	Use survival_strategy='generational'
Slow convergence	Weak selection pressure	Switch to survival_strategy='elitism'
High variance	Stochastic instability	Increase mutation_prob to 1.0
Invalid chromosomes	Crossover/mutation bugs	Automatic repair via repair_chromosome()

# Appendix A: Experimental Results Summary

## Task 2 Findings

- **Mutation Probability:** 1.0 optimal (59 gen vs 231 gen at 0.2)
- **Recombination Rate:** 1.0 recommended (85 gen vs 145 gen at 0.5)
- **Mutation Type:** Swap only (bitwise unsuitable for permutations)

## Task 3 Findings

- **Best Crossover:** Cut-and-Fill (~81 gen, low variance)
- **PMX Performance:** Fast average but inconsistent (high variance)
- **N-Cut Analysis:** No benefit from increasing cuts (2-cut  $\approx$  3-cut)

## Task 4 Findings

- **Fastest:** Elitism (2.3 gen,  $\pm 2.0$ )
- **Most Diverse:** Generational (3.0 gen,  $\pm 1.9$ )
- **Slowest:** Fitness-based (94 gen,  $\pm 136$ )

## Task 5 Findings

- **Reliable Range:**  $N \leq 10$  (100% success)
  - **Transition Point:**  $N = 12$  (83% success)
  - **Challenge Zone:**  $N \geq 20$  (87% success, high variance)
- 

# Appendix B: Utility Functions

`repair_chromosome(chromosome):`

- Fixes permutation violations by replacing duplicates
- Used automatically after crossover/mutation
- Time:  $O(N)$

`is_valid_chromosome(chromosome, n):`

- Validates permutation property
- Checks: length, data type, range, uniqueness

`visualize_chessboard(individual):`

- ASCII board representation
- 'Q' = queen, '.' = empty

`print_summary_table(results):`

- Statistical summary of experimental runs
- Success rate, avg generations, avg evaluations